United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2015 No. 20

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

God of all creation, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In the midst of cold winds and uncertain and sometimes disastrous weather patterns, the consistent warm rays of light fall upon the good and the bad, the believers and unbelievers alike. Gradually, the days are already growing longer but, like the movement of Your grace, often unnoticed.

Lord, You are ever present, especially to those most in need. Show Your mercy to the weakest among us, the children, the poor, the elderly, the homeless. And on this National Day of Prayer, may all Your people be mindful of these anawim among us.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House, that they might be inspired to do what they are able, to care for those whom You have favored from biblical times, the powerless and most vulnerable.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TALIBAN

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, the White House refused to recognize the Taliban as a terrorist group, calling them an ''armed insurgency'' instead. What part of terrorism don't they understand?

Under Federal law, a ''terrorist organization'' must meet three criteria: be foreign, be engaged in terrorist activity and intimidation, and threaten the security of the United States of America.

The Department of the Treasury and the National Counterterrorism Center define the Taliban as a ''terrorist organization,'' but the White House refuses to do so. Common sense says, if we can't call our enemy what they are, then how can we fight them?

Mr. Speaker, my resolution is simple. It urges the administration to publicly recognize the Taliban as a terrorist organization. We could use a little straight talk around here.

I ask for your support of House Concurrent Resolution 13.

PUT AMERICA BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, instead of taking action for bigger paychecks for Americans or rebuilding America's crumbling infrastructure, House Republicans yesterday introduced legislation to repeal and undermine the Affordable Care Act.

This legislation would undermine fundamental guarantees under the ACA that you can no longer lose or be denied coverage due to a preexisting condition. This latest proposal would put coverage for things like maternity care up to the whim of the States. It would include a tax hike on working families and would leave millions uninsured without any coverage at all.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a serious proposal, and more than 2,000 days after President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act, Republicans still lack a serious alternative.

Thanks to the ACA, uninsured rates are at a record low and hardworking families can afford health care, but Republicans continue their obsession with stripping protections from affordable coverage.

This is the wrong direction for our country. We should be working on putting America back to work.

OBAMACARE REPEAL

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful opportunity to set the record straight.

I rise today to applaud my colleagues in the House for passing H.R. 596 on Tuesday which repeals ObamaCare in its entirety. This bill also instructs committees to pass solutions that are patient-centered, free market alternatives because ObamaCare is unaffordable.

I hear it when I am at my son's football games or when I go to the grocery stores: it is important to Americans that Members up here in Washington are listening to and fighting for them on this issue because the President refuses to.

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

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Today, in Thomas County, in south Georgia, a $3,500 deductible will cost a 25-year-old $333 a month, and it will cost a 60-year-old $900 a month. $900 for a $3,500 deductible, that is more like a mortgage payment where I come from. This is the solution that according to the President—the Democrats—that is affordable? Well, it is not affordable, and it is hurting people.

I am proud to cochair a task force of conservative Members who are working towards a patient-centered, free market alternative that respects the freedom of the American citizens.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KYLE LONG

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Kyle Ean Long who was born in Sacramento on June 14, 1987, and died on January 10, 2015, at the all too young age of 27.

The son of James and Tina Long was born and raised in Sacramento, California, attended local public schools, and was a graduate of Sacramento State University. I became familiar with Kyle when he came to work for me as an intern, quickly rising to a legislative aide in my previous position as a Member of the California State Senate.

Kyle's passion for public policy and his enthusiasm for bringing people together made him a highly effective legislative staffer. During his tenure in the State senate, Kyle successfully steered bills through the legislative process in California that helped to provide counseling services for rape victims, prohibited pesticides at school sites and child care facilities, and provided school supplies for homeless children.

In addition to being an important member of the California State family, Kyle was a beloved friend, family member, and a member of the broader Sacramento community. He died when he went to his local gym in the morning to start his daily exercise regimen, had a heart attack, and passed away at the all too early age of 27.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary but all too brief life of Kyle Long.

FIRE IN EDGEWATER

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, a five-alarm fire ripped through 240 apartments in Edgewater, New Jersey. The fire completely destroyed the complex and displaced nearly 1,000 residents. You could see and smell the flames and ashes for miles around.

I rise today to extend my sympathies to the families and recognize and honor the brave men and women of the Edgewater Volunteer Fire Department who responded to this devastating blaze, as well as over 500 first responders from 35 municipalities who came to Edgewater, rescued victims, and battled flames that blazed for 7 hours.

Under the leadership of Fire Chief Tom Jacobson, firefighters rescued people from three floors and miraculously managed to prevent any loss of life or severe injuries.

Thanks to the quick response by the American Red Cross and other aid organizations, the more than 1,000 displaced people were able to take refuge in the Edgewater Community Center.

On behalf of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, in Edgewater, I want to once again extend my gratitude to all the first responders who answer to the call every day and helped prevent further damage in this particular travesty.

SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 527.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 78 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. 527.

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

□ 0910

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. 527) to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes, with Mr. WESTMORELAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

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

Good morning, Mr. CONYERS. It is good to see you.

Six long years into the Obama administration, and notwithstanding some fleeting, recent signs, jobs have yet to recover from the recession. Wages also have not recovered, and the rate of new business startups has not recovered as well.

Instead, permanent exits from the labor force are at historical levels. Real wages have fallen. Dependency on government assistance has increased. Our economy is failing to give enough hardworking Americans the confidence they need to start new small businesses and create new jobs.

At the root of our problem are, more than anything else, the endless drain to Washington of hard-earned income that working people and small businesses need to turn things around in their homes and communities and Washington's endless placement of regulatory roadblocks in the path of opportunity and growth.

That regulatory burden hits small businesses especially hard. Small businesses generate 63 percent of net new private sector jobs and employ nearly half of America's private sector workers; yet they have to pay significantly more to comply with Federal regulations than do larger employers.

Poll after poll has demonstrated that the level of Federal regulations coming from Washington is at the top of the list of obstacles faced by America's small businesses, our top job creators.

This is not fair, and it is exactly the wrong burden to place on small businesses as this Nation struggles to produce a true jobs and wages recovery. Congress can and should act to free small businesses of the burdens and waste associated with excessive Federal regulations so that more jobs will be available to Americans trying to make a better life for themselves and their families.

That is why prompt passage of the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act is so important. This legislation will, for the first time in nearly 20 years, overhaul the laws that govern how Federal regulators should consider—and minimize—the adverse impacts of new regulations on small businesses.

Primarily, the bill reinforces the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 and the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. It only requires agencies to do what current law tries to achieve and what common sense dictates should be done.

□ 0915

However, current law is beset by loopholes, and those loopholes must be closed. That is what the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, at long last, does.

For example, the bill mandates that all agencies, not just the current few, work with small business review panels early in the rulemaking process for major rules, before agencies become entrenched in their proposed paths, to help small businesses better and more effectively point out to agencies what is the best path. The bill also requires agencies to assess not just the direct effects of new regulation on small businesses but also indirect effects, which often can be substantial.

The bill also, for the first time, authorizes the Small Business Administration's Chief Counsel for Advocacy to be the one consistent authority on regulatory flexibility requirements the law imposes on all agencies. This will, at long last, curb the agencies' tendencies to interpret the law to suit their own individual whims and will force agencies to focus on the common needs of small business.

The minute this bill becomes law, what will start to happen?

Small businesses will have a real chance to be heard before agencies, effectively, make up their minds. Agencies will have better information upon which to tailor their regulations to reduce unnecessary burdens on small businesses. Agencies will have fewer opportunities to escape requirements to hear those businesses and gather that better information, and small businesses will be freer than they have been in decades to devote their resources to what they do best—create the new jobs, products, and services that can drive the economy forward to true and lasting recovery.

The Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act recognizes that economic growth ultimately depends on job creators, not regulators. It represents a critical means to convert the recognition into reality.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 3, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Pickford.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

H.R. 527, SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015

Summary: H.R. 527 would amend the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) to expand the number of rules covered by the RFA and to require agencies to perform additional analysis of regulations that affect small businesses. The legislation also would provide new authorities to the Small Business Administration's (SBA's) Office of Advocacy to intervene and provide support for agency rulemaking. Finally, H.R. 527 would require the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to report on the implementation of the legislation.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 527 would cost $55 million over the 2015–2020 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary funds. Enacting the bill could affect direct spending by agencies not funded through annual appropriations; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. CBO estimates, however, that any net increase in spending by those agencies would not be significant. Enacting H.R. 527 would not affect revenues.

H.R. 527 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

If any federal agencies increase their mandatory fees to offset the costs of implementing the additional analysis required by the bill, H.R. 527 would increase the cost of an existing mandate on private entities to pay those fees. CBO expects that if such mandatory fees are increased as a result of the bill, the additional cost of the mandate in any one year would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates ($154 million in 2015, adjusted annually for inflation).

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary effect of H.R. 527 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget functions 370 (commerce and housing credit), 800 (general government), and all budget functions that include funding for agencies that issue regulations affecting small businesses.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—						
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2015–2020
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION							
Estimated Authorization Level	3	9	12	12	12	12	60
Estimated Outlays	2	7	10	12	12	12	55

Basis of Estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that the legislation will be enacted in fiscal year 2015, that the necessary amounts will be appropriated each year, and that spending will follow historical patterns for similar activities.

CBO is unaware of any comprehensive information on the current level of spending for regulatory activities governmentwide. However, according to the Congressional Research Service, federal agencies issue 3,000 to 4,000 final rules each year. Most rules, regardless of size, are promulgated by the Departments of Transportation, Homeland Security, and Commerce, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Most major rules (those with an estimated economic impact on the economy of more than $100 million per year) are issued by the Departments of Health and Human Services and Agriculture, and EPA.

H.R. 527 would broaden the definition of a ''rule'' for rulemaking purposes to include agency guidance documents and policy statements. The bill also would expand the scope of the regulatory analysis for proposed and final rules to include an examination of indirect economic effects on small businesses and a more detailed analysis of the possible economic consequences of the rule for small businesses. The legislation defines indirect economic effects as any impact that is reasonably foreseeable. The legislation also would require agencies to prepare reports on the cumulative economic impact on small businesses of new and existing regulations.

Implementing H.R. 527 would increase the amount of regulatory analysis that agencies would need to prepare, and it would expand the role of the SBA's Office of Advocacy and the Office of Management and Budget's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) in the rulemaking process. Finally, the legislation would require more federal agencies to use panels of experts to evaluate regulations and to prepare reports on the economic impact of proposed regulations on small business.

Information from OIRA, SBA, and some federal agencies indicates that the new requirements would increase the cost to issue a few hundred of the thousands of federal regulations issued annually. Based on that information, CBO estimates that administrative costs in some regulatory agencies, the SBA's Office of Advocacy, and OIRA would eventually increase by a total of about $12 million annually, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. We expect that it would take about three years to reach that level of effort. The GAO report on the impact of the legislation of the Office of Advocacy would cost less than $500,000 to complete, subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Pay-As-You-Go considerations: The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 establishes budget-reporting and enforcement procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or revenues. Enacting H.R 527 could affect direct spending by agencies not funded through annual appropriations; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. CBO estimates, however, that any net increase in spending by those agencies would not be significant.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 527 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

If any federal agencies increase their mandatory fees to offset the costs of implementing the additional analysis required by the bill, H.R. 527 would increase the cost of an existing mandate on private entities to pay those fees. CBO expects that if such mandatory fees are increased as a result of the bill, the additional cost of the mandate in any one year would fall well below the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates ($154 million in 2015, adjusted annually for inflation).

Estimate prepared by: Federal Spending: Matthew Pickford and Susan Willie; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Melissa Merrell; Impact on the Private Sector: Paige Piper/Bach.

Estimate approved by: Theresa A. Gullo, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015. The legislation falls within Rule X (q) jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on the Judiciary to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the right of the Committee on Small Business to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Small Business does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X (q) jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider the legislation.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 527 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this issue and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2015.

Hon. STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman, House Committee on Small Business, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHABOT, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 527, the ''Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015.'' As you noted, the Committee on Small Business was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to discharge the Committee on Small Business from further consideration of H.R. 527 so that it could proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Small Business is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 527.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, threatens to substantially undermine agencies' abilities to effectively regulate areas such as consumer health and product safety, environmental protections, workplace safety, and financial industry misconduct.

Under the guise of protecting small businesses from allegedly burdensome regulatory requirements, this bill is just another attempt to prevent regulatory agencies from promulgating regulations that promote and protect the health and safety of Americans, overwhelm regulatory agencies with unnecessary and costly analysis, and give well-financed businesses and antiregulatory organizations even more opportunities to thwart the rulemaking process.

This explains why the administration has threatened to veto this legislation, stating that the bill would seriously undermine the ability of agencies to execute their statutory mandates and would impede the ability of agencies to provide the public with basic protections.

It also explains why many of the Nation's leading consumer, labor, and environmental organizations have expressed similar concerns about this ''dangerous'' measure, including the AFL–CIO, the American Lung Association, the Consumer Federation of America, the Consumers Union, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Citizen, the United Auto Workers, and the National Women's Law Center.

One of my principal concerns about this bill is that it could jeopardize America's health and safety. Our Federal agencies are charged with promulgating regulations that impact virtually every aspect of our lives, including the air we breathe, the water we drink, the food we eat, the cars we drive, and even the toys we give our children.

Small businesses, like all businesses, provide services and goods that also affect our lives. It makes no difference to a victim who breathes contaminated air or who drinks poisoned water whether the hazards were caused by a small or a large business. The far-reaching legislation before us today would undermine the ability of Federal agencies to quickly respond to emergent health and safety concerns.

Section 5 of the bill, for example, repeals the authority under the current law that allows an agency to waive or delay the initial analysis required under the Regulatory Flexibility Act in response to an emergency that makes timely compliance impracticable. So, if there is a widespread E. coli outbreak or an imminent environmental disaster that could be quickly addressed through regulation, this bill says: Don't worry. Don't rush. Let's have the Chief Counsel for Advocacy decide.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I hear constantly when we are on the floor with bills, which sometimes are bipartisan and sometimes are not, that the President says he is going to veto them. I hope that is not the case, because when it comes to saying that the President is going to veto and his actually doing it, they are two different things. I hope the President works with us on this.

Again, we extend our hand across the aisle here and to the other side of the Capitol to simply say to the regulators that this bill does not want to regulate the regulators. It wants the regulators to use common sense and to get input from the American people—the middle class—and from the people who create jobs, the small businesses, to see what they have to say.

I worked in a factory before I went to college and law school, and I worked my way up to mid-level management. When we did things, I brought in everyone—the people who even worked the machinery. We talked about things, and we resolved many, many things, but we got input from everyone.

As far as letters from people who support the bill, I have a list of 159 names and businesses. This is dated February 3, 2015, from A to Z—from the Adhesive and Sealant Council to woodworking machinery associations. All of these 159 small businesses support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act.

I oppose this legislation, which would paralyze agency rulemaking through unworkable, complex requirements while aggrandizing the powers of the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy with broad authority to act as the gatekeeper of our Nation's regulatory system.

H.R. 527 would allow for large, regulated industries to manipulate the regulatory system in their favor while delaying or blocking critical safeguards to safeguard our Nation's food supply, environment, and workforce.

That is why the American Sustainable Business Council, a coalition of partner organizations representing over 200,000 businesses and more than 325,000 business professionals, opposes this legislation. This coalition notes that H.R. 527 would erode ''the operational capacity of regulatory agencies to do their jobs,'' allowing for ''the largest firms to further dominate the marketplace.'' In other words, H.R. 527 is a thinly-veiled handout to large corporations.

Mr. Chairman, Americans support smart regulation across party lines but not deregulation. Over 70 percent of Americans support strong rules to ensure an open Internet. By a 2–1 margin, Americans across the political spectrum support rules to address climate change by limiting emissions from coal-fired plants. Sixty percent of Americans support the strict regulation of financial institutions, tougher enforcement, and remain deeply concerned about dangerous financial practices.

These are the same rules in the crosshairs of the radical deregulatory agenda of my Republican colleagues.

Dangerous policies like H.R. 527 echo the same laissez-faire rhetoric of deregulation that led to the Great Depression and the Great Recession. H.R.

527 is more of the same. Another handout for the largest corporate interests, that is what this is. It is another bill designed to deregulate industries instead of to promote actual governance in order to deceive Americans through fuzzy math and untried and unfounded rhetoric.

Mr. Chairman, we need real solutions to help real people. We need legislation that creates middle class security and opportunity, and we need sensible regulations that protect American families from financial ruin, that encourage competition, and that bring predatory financial practices to an end.

We need legislation that brings the United States in conformity with the rest of the world's employment policies by guaranteeing paid sick leave and parental leave—I should say the world's industrialized economies' employment practices. According to the Rutgers Center for Women and Work, paid family leave increases wages for women with children while saving the Federal Government funds that would otherwise be allocated to assistance programs.

We need legislation that increases our global competitiveness by creating an affordable higher education. Strong evidence from a Department of Education report roundly demonstrates that investing in our education system expands job opportunities, boosts America's competitiveness, and supports the kind of income mobility that is fundamental to a growing economy.

In other words, what we need is actual governance that helps middle class families, that grows the economy, and that promotes international competitiveness.

What we don't need is yet another deregulatory bill that would increase complexity in our regulatory system while placing a finger on the scales in favor of corporations and against the public interest. I ask that my colleagues oppose H.R. 527.

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

I have been doing some research over these couple of days. This administration alone has implemented over 75,000 pages of new regulations. I just read some figures earlier on this morning that, if we get rid of this ridiculous regulation—and I am not saying all regulation; we do need oversight regulation—almost $1 trillion a year will be added to the economy and almost 1 million people will be added to work on a yearly basis. This is just excellent stuff.

I want to give you an example from my district, Pennsylvania's 10th District. I live in a little village called Cogan Station outside of Williamsport, which is the home of Little League World Series Baseball. I live in the middle of five farms, and I have been there for 15 years.

Pursuant to the Navigable Waters Act, the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA have said that, if it rains and if a puddle forms on the farm—in an attempt for this administration to get more control over our lives—because of the Navigable Waters Act, the EPA and the Army Corps have control now over that farm and can shut it down.

□ 0930

Now, I have been there for 15 years in the middle of these five farms, and I have yet to see as much as a rowboat go through. So this is just an example of how ridiculous this legislation can get.

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

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I have the distinct honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), my good friend, to speak on behalf of us.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chair, here in Washington, D.C., I believe we have too many people working on K Street looking out for Wall Street when we should be, instead, fighting for Main Street. It is our Main Street businesses, our small businesses, that are the heart and soul of our economy and without which there will be no economic recovery.

America has slogged through 6 years of a lackluster economy in part because our hardworking small business men and women are strangled by this administration's overregulation. During my 267 town hall meetings throughout my district in the last 4 years, the number one complaint is this: there is too much regulation on small business from faceless, nameless bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., who don't understand the needs of rural America.

It is time for some red tape relief. It is time for some regulatory certainty. It is time to free up Main Street so they can kick-start our economy and get America back to work. As an active member of the Committee on Small Business, I encourage my colleagues to join me and millions and millions of small business entrepreneurs all across America and pass this bill today.

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

I would like to continue our discussion on this side.

Another problem with this bill, my colleagues, is that it will waste millions of taxpayer dollars by forcing agencies to redirect their scarce resources to meet the bill's burdensome compliance requirements. Section 6 of the bill, for example, would require agencies to review not only all rules currently in effect, but, in addition, all guidance documents in effect as of the bill's date of enactment. Now, we are talking about thousands of pages of regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations and several hundred thousand guidance documents.

So, what is to be gained by that?

Thus, it is no wonder that the Congressional Budget Office estimated that it would cost $45 million over a 5-year period to implement the new requirements imposed under a substantively similar bill considered in the last Congress. Rather than burdening agencies responsible for protecting our health and safety, we should be exploring constructive ways to help small business comply with these regulations.

Finally, this bill will do little to help small businesses, while simultaneously giving corporate interests increased control over the rulemaking process. The bill's expansion in section 8 of judicial review to include challenges to the adequacy of regulatory flexibility analysis would open the door to endless litigation by well-funded antiregulatory business interests who could challenge agency compliance with the legislation's numerous vague, speculative, and cumbersome analytical and other requirements.

I think we get the drift here, where they are going and where they are coming from. I share my colleagues' belief that small business plays an important role in our economy, but this bill does nothing to alleviate the burden, the purported burden on small entities of complying with Federal regulations. In fact, it includes no provision that offers assistance to small entities, whether through subsidies, government-guaranteed loans, preferential tax treatment for small firms, or fully funded compliance assistance offices. Instead, the bill merely aggrandizes the power of the professional lobbying class in Washington, creating opportunities for a well-funded business interest to intervene in the process.

This is a very harmful bill that puts the health and safety of all Americans at risk, while adding nothing to the efficiency or cost-effectiveness of agency rulemaking. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I understand the responsibility of having oversight over any business, but let me give you a couple of examples, again, from my district where a small community bank, who is the primary lender of small businesses, instead of hiring more tellers to expand the business and provide better service for their small business clients, had to hire three people just to review and keep up with regulatory reform that applies to large national and international banks who are lending hundreds of millions of dollars.

That is not the case with smalltown banks. They are lending money to the young man and woman who got a job, saved some money, want to buy a car, and have to go to the bank and say: Can you lend me $10,000? The paperwork that the bank has to go through to do that is costing jobs and costing our economy.

I just got a call yesterday from one of my constituents. The Amish in my district were putting a roof on a small barn they had. OSHA stopped by and

shut it down and fined the Amish because they didn't have helmets on. They only had their straw hats. So he put them out of work for a couple of weeks. They had to pay a fine, and then they have to go buy helmets to put a small roof on a small barn.

I have a constituent from my district who has a little grocery store, and he just had a shipment of bread delivered. It just so happened that an inspector was there, and the bread was brought in through the dock door and set next to, inside the dock door. He was fined because the bread, which is wrapped and on racks, was sitting too close to the dock door.

These are the types of regulation to which we are referring that crush jobs and are killing this economy. One of the inspectors was asked: Why are you doing this?

The inspector simply said, and according to my constituent, arrogantly said: Because I can.

That is no way for an employee of the United States Government to be talking to someone who helps pay his wages.

So with that, Mr. Chair, this is a good piece of legislation. This is common sense, and this is very simple. Let's make the regulators do more with less. There are no agencies or departments in the Federal Government that can tell me that they are running as efficiently as they possibly can.

My good friend, the ranking member, said it is going to cost a great deal to have this rule, this legislation, implemented and the departments and agencies follow the rule. No. You know what the departments and agencies have to do? They have to do just exactly what small business operators throughout this country do: do more with less, and put in a good, hard day's work.

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

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

I rise today in support of this bill, H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015.

I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE as well as Chairman MARINO for the opportunity to work with them on this important piece of legislation.

Small businesses are critical to this country's success. They provide a means for millions of workers and their families to attain the American Dream. They employ one out of every two private sector workers and create two of every three new private sector jobs.

There are over 926,000 small businesses in my home State of Ohio. Small firms rarely have in-house legal departments or regulatory compliance experts on staff. Often, it is the small business owner, the individual running the business and meeting payroll, who also must keep up with regulations and the payment of taxes.

Small manufacturers, retailers, and construction firms want to comply with the law. However, when they divert resources to costly regulatory compliance, they cannot hire workers or start new projects or make other job creation investments.

If there is a way to find less expensive means to achieving regulatory objectives of our agencies, small businesses could protect the environment and workers and still create the good middle class jobs that this country needs.

There is such a law, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or RFA, which requires agencies to understand the costs to small businesses and find less costly alternatives while meeting the regulatory missions required by statute. However, despite admonitions by multiple Presidents, including the current one, agencies continue to ignore the RFA.

The bill before us today, H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015, addresses a goal shared by virtually all Republicans and some Democrats and will ensure that agencies no longer ignore the law and craft more cost-effective regulations. The bill will force agencies to analyze both direct and reasonably foreseeable indirect effects of their rules, just as they are required to do when promulgating major regulations that affect the environment under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

□ 0945

The bill provides for early input in the regulatory process so that agencies do not craft regulations that are so cost prohibitive that small businesses cannot comply, and seeks to ensure consistent application of the RFA by all agencies through regulations written by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy, a process first used to ensure that all agencies performed adequate environmental impact statements under NEPA.

Even with the additional procedures, nothing in H.R. 527 will prevent an agency from issuing a regulation. H.R. 527, to paraphrase President Ronald Reagan, simply requires that agencies know before they regulate. Common sense.

H.R. 527 will ensure that agencies adopt commonsense regulations that achieve their objectives while reducing unnecessary burdens on our best job creators, which are small businesses. About 70 percent of the jobs that are created in our economy nowadays are created by small businesses, after all. That is why the legislation has bipartisan support, and over 150 associations representing the full range of small businesses support passage of this legislation.

Mr. Chair, to fully understand how the bill will work, it is important the committee report filed by the gentleman from Virginia be read together with the committee report on the predecessor bill, H.R. 2542 filed in the 113th Congress by my predecessor as chairman of the Committee on Small Business, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. GRAVES.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this very good legislation, I believe, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Reducing the costs of regulations is a very important issue for small businesses, and it is an issue that is always on their minds. Complicated rules and duplicative requirements can create burdens for small firms across a wide range of industries. Unchecked regulations can reduce companies' profitability, causing them to reduce employment and, in the worst cases, even go out of business.

It is for these very reasons that President Barack Obama has taken strong actions. He has issued several broad-based executive orders on rulemaking. Most importantly, he instructed agencies to conduct retrospective review of their regulations. These reviews have resulted in near-term cost savings to the U.S. economy of $10 billion.

He has always required agencies to estimate the costs and benefits of regulations, consider less burdensome alternatives, and incorporate those that are affected by regulations into the rulemaking process.

Taken together, these efforts are helping to rein in regulatory costs, while ensuring that agencies can carry out their mission. It is against this backdrop that we are considering the bill before us today.

Too often on the House floor legislation is painted as either being totally perfect or completely awful. With this bill, neither of these characterizations is appropriate. In fact, on many fronts, H.R. 527 contains several very positive provisions and will make a real difference for small businesses.

Many of these provisions were contained in legislation that passed out of the Small Business Committee when I was the chair. Together with current Chairman CHABOT, who was then the ranking member, we passed a regulatory reform bill unanimously out of our committee.

For instance, the bill makes the agency's reg flex analyses more detailed so that they cannot simply overlook their obligations to small businesses. It also gives ''real teeth'' to periodic regulatory look-backs, which require agencies to review outdated regulations that remain on the books. Agencies will also be required to evaluate the entire impact of their regulations, something that is long overdue. And it cannot go without mention that the bill brings the IRS under the purview of the RFA. This is a real improvement for small firms, who will undoubtedly benefit from greater scrutiny of complex and burdensome tax rules. These are all constructive changes that will bring real relief to small businesses.

With that said, Mr. Chairman, there are other items in this legislation that

leave you scratching your head. Adding so many new agencies to the panel process is a recipe for disaster. Such a dramatic change will require new bureaucratic processes, more staff, and more paperwork.

It must be ironic for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this bill attempts to reduce Federal regulation by dramatically expanding the role and scope of government.

It also applies reg flex to land management plans, something I have never heard small businesses complain about in my 17 years on the committee. Doing so will enable corporate interests to more readily challenge land use decisions, which could have adverse consequences for the environmental stewardship of public lands. The reality is that the RFA was just not intended to cover these types of actions, and it should not do so going forward.

Another head-scratcher is the creation of another office of size standard within the Small Business Administration. The SBA already has one and does not need two. There is simply no reason to create this bureaucratic duplication. I think both sides of the aisle would agree that, during a time of fiscal constraint, we do not need to be wasting money on a new office when it already exists in the very same agency.

Finally, it is important to note that the Office of Advocacy's footprint has traditionally been minimal, with a budget of $9 million and 46 employees. According to CBO, its budget would have to potentially double to handle the new responsibilities of H.R. 527.

CBO also notes that the private sector could also face increased costs. Federal agencies will likely charge the private sector higher fees to carry out the new responsibilities under this bill.

Simply put, now is not the time to make costly statutory leaps when smaller steps are more appropriate.

It is important to remember that tinkering with our regulatory system will not turn the economy around and create jobs that we need in our communities. In order to make real inroads, we need to, instead, provide businesses with the capital they need to start up and grow through affordable lending and getting more customers through their doors. The best way to achieve that is by increasing the Federal minimum wage.

In the end, legislation such as this detracts us from the real task at hand: creating real jobs through substantive progrowth policies.

So in conclusion, there are some good and some not so good things in this bill. I want to acknowledge the effort by the bill's managers, but in the end, it is not something that I can support, given the imposition of too many questionable policies. However, I want to thank Chairman CHABOT for always being open to discussions, and I look forward to continuing our dialogue on this legislation.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), who is a new member of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 527, to grant long-overdue relief from Federal regulations for small business owners.

This issue is especially important to me as a Representative from California. As of 2012, California had more small businesses and employees than any other State, according to the Small Business Association.

As I understand it, this act does not stop regulation. It just asks for some common sense. When we are looking at small business, all we want is for them to make money, morally and ethically, so that they can expand, so that they can hire, so that they can produce for our country. Well, this is a step in the right direction. Analyzing direct and indirect impacts is something that we should want from our government, federally and statewide.

Many Americans just want to work. The best way Congress can help is cutting some of the burdensome red tape and letting job creators do what they do best—and maybe letting us get out of the way.

Instead of making small businesses spend thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours trying to understand and comply with regulations that might not help, we should let them focus on getting Americans back to work.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY), who is also a new member of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my support for this bipartisan effort to ensure that small businesses and their employees are not overburdened by regulations.

As a former business owner, I know how government intrusion and overregulation can increase costs, decrease efficiency, and ultimately harm hardworking individuals and their families. These taxpayers deserve a responsive government that is efficient, effective, and accountable to them.

As we fight for an environment more favorable to job creation, Federal agencies cannot be allowed to bypass their obligation to measure the direct and indirect economic effects regulations have on businesses. Ultimately, these businesses—the economic engines of our communities—should have the freedom to pursue safe, responsible opportunities unhampered by burdensome rulemaking and red tape.

As a result, communities and businesses, like those represented by the Nevada Manufacturers Association, will thrive. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I stand alongside my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to cosponsor this bill.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), who is also a new member of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the chairman for being a strong advocate for our Nation's emerging entrepreneurs. I look forward to serving under your leadership on the Small Business Committee.

Mr. Chairman, our local businesses employ our friends and neighbors, helping them pay their bills and provide a better life for themselves and their families.

When we talk about helping our local businesses, it is not just about the entrepreneurs. It is also about helping the workers that depend on them for their paychecks. It is not just about strengthening Main Street; it is also about keeping our neighbors strong and prosperous. We should never forget the vital role that our local businesses play in our communities.

The Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act upholds this commitment. Current law requires an analysis to determine if a new rule could have ''significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.'' Unfortunately, our government agencies have failed to comply with the law's spirit.

Among its provisions, the underlying legislation targets loopholes agencies use to avoid Regulatory Flexibility Act requirements. It also requires agencies to include assessments on the cumulative impacts a new rule may have on small businesses.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Now is the time for us to focus on creating well-paying jobs for our communities. I urge my colleagues to vote for passage.

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

Since its enactment in 1980, the Regulatory Flexibility Act has reduced the burden of Federal rules on small businesses. It has evolved over time to include new tools, expanding its purview, and making a real difference for entrepreneurs across the country.

With this important role in mind, the legislation before us makes some essential changes, such as requiring more robust reviews of existing regulations and ensuring that new rules are more thoroughly examined. This improvement will give small firms a greater voice, while reducing the compliance costs they face in so many facets of their business; however, in other areas, the bill goes too far.

At a time of mountainous deficits and growing taxpayer anger at how tone-deaf Congress has become, H.R. 527 will dramatically expand the Federal bureaucracy at a cost of nearly $60 million.

□ 1000

It also turns the SBA's Office of Advocacy into another superregulator, giving it unprecedented authority to issue regulations and greatly increase its role into judicial proceedings.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want people to think that I do not appreciate the fine work that the Office of Advocacy does on behalf of small businesses, but what this bill does is setting them up for failure.

And with all these new powers, it does nothing to pay for it. Instead, it leaves taxpayers with just another bill.

While it is important to empower small businesses, this is not the best and most cost-effective way to do it. In fact, there is no clear estimate of how much savings small businesses will actually receive as a result of this legislation.

The truth is, there are better ways to accomplish these very objectives but without the extravagance of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Chairman, too often, agencies craft one-size-fits-all regulations that do not account for the impact on small businesses. It is our job to remember that what affects small businesses also affects families that depend on those small businesses.

Agencies can still achieve their regulatory objectives while creating smarter, more narrowly-tailored regulations that are sensitive to small businesses.

Some claim that agencies are already doing what the RFA requires—outreach to small business and assessment of economic impacts. If that is the case, agencies should have no problem meeting the new requirements of this legislation. It simply ensures that agencies comply with the letter and spirit of the RFA, as President Obama stated in a memorandum to agencies on January 18, 2011.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act.

Madam Chair, for too long, small businesses have had to conform to a "one size fits all" approach. The intent of the original law, which was passed in 1980, was to lessen the burden on small businesses when conforming to regulatory issues.

Since that time Federal Agencies have abused certain loopholes in the codes, to enforce often arbitrary costs to those businesses. These additional expenditures are far too often the difference between a small business thriving or going under.

I know that in the Territory of American Samoa, our local economy is absolutely dependent upon small businesses and their success. This legislation will enable those who own small businesses across the nation and the territories to have a greater degree of certainty when planning for the future of their business, by allowing for input into the regulatory process from the business owners themselves. This legislation will also require those rule making agencies to regularly review the regulations that are already on the books and what impact they are having small businesses.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman CHABOT and the Small Business Committee staff for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor, and I firmly voice my support for H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act and urge my colleagues in the House to also support this important measure.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. JENKINS of Kansas). All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of an amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–3. 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. 527

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 ''Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION AND EXPANSION OF RULES COVERED BY THE REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) RULE.—The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551(4) of this title, except that such term does not include a rule pertaining to the protection of the rights of and benefits for veterans or a rule of particular (and not general) applicability relating to rates, wages, corporate or financial structures or reorganizations thereof, prices, facilities, appliances, services, or allowances therefor or to valuations, costs or accounting, or practices relating to such rates, wages, structures, prices, appliances, services, or allowances.''.

(b) INCLUSION OF RULES WITH INDIRECT EFFECTS.—Section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) ECONOMIC IMPACT.—The term 'economic impact' means, with respect to a proposed or final rule—

''(A) any direct economic effect on small entities of such rule; and

''(B) any indirect economic effect (including compliance costs and effects on revenue) on small entities which is reasonably foreseeable and results from such rule (without regard to whether small entities will be directly regulated by the rule).''.

(c) INCLUSION OF RULES WITH BENEFICIAL EFFECTS.—

(1) INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.—Subsection (c) of section 603 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting ''Each initial regulatory flexibility analysis shall also contain a detailed description of alternatives to the proposed rule which minimize any adverse significant economic impact or maximize any beneficial significant economic impact on small entities.''.

(2) FINAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.—The first paragraph (6) of section 604(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''minimize the significant economic impact'' and inserting ''minimize the adverse significant economic impact or maximize the beneficial significant economic impact''.

(d) INCLUSION OF RULES AFFECTING TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Paragraph (5) of section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and tribal organizations (as defined in section 4(l) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(l))),'' after ''special districts,''.

(e) INCLUSION OF LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS AND FORMAL RULEMAKING.—

(1) INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.—Subsection (a) of section 603 of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence—

(A) by striking ''or'' after ''proposed rule,''; and

(B) by inserting ''or publishes a revision or amendment to a land management plan,'' after ''United States,''.

(2) FINAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.—Subsection (a) of section 604 of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence—

(A) by striking ''or'' after ''proposed rulemaking,''; and

(B) by inserting ''or adopts a revision or amendment to a land management plan,'' after ''section 603(a),''.

(3) LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN DEFINED.—Section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'land management plan' means—

''(i) any plan developed by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604); and

''(ii) any plan developed by the Secretary of the Interior under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712).

''(B) REVISION.—The term 'revision' means any change to a land management plan which—

''(i) in the case of a plan described in subparagraph (A)(i), is made under section 6(f)(5) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(f)(5)); or

''(ii) in the case of a plan described in subparagraph (A)(ii), is made under section 1610.5–6 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

''(C) AMENDMENT.—The term 'amendment' means any change to a land management plan which—

''(i) in the case of a plan described in subparagraph (A)(i), is made under section 6(f)(4) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(f)(4)) and with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture prepares a statement described in section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)); or

''(ii) in the case of a plan described in subparagraph (A)(ii), is made under section 1610.5–5 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation) and with respect to which the Secretary of the Interior prepares a statement described in section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).''.

(f) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN INTERPRETIVE RULES INVOLVING THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 603 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting ''or

a recordkeeping requirement, and without regard to whether such requirement is imposed by statute or regulation.''.

(2) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—Paragraph (7) of section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(7) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—The term 'collection of information' has the meaning given such term in section 3502(3) of title 44.''.

(3) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (8) of section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(8) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENT.—The term 'recordkeeping requirement' has the meaning given such term in section 3502(13) of title 44.''.

(g) DEFINITION OF SMALL ORGANIZATION.—Paragraph (4) of section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(4) SMALL ORGANIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'small organization' means any not-for-profit enterprise which, as of the issuance of the notice of proposed rulemaking—

''(i) in the case of an enterprise which is described by a classification code of the North American Industrial Classification System, does not exceed the size standard established by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) for small business concerns described by such classification code; and

''(ii) in the case of any other enterprise, has a net worth that does not exceed $7,000,000 and has not more than 500 employees.

''(B) LOCAL LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.—In the case of any local labor organization, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without regard to any national or international organization of which such local labor organization is a part.

''(C) AGENCY DEFINITIONS.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not apply to the extent that an agency, after consultation with the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and after opportunity for public comment, establishes one or more definitions for such term which are appropriate to the activities of the agency and publishes such definitions in the Federal Register.''.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF REPORT OF REGULATORY AGENDA.

Section 602 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking '', and'' at the end and inserting '';'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) a brief description of the sector of the North American Industrial Classification System that is primarily affected by any rule which the agency expects to propose or promulgate which is likely to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities; and''; and

(2) in subsection (c), to read as follows:

''(c) Each agency shall prominently display a plain language summary of the information contained in the regulatory flexibility agenda published under subsection (a) on its website within 3 days of its publication in the Federal Register. The Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration shall compile and prominently display a plain language summary of the regulatory agendas referenced in subsection (a) for each agency on its website within 3 days of their publication in the Federal Register.''.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS PROVIDING FOR MORE DETAILED ANALYSES.

(a) INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.—Subsection (b) of section 603 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(b) Each initial regulatory flexibility analysis required under this section shall contain a detailed statement—

''(1) describing the reasons why action by the agency is being considered;

''(2) describing the objectives of, and legal basis for, the proposed rule;

''(3) estimating the number and type of small entities to which the proposed rule will apply;

''(4) describing the projected reporting, recordkeeping, and other compliance requirements of the proposed rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report and record;

''(5) describing all relevant Federal rules which may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed rule, or the reasons why such a description could not be provided;

''(6) estimating the additional cumulative economic impact of the proposed rule on small entities beyond that already imposed on the class of small entities by the agency or why such an estimate is not available;

''(7) describing any disproportionate economic impact on small entities or a specific class of small entities; and

''(8) describing any impairment of the ability of small entities to have access to credit.''.

(b) FINAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 604(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''an explanation'' and inserting ''a detailed explanation'';

(B) in each of paragraphs (4), (5), and the first paragraph (6), by inserting ''detailed'' before ''description'';

(C) in the second paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting ''; and'';

(D) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) a detailed description of any disproportionate economic impact on small entities or a specific class of small entities.''.

(2) INCLUSION OF RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON CERTIFICATION OF PROPOSED RULE.—Paragraph (2) of section 604(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(or certification of the proposed rule under section 605(b))'' after ''initial regulatory flexibility analysis''.

(3) PUBLICATION OF ANALYSIS ON WEBSITE.—Subsection (b) of section 604 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(b) The agency shall make copies of the final regulatory flexibility analysis available to the public, including placement of the entire analysis on the agency's website, and shall publish in the Federal Register the final regulatory flexibility analysis, or a summary thereof which includes the telephone number, mailing address, and link to the website where the complete analysis may be obtained.''.

(c) CROSS-REFERENCES TO OTHER ANALYSES.—Subsection (a) of section 605 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) A Federal agency shall be treated as satisfying any requirement regarding the content of an agenda or regulatory flexibility analysis under section 602, 603, or 604, if such agency provides in such agenda or analysis a cross-reference to the specific portion of another agenda or analysis which is required by any other law and which satisfies such requirement.''.

(d) CERTIFICATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 605 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''detailed'' before ''statement'' the first place it appears; and

(2) by inserting ''and legal'' after ''factual''.

(e) QUANTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 607 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 607. Quantification requirements

''In complying with sections 603 and 604, an agency shall provide—

''(1) a quantifiable or numerical description of the effects of the proposed or final rule and alternatives to the proposed or final rule; or

''(2) a more general descriptive statement and a detailed statement explaining why quantification is not practicable or reliable.''.

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF WAIVER AND DELAY AUTHORITY; ADDITIONAL POWERS OF THE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 608 is amended to read as follows:

''§ 608. Additional powers of Chief Counsel for Advocacy

''(a)(1) Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration shall, after opportunity for notice and comment under section 553, issue rules governing agency compliance with this chapter. The Chief Counsel may modify or amend such rules after notice and comment under section 553. This chapter (other than this subsection) shall not apply with respect to the issuance, modification, and amendment of rules under this paragraph.

''(2) An agency shall not issue rules which supplement the rules issued under subsection (a) unless such agency has first consulted with the Chief Counsel for Advocacy to ensure that such supplemental rules comply with this chapter and the rules issued under paragraph (1).

''(b) Notwithstanding any other law, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration may intervene in any agency adjudication (unless such agency is authorized to impose a fine or penalty under such adjudication), and may inform the agency of the impact that any decision on the record may have on small entities. The Chief Counsel shall not initiate an appeal with respect to any adjudication in which the Chief Counsel intervenes under this subsection.

''(c) The Chief Counsel for Advocacy may file comments in response to any agency notice requesting comment, regardless of whether the agency is required to file a general notice of proposed rulemaking under section 553.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 611(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''608(b),''.

(2) Section 611(a)(2) of such title is amended by striking ''608(b),''.

(3) Section 611(a)(3) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(B) by striking ''(3)(A) A small entity'' and inserting the following:

''(3) A small entity''.

SEC. 6. PROCEDURES FOR GATHERING COMMENTS.

Section 609 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and all that follows through the end of the section and inserting the following:

''(b)(1) Prior to publication of any proposed rule described in subsection (e), an agency making such rule shall notify the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and provide the Chief Counsel with—

''(A) all materials prepared or utilized by the agency in making the proposed rule, including the draft of the proposed rule; and

''(B) information on the potential adverse and beneficial economic impacts of the proposed rule on small entities and the type of small entities that might be affected.

''(2) An agency shall not be required under paragraph (1) to provide the exact language of any draft if the rule—

''(A) relates to the internal revenue laws of the United States; or

''(B) is proposed by an independent regulatory agency (as defined in section 3502(5) of title 44).

''(c) Not later than 15 days after the receipt of such materials and information under subsection (b), the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration shall—

''(1) identify small entities or representatives of small entities or a combination of both for the purpose of obtaining advice, input, and recommendations from those persons about the potential economic impacts of the proposed rule

and the compliance of the agency with section 603; and

''(2) convene a review panel consisting of an employee from the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, an employee from the agency making the rule, and in the case of an agency other than an independent regulatory agency (as defined in section 3502(5) of title 44), an employee from the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget to review the materials and information provided to the Chief Counsel under subsection (b).

''(d)(1) Not later than 60 days after the review panel described in subsection (c)(2) is convened, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration shall, after consultation with the members of such panel, submit a report to the agency and, in the case of an agency other than an independent regulatory agency (as defined in section 3502(5) of title 44), the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(2) Such report shall include an assessment of the economic impact of the proposed rule on small entities, including an assessment of the proposed rule's impact on the cost that small entities pay for energy, an assessment of the proposed rule's impact on start-up costs for small entities, and a discussion of any alternatives that will minimize adverse significant economic impacts or maximize beneficial significant economic impacts on small entities.

''(3) Such report shall become part of the rulemaking record. In the publication of the proposed rule, the agency shall explain what actions, if any, the agency took in response to such report.

''(e) A proposed rule is described by this subsection if the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget, the head of the agency (or the delegatee of the head of the agency), or an independent regulatory agency determines that the proposed rule is likely to result in—

''(1) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(2) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local governments, tribal organizations, or geographic regions;

''(3) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

''(4) a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

''(f) Upon application by the agency, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration may waive the requirements of subsections (b) through (e) if the Chief Counsel determines that compliance with the requirements of such subsections are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.

''(g) A small entity or a representative of a small entity may submit a request that the agency provide a copy of the report prepared under subsection (d) and all materials and information provided to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration under subsection (b). The agency receiving such request shall provide the report, materials and information to the requesting small entity or representative of a small entity not later than 10 business days after receiving such request, except that the agency shall not disclose any information that is prohibited from disclosure to the public pursuant to section 552(b) of this title.''.

SEC. 7. PERIODIC REVIEW OF RULES.

Section 610 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 610. Periodic review of rules

''(a) Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this section, each agency shall publish in the Federal Register and place on its website a plan for the periodic review of rules issued by the agency which the head of the agency determines have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Such determination shall be made without regard to whether the agency performed an analysis under section 604. The purpose of the review shall be to determine whether such rules should be continued without change, or should be amended or rescinded, consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes, to minimize any adverse significant economic impacts or maximize any beneficial significant economic impacts on a substantial number of small entities. Such plan may be amended by the agency at any time by publishing the revision in the Federal Register and subsequently placing the amended plan on the agency's website.

''(b) The plan shall provide for the review of all such agency rules existing on the date of the enactment of this section within 10 years of the date of publication of the plan in the Federal Register and for review of rules adopted after the date of enactment of this section within 10 years after the publication of the final rule in the Federal Register. If the head of the agency determines that completion of the review of existing rules is not feasible by the established date, the head of the agency shall so certify in a statement published in the Federal Register and may extend the review for not longer than 2 years after publication of notice of extension in the Federal Register. Such certification and notice shall be sent to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and the Congress.

''(c) The plan shall include a section that details how an agency will conduct outreach to and meaningfully include small businesses (including small business concerns owned and controlled by women, small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, and small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (as such terms are defined in the Small Business Act)) for the purposes of carrying out this section. The agency shall include in this section a plan for how the agency will contact small businesses and gather their input on existing agency rules.

''(d) Each agency shall annually submit a report regarding the results of its review pursuant to such plan to the Congress, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, and, in the case of agencies other than independent regulatory agencies (as defined in section 3502(5) of title 44) to the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget. Such report shall include the identification of any rule with respect to which the head of the agency made a determination described in paragraph (5) or (6) of subsection (e) and a detailed explanation of the reasons for such determination.

''(e) In reviewing a rule pursuant to subsections (a) through (d), the agency shall amend or rescind the rule to minimize any adverse significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities or disproportionate economic impact on a specific class of small entities, or maximize any beneficial significant economic impact of the rule on a substantial number of small entities to the greatest extent possible, consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes. In amending or rescinding the rule, the agency shall consider the following factors:

''(1) The continued need for the rule.

''(2) The nature of complaints received by the agency from small entities concerning the rule.

''(3) Comments by the Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman and the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

''(4) The complexity of the rule.

''(5) The extent to which the rule overlaps, duplicates, or conflicts with other Federal rules and, unless the head of the agency determines it to be infeasible, State, territorial, and local rules.

''(6) The contribution of the rule to the cumulative economic impact of all Federal rules on the class of small entities affected by the rule, unless the head of the agency determines that such calculations cannot be made and reports that determination in the annual report required under subsection (d).

''(7) The length of time since the rule has been evaluated or the degree to which technology, economic conditions, or other factors have changed in the area affected by the rule.

''(f) Each year, each agency shall publish in the Federal Register and on its website a list of rules to be reviewed pursuant to such plan. The agency shall include in the publication a solicitation of public comments on any further inclusions or exclusions of rules from the list, and shall respond to such comments. Such publication shall include a brief description of the rule, the reason why the agency determined that it has a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (without regard to whether it had prepared a final regulatory flexibility analysis for the rule), and request comments from the public, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, and the Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman concerning the enforcement of the rule.''.

SEC. 8. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT AVAILABLE AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE FINAL RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 611(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''final agency action'' and inserting ''such rule''.

(b) JURISDICTION.—Paragraph (2) of such section is amended by inserting ''(or which would have such jurisdiction if publication of the final rule constituted final agency action)'' after ''provision of law,''.

(c) TIME FOR BRINGING ACTION.—Paragraph (3) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''final agency action'' and inserting ''publication of the final rule''; and

(2) by inserting '', in the case of a rule for which the date of final agency action is the same date as the publication of the final rule,'' after ''except that''.

(d) INTERVENTION BY CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY.—Subsection (b) of section 612 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the first period ''or agency compliance with section 601, 603, 604, 605(b), 609, or 610''.

SEC. 9. JURISDICTION OF COURT OF APPEALS OVER RULES IMPLEMENTING THE REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2342 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

''(8) all final rules under section 608(a) of title 5.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph (3) of section 2341 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

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

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(F) the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, when the final rule is under section 608(a) of title 5.''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION TO INTERVENE AND COMMENT ON AGENCY COMPLIANCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE.—Subsection (b) of section 612 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''chapter 5, and chapter 7,'' after ''this chapter,''.

SEC. 10. ESTABLISHMENT AND APPROVAL OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN SIZE STANDARDS BY CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 3(a)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)(2)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the criteria specified in paragraph (1)—

''(i) the Administrator may specify detailed definitions or standards by which a business concern may be determined to be a small business concern for purposes of this Act or the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; and

''(ii) the Chief Counsel for Advocacy may specify such definitions or standards for purposes of any other Act.''.

(b) APPROVAL BY CHIEF COUNSEL.—Clause (iii) of section 3(a)(2)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)(2)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

''(iii) except in the case of a size standard prescribed by the Administrator, is approved by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy.''.

(c) INDUSTRY VARIATION.—Paragraph (3) of section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or Chief Counsel for Advocacy, as appropriate'' before ''shall ensure''; and

(2) by inserting ''or Chief Counsel for Advocacy'' before the period at the end.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF SIZE STANDARDS APPROVED BY CHIEF COUNSEL.—Section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF STANDARDS APPROVED BY CHIEF COUNSEL.—In the case of an action for judicial review of a rule which includes a definition or standard approved by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy under this subsection, the party seeking such review shall be entitled to join the Chief Counsel as a party in such action.''.

SEC. 11. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(B) by striking ''(1) the term'' and inserting the following:

''(1) AGENCY.—The term'';

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(B) by striking ''(3) the term'' and inserting the following:

''(3) SMALL BUSINESS.—The term'';

(3) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(B) by striking ''(5) the term'' and inserting the following:

''(5) SMALL GOVERNMENTAL JURISDICTION.—The term''; and

(4) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(B) by striking ''(6) the term'' and inserting the following:

''(6) SMALL ENTITY.—The term''.

(b) INCORPORATIONS BY REFERENCE AND CERTIFICATIONS.—The heading of section 605 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 605. Incorporations by reference and certifications''.

(c) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By striking the item relating to section 605 and inserting the following new item:

''605. Incorporations by reference and certifications.''.

(2) By striking the item relating to section 607 and inserting the following new item:

''607. Quantification requirements.''.

(3) By striking the item relating to section 608 and inserting the following:

''608. Additional powers of Chief Counsel for Advocacy.''.

(d) OTHER CLERICAL AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 6.—Chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, is amended in section 603(d)—

(1) by striking paragraph (2);

(2) by striking ''(1) For a covered agency,'' and inserting ''For a covered agency,'';

(3) by striking ''(A) any'' and inserting ''(1) any'';

(4) by striking ''(B) any'' and inserting ''(2) any''; and

(5) by striking ''(C) advice'' and inserting ''(3) advice''.

SEC. 12. AGENCY PREPARATION OF GUIDES.

Section 212(a)(5) the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) AGENCY PREPARATION OF GUIDES.—The agency shall, in its sole discretion, taking into account the subject matter of the rule and the language of relevant statutes, ensure that the guide is written using sufficiently plain language likely to be understood by affected small entities. Agencies may prepare separate guides covering groups or classes of similarly affected small entities and may cooperate with associations of small entities to distribute such guides. In developing guides, agencies shall solicit input from affected small entities or associations of affected small entities. An agency may prepare guides and apply this section with respect to a rule or a group of related rules.''.

SEC. 13. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete and publish a study that examines whether the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration has the capacity and resources to carry out the duties of the Chief Counsel under this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114–14. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114–14.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike ''a rule'' and all that follows through ''a rule'' on line 13 and insert the following: ''—

''(A) a rule pertaining to the protection of the rights of and benefits for veterans or part 232 of title 32 of the Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on July 1, 2014) or any successor provisions thereto; or

''(B) a rule''.

Page 11, insert after line 14 (and redesignate succeeding subparagraphs accordingly) the following:

(C) in the first paragraph (6), by striking ''; and'' at the end;

Page 13, line 21, insert after ''Section 608'' the following: ''of title 5, United States Code,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 78, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Chair, my amendment is very straightforward and has a singular goal of making sure that we are not making our Active Duty servicemembers more vulnerable to predatory lending.

Members of our Armed Services make sacrifices every day to protect our country from harm and to defend our freedoms, and it is our responsibility here in Congress to ensure that these men and women are protected from scams and predatory lenders that seek to exploit their service.

Sadly, it has become clear that the nature of military service makes our men and women in uniform the ideal targets for predatory loans that carry exorbitant interest rates.

San Diego, part of which I represent, is home to the largest concentration of military forces in the world. More than 100,000 Active Duty servicemembers call the region home. Predatory lending is an acute problem in my district and in the region and continues to hurt too many families.

Despite passage of the Military Lending Act of 2007 to eliminate this type of predatory lending, which too often leaves servicemembers and their families with crippling amounts of debt, there are a number of loopholes that these bad-acting lenders have continued to exploit.

These reprehensible predators are trapping servicemembers and their families in a cycle of debt that can be extremely difficult to overcome, and it is our responsibility, and we are able to act.

A bipartisan and bicameral effort has been made to call on the Department of Defense to issue rules that close the loopholes and ensure our Active Duty personnel do not fall victim to predatory practices that leave them financially strapped.

This amendment would keep regulations on predatory lenders so that we are maintaining a watchful eye on those companies that are exploiting those who have sacrificed so much for our safety, even as we move to reform and streamline the regulatory processes on businesses that are playing by the rules.

I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee and Chairman CHABOT of the Small Business Committee for working with me over the past few days on this amendment, and for their commitment to working on a bipartisan basis to protect our servicemembers.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I will

speak in favor of the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is a recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I want to thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I think this is a good example of the way bipartisanship should work. The gentleman offered, I think, a very constructive amendment. We committed that our staffs and the Members would work together on the gentleman's amendment, and most of us have agreed with the amendment and do support it now, so we thank him for his leadership on this amendment.

We strongly support our servicemembers and veterans. Our Nation owes them an enormous debt and the utmost respect.

In the last Congress an amendment was added to this legislation to allow rules that protect the rights and benefits of veterans to bypass the RFA process. That amendment is carried forward in today's legislation.

The legislation, however, does not yet place on the same plane rules written to protect Active Duty servicemembers from predatory lending. This amendment reconciles that difference, and so we again commend the gentleman for offering it.

In addition, the amendment makes a very small number of technical corrections to the text of the bill. In each of these ways, the amendment improves the bill. I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Madam Chair, I just simply want to say that I support this legislation. I tell my children on a weekly basis—they can recite it verbatim—that if it were not for our veterans, if it were not for our military personnel and our servicemembers that are working now, my children wouldn't have what they have today. So I want to reinforce that.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114–14.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 13, line 18, strike section 5 (and redesignate provisions accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 78, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Madam Chairman, my amendment would preserve the ability of agencies to quickly respond to emergencies that threaten America's health and safety by striking one of the most pernicious elements of this legislation.

Section 5 of H.R. 527 contains one of the bill's most problematic provisions. As drafted, it could undermine the ability of agencies to quickly respond to emergent health and safety risks.

So this section repeals the authority under current law that allows an agency to waive or delay the initial analysis required under the Regulatory Flexibility Act ''in response to an emergency that makes compliance or timely compliance impracticable.''

Rather than leave this critical exception under current law in place, section 5 replaces it with a provision empowering the Chief Counsel for Advocacy to issue regulations about how agencies, in general, should comply with the act, without any provision allowing agencies to respond to emergencies through expedited rulemakings.

Thus, if there is a looming national pandemic or environmental disaster that could be avoided or mitigated through regulation, the bill prevents agencies from responding to such emergencies without first having to go through the arduous and time-consuming task of review and analysis.

For example, last year, OSHA issued guidance to assist hospitals in preparing to provide inpatient care for Ebola patients.

H.R. 527, however, would have significantly delayed this process. This is because the legislation broadly applies to both rules and interim guidance, requiring agencies to undertake a burdensome analysis and review process prior to issuing even interim guidance.

And because H.R. 527 eliminates the emergency exception, there would have been no way for OSHA to quickly act in the face of a possible Ebola outbreak.

This amendment would simply preserve the critical emergency exception under current law so that agencies can quickly respond to emergencies without being hampered or second-guessed by others.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TIPTON). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, one of the key failings of existing law is that it allows different agencies to interpret differently the terms of the Regulatory Flexibility Act and Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. This allows agencies to find loopholes at their pleasure and evade the requirements of the law.

The bill remedies this defect by granting the Small Business Administration's Office of Chief Counsel for Advocacy authority to write regulations to govern all agencies' compliance with the RFA and SBREFA.

The bill also grants the Office of Chief Counsel authority to intervene—the key word there, ''intervene''—in agency adjudications and offer comments in agency notice-and-comment proceedings. These reforms will, at last, assure consistent compliance with the RFA and the SBREFA across the entire Federal Government.

The amendment would defeat the purpose and restore to the agencies their ability to find loopholes to suit their whims. America's small business creators deserve better than that.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

So if there is a looming environmental disaster or a national pandemic like Ebola that could be mitigated through regulation, this bill says: ''Don't worry, don't rush. Let's have the Office of Advocacy decide.''

And what is this Office of Advocacy?

Well, it is an office that is woefully ill-equipped to fulfill its current responsibilities. So I urge support for the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1015

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114–14.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 14. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the case of any rule that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation, the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect, and the provisions of law amended, as in effect on the day prior to the effective date of this Act, shall remain in effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 78, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chair, on many fronts, H.R. 527 does a very good job strengthening requirements that agencies review regulations that are already on the books, with stronger analyses about how these regulations impact small businesses. Ensuring that agencies are operated in an efficient manner has never been so important. This means that efforts must be made to limit programs that tend to duplicate one another.

Now, unfortunately, section 10 of this legislation creates a duplicative program, using resources twice at the SBA. It further grows the convoluted aspects of the Federal Government's regulatory processes.

To approve a size standard has been the province of the SBA administrative office. It requires expertise and analytical resources, which the Office of Advocacy will now have to acquire. This will duplicate similar resources maintained by the SBA's office of size standards. It seems very redundant to create another office to do the same thing that a current office already does. The Chief Counsel for Advocacy for President Reagan testified in 2011 before the Small Business Committee that Advocacy should not take on the new responsibilities outlined in this very legislation.

My amendment is simple. It would strike this duplicative section and keep all the regulatory flexibility reforms that are in the bill. Eliminating this provision from the bill will not have any effect on the size standard process or on small businesses. It will be business as usual. What it does do is saves taxpayers from footing the bill for two identical size standard offices.

For these reasons, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, which is a vote to reduce waste and unnecessary duplication at the SBA. Reducing government complexity should be a bipartisan effort.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chair, this amendment proposes to strike section 10 from the bill, which gives the Small Business Administration's Chief Counsel for Advocacy authority to approve small business size standards for the purposes of any act other than the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. That includes, of course, authority to approve size standards for the purposes of the RFA.

This makes sense, since the Chief Counsel for Advocacy, not the Small Business administrator, is charged with overseeing agency compliance with the RFA; and the Chief Counsel exercises that authority independently from the SBA administrator.

The theory of the amendment is that, under section 10, a new size standards office, duplicative of the SBA administrator's own size standards office, will be created. But that is just not the case.

The SBA administrator will retain the authority to set size standards under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. But alternative size standards for the purposes of RFA compliance are a different matter, and under existing law, agencies must consult with the Chief Counsel for Advocacy with regard to those alternative size standards.

To authorize the Chief Counsel for Advocacy to actually approve size standards about which it already must be consulted is simply to formalize an existing reality, not to create a duplicative function or a duplicative office. Stated differently, it is erroneous to think that the Office of Advocacy will have to establish a new office of size standards to do what the Office of Advocacy already essentially does. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

And just in summary, I would reiterate that 70 percent of the jobs that are created in this economy today are created by small businesses. They are overregulated. The RFA was basically set up to avoid the impact on small businesses by all these regulations that are being imposed upon them.

For small businesses, it is much more expensive for them to comply than it is for larger corporations who have lots of staff. They have attorneys. They have accountants and everything else. If you are a small business owner, it can be the death of that business. And it is not just that business that goes down the drain, but those jobs do, too. That affects families all over this country all the time.

The purpose of this legislation is to improve the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and that is why virtually all Republicans and many Democrats also have endorsed and supported this legislation in the past and do this time.

There is something like 160 different companies and agencies around the country that are supportive, and I just wanted to name a few of those:

The American Dental Association; the Farm Bureau; the Trucking Association; Associated Builders and Contractors; the credit unions; the National Association of Manufacturers; the Realtors; the National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, which is the principal organization that advocates on behalf of small businesses in this country; the National Restaurant Association; the Retail Federation; the independent drivers; the Chamber; and on and on. Obviously, I don't have time to read them all.

This is good legislation. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114–14.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 26, beginning on line 9, strike section 10, and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 78, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which would exempt from H.R. 527 all rules that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation.

Under President Obama, our country has rebounded from the Great Recession, creating 11 million new jobs over 5 years, and unemployment is falling at the fastest rate in three decades. Consumer and business spending have catalyzed the fastest gross domestic product growth since 2003. My amendment would ensure that this meteoric growth and progress continues.

Contrary to my Republican colleagues' assertion that regulations kill jobs, a wealth of unimpeachable, bipartisan evidence has repeatedly and effectively debunked this claim. Studies by both the San Francisco and New York Federal Reserve found that there is zero correlation between job growth and regulations and that there is no evidence showing that increased regulations and taxes have any effect on the unemployment rate.

And the evidence that regulations harm the economy? The only evidence relied on for the absurd figures repeated by the proponents of this bill derive from a study roundly disproven by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, which found that the study's cost figures were cherry-picked, inaccurate, based on evidence from decades ago, and without contemporary value.

I have also heard my Republican colleagues repeatedly claim that regulations have a $15,000 regulatory burden on every American family. Consequently, The Washington Post awarded this claim, ''Two Pinocchios,'' on January 14, arguing that this absurd figure has ''serious methodological problems—even the report admits it is 'not scientific' and 'back of the envelope'—and we fear these caveats are being forgotten as it is repeated in Capitol Hill news conferences and then in

news reports,'' and sometimes even on this floor.

Mr. Chair, the economy and job growth are growing at its fastest pace in years on the back of sound economic policy and sensible regulations. Despite this growth, it is clear that many continue to struggle to live comfortably on their income, pay their bills on time, or set aside for retirement. Americans work harder than ever, thanks to corporations maximizing profits through a ''streamlined workforce.'' Meanwhile, the world's top 1 percent will soon control half of the world's wealth as the compensation of corporate executives balloons ever-higher.

The same corporations that are continuing to show record profit margins are also pushing deregulation and fewer taxes because they have a ''myopic obsession with short-term profits at the expense of long-term value creation,'' according to Henry Blodget, the CEO of Business Insider.

It is also clear that, despite its incredible workplace productivity, wages have stagnated. We do need to fix that, but unfortunately, deregulation does not do so.

Last Congress, Republicans blocked Democratic legislation that would increase the Federal minimum wage by less than $3, lifting countless full-time workers out of poverty, while saving the Federal Government trillions in annual safety net costs.

Fortunately, for Americans, minimum wage increases have gone into effect in 20 States this month alone, bringing the minimum wage in 29 States above the Federal minimum wage, but yet this Congress refuses to take up legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage. Perhaps my Republican colleagues will heed the calls of workers across the country for a living wage. This bill does not do that.

I ask that my colleagues support my amendment, which does protect jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I share and welcome the gentleman's concerns about the impacts of regulations on jobs, but the right way to address that concern is to join me in supporting this bill.

At the heart of the bill are reforms to make sure agencies better identify the potential jobs impact of new rules; that includes not only identifying and minimizing the adverse jobs impact, but maximizing positive job benefits. It is right there in subsection 2(c) on page 3 of the bill.

If the gentleman wants to maximize job creation, the way to do it is to make sure the provisions designed to maximize job benefits apply to all rules, including those that OMB believes will result in net job creation.

Why stop at just helping to create a net increase in jobs, which could mean as little as just one net job? Why not make sure agencies always work with small businesses under the bill's provisions to help create the most new jobs possible and prevent the destruction of the most jobs possible? Isn't that what makes sense as the Nation tries to recover from the jobs depression?

Further, why create a carve-out from the bill that gives the executive branch an incentive to manipulate its jobs impact analyses to avoid the requirements of the bill rather than comply with them?

I would also like to bring to the Chair's attention, this administration highly overinflates—or underinflates, whatever side you are looking at—the unemployment rate.

□ 1030

In the unemployment rate, they are not taking into account the almost 1 million people that are not looking for work, and that is normally taken into consideration. They are also taking into account as a person being employed as this example: a person who mows his neighbor's lawn for 20 bucks because he doesn't have a job. That is considered, according to this administration, a job.

Multiple reports clearly prove that the cost of Federal regulation to the U.S. economy, manufacturing, and small business, and Ten Thousand Commandments, these are reports from just last year, and they give the accurate account of the unemployment rate.

My good colleague on the other side of the aisle refers to a report from 2010. We should be referring to the latest reports as I hold them in my hand.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 114–14.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 14. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a rule proposed, issued, or made by the Food and Drug Administration relating to consumer safety, including any rule made under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect, and the provisions of law amended, as in effect on the day prior to the effective date of this Act, shall remain in effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 78, 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 the chairman; thank the mover of this legislation; my ranking member, Mr. JOHNSON; and my ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CONYERS, for their leadership and for bringing us together around a universal concept.

We all are promoting jobs, Mr. Chairman. Not one of us on this floor wants to in any way undermine jobs. We want people to work, and we want small businesses to have the opportunity to thrive.

What I am talking about is the reality of protecting the American people when it comes to unique issues of health care. I am not going to cite the name of this individual, but what I am going to do is to read just a paragraph from Al Kamen, K-a-m-e-n, ''In the Loop'':

''As a matter of fact, I think this is one where I think I can illustrate the point,'' he recalled telling her. ''I don't have any problem with Starbucks if they choose to opt out of this policy as long as they post a sign that says, 'We don't require our employees to wash their hands after leaving the restroom.' The market will take care of this. It is one example.''

Now, I have a different perspective, and so my amendment under this legislation asks to make an exception for rules that are dealing with consumer safety, saving lives.

My amendment makes an exception for rules from the Food and Drug Administration, commonly known as the FDA. This bill, H.R. 527, seeks to reform the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 and 1996 which attempted to require agencies to account better for the impact of proposed regulations on small businesses, other small entities, and to tailor final regulations to minimize adverse impacts on these entities like the Food and Drug Administration.

Yes, small business can be a single franchise of a McDonald's or Burger King or Starbucks, many of them doing quite well. It could be a number of them under one businessowner. But, in fact, they do deal with the public.

This bill continues to expand the reach and scope of the Regulatory Flexibility Act and would only add to already unnecessary and lengthy regulatory delays, increased meddling by regulated industries, and encourage gratuitous court challenges.

The Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Act adds a host of new analytical requirements for agency policy actions, including rulemakings and guidance documents, that might affect a large number of small businesses, even if that is indirect.

Because the bill defines indirect effects broadly, it would mandate costly and wasteful new analyses that could be applied to virtually any action and agency attempt to make a better life

for Americans, no matter how tenuous the connection to business interests.

Again, can we imagine not being able to regulate or interfere with some small business that says you do not have to wash your hands in a restaurant? It is shocking to me.

Mr. Chairman, when I wrote this amendment, I had in mind one of the new issues that we have been facing, and that is the story of CRE, which is a disease that is being found on endoscopes, that has been found in a particular hospital in the far West.

This disease, this rare bacteria, was likely spread through specialized endoscopes that have been cleaned according to manufacturer's directions but still had some form of deadly germs. Are we suggesting that it is not an emergency to regulate or to keep or to be able to suggest that there needs to be a better cleaning process?

This is just the latest example of a life-threatening disease which is calling out for action from the government, and the CDC and the FDA should not have their hands tied.

In fact, the Houston Chronicle reported last week that these problems of dirty endoscopes have been tied to superbug infections in cities like Chicago and Pittsburgh in recent years. Although the bacteria weren't exactly the same, the situation raises new questions about the design, this infection, and regulation of the devices.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that our economy is doing fine, not for every single American, but it has a marked improvement. Jobs are increasing, and unemployment is under 5 percent.

I would only say that this legislation needs an addition from this amendment, and I hope my colleagues will accept the Jackson Lee amendment. It is a commonsense amendment that speaks to the health and care of the American public.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to briefly explain my amendment. My amendment makes an exception for rules from the Food and Drug Administration, commonly known as the FDA.

This bill, H.R. 527, seek to reform the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 and the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, which attempted to require agencies to account better for the impacts of proposed regulations on small businesses and other small entities and to tailor final regulations to minimize adverse impacts on these entities like the Food and Drug Administration.

In reality, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Act expands the reach and scope of the Regulatory Flexibility Act and would only add to already unnecessary and lengthy regulatory delays, increase meddling by regulated industries, and encourage gratuitous court challenges.

The Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Act adds a host of new analytical requirements for agency policy actions—including rulemakings and guidance documents—that might affect a large number of small businesses, even if that effect is "indirect."

And because the bill defines "indirect effects" broadly, it would mandate costly and wasteful new analyses that could be applied to virtually any action an agency attempts to undertake, no matter how tenuous the connection to small business interests.

And according to the American Sustainable Business Council, this bill would open the door for regulated industries to manipulate the regulatory process in their favor.

This undue influence would paralyze the regulatory process, creating uncertainty in the marketplace and stifling competition and innovation from small- and medium-sized entities.

When I wrote this amendment I had in mind the rare bacteria like that known as carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae, commonly known as CRE. This rare bacteria is being transmitted to patients even though the tools had been cleaned according to manufacturers' directions but still harbored the potentially deadly germs.

This is just the latest example of a life-threatening disease which is calling out for action from the government—and the CDC and the FDA should not have their hands tied.

The Houston Chronicle reported in a story last week:

The Seattle outbreak appears to be among the worst so far in the U.S., where problems with dirty endoscopes have been tied to superbug infections in Chicago and Pittsburgh in recent years. Although the bacteria weren't exactly the same, the situation raises new questions about the design, disinfection and REGULATION of the devices, critics charge.

The bill reforms the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 and the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, which attempted to require agencies to account better for the impacts of proposed regulations on small businesses and other small entities and to tailor final regulations to minimize adverse impacts on these entities like the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. Chair, the economy is doing fine now, not for every single American but it has seen a marked improvement from 2008. A bill like H.R. 527 only serves to gum-up the wheels of government and business collaboration by creating new and confusing rules.

When added to the existing gauntlet of procedural and analytical requirements that agencies must already navigate in order implement laws, SBRFIA's new requirements would serve only to further "ossify" rulemaking and make it nearly impossible for agencies to fulfill their congressionally mandated mission of protecting the public and responding to emerging health and environmental dangers.

The Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act also ties the hands of agencies like the FDA by forcing them to delay actions until new analyses are completed. Under current law, an agency can continue to promulgate a regulation before it has finished the regulatory flexibility analysis, if the agency head believes its mission or the law calls for more immediate action.

The SBRFIA would eliminate these commonsense procedures. Imagine if emergency regulations to protect miners had to be delayed until the agency could finish this onerous and highly speculative analysis-lives could be lost and people could be needlessly injured. Or the FDA needed to issue a rule impacting the safety of dairy products. Lives are at stake.

Let me be quick to add that I specifically I oppose H.R. 527 because: (1) it is based on a faulty study; (2) taken as a whole, it will severely undermine Federal agency rulemaking, thereby threatening public health and safety; (3) it fails to address shortcomings in current law; (4) it offers no real assistance to small businesses in complying with regulations; and (5) it imposes additional duties on agencies while failing to provide any additional resources to agencies.

I urge an aye vote for the Jackson Lee amendment exempting FDA rules and add common sense to this legislation.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Jan. 22, 2015]

SEATTLE (AP).—A multidrug-resistant superbug has sickened dozens of people at a Seattle hospital, spread from patient-to-patient through contaminated equipment.

The Seattle Times reports (http://is.gd/m4JVhK) investigators found the rare bacteria known as CRE—carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae—was likely spread through specialized endoscopes that had been cleaned according to manufacturers' directions but still had some of the deadly germs.

Virginia Mason Medical Center officials say they've changed their cleaning protocol for the devices, even though federal officials found no problem with their infection-control practices.

Doctors say 11 of the at least 35 patients infected at the hospital died, but it's not clear what role, if any, the infection played in their deaths.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to carve out an exception to the bill for Food and Drug Administration rules related to consumer safety. I am all for consumer safety. All of us support the protection of consumer safety, but it is my fervent hope that all of us also support small business jobs and want to protect them.

That, of course, was the point of the Regulatory Flexibility Act in the first place, to continue to allow agencies like the FDA to protect consumers but, at the same time, to start accounting for and avoiding—where possible—adverse impacts on small businesses.

If agencies had faithfully done what they were supposed to do under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, then we wouldn't be here today, but they haven't; instead, they have routinely tried to evade that law. That has to stop.

Small businesses create jobs, and jobs are the key to economic recovery. To help small businesses to create jobs, we need to reduce—not increase—the regulatory burden on small businesses.

The FDA is a major regulatory agency, and it is not exempt from the RFA as it currently stands. Now is not the time to start walking back the RFA's requirements. This amendment simply is not consistent with the spirit of small business—the Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act—or the needs of today's small business job creators.

If the gentlelady's concern is to make sure that the law allows the FDA to issue new emergency rules to protect consumer safety, then let me assure her, there is no need to worry. Subsection 553(b)(3)(B) of the APA already allows agencies to dispense with notice and comment for good cause.

Since the RFA only applies in notice and comment rulemakings, a fact the bill does not change, nothing will hinder the FDA from issuing emergency rules if the bill is enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our leader.

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

Mr. Chairman, I recently read a headline about the President's budget. Do you know what it said? ''Budget proposal is Obama's map back to Big Government.'' Think about that for a moment. There used to be a time, Mr. Chairman, in the White House where they said, ''The era of Big Government is over.'' Now, it is as if we are heading back in time.

Everyone knows why the era of Big Government should be over. It is because Big Government has big costs. Mr. Chairman, large, inefficient programs cost a lot of money which mean higher taxes and more debt, but there are other costs to Big Government, too. As government grows, so does bureaucracy; and more bureaucracy means more regulations.

These regulations—tens of thousands of pages—get put on the backs of every single individual in business that works hard and tries to get by. In fact, for small businesses, regulations add almost $1,000 per employee per month—think of that, $1,000 per employee per month. That makes it much harder for our economy to grow and for small businesses to create jobs.

America needs a full-scale regulatory reform, so that bureaucracy is held accountable for all these costs. I know that is a big goal, but Representative CHABOT's bill is a step realizing that goal.

This bill forces agencies to consider the least costly options for getting something done, just like every American has to do in a tough economy, and it makes agencies actually have to think about the impact the regulations have on small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, President Clinton said, ''The era of Big Government is over.'' It should be over. America simply cannot afford to tie down small businesses and hardworking people with more red tape, so let's take a step forward.

Let's move forward, ending the era of Big Government, and vote ''yes'' on the bill.

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

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 114–14 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. SCHRADER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 234, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

AYES—184

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
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 (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—234

Abraham
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 (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Chu (CA)
Collins (GA)
Duckworth
Emmer
Engel
Gutiérrez
Lee
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Meehan
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

□ 1111

Messrs. BOST, HANNA, DUNCAN of South Carolina, and ROKITA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 65 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 65 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. 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 noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 248, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

AYES—172

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
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
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—248

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
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 (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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 (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Chu (CA)
Collins (GA)
Delaney
Duckworth
Engel
Gutiérrez
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Peters
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

□ 1116

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chair, I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall No. 66 today due to congressional business. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted 'aye'.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. BYRNE, 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. 527) to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 78, 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. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEUTCH. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Deutch moves to recommit the bill H.R. 527 to the Committee on the Judiciary

with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 14. PREVENTING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act do not apply in the case of any rule that stops the proliferation, spread, or development of nuclear weapons, including to North Korea and Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It won't kill the bill, and it won't send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, would mire the rulemaking process in an endless agency analytical and procedural review. This bill would require agencies to engage in speculative analysis on the ''indirect economic effect'' of a proposed rule.

Critical rules that protect the health and safety of our communities, that protect the environment in which we live, and that respond to disasters or pandemics would be stuck in this bill's imposed layers of bureaucratic review, and there would be no relief under this bill for rules that are needed to address an ongoing emergency. Indeed, in the event of an emergency, agencies would be required to conduct a lengthy and time-consuming analysis even of a rule that would protect citizens from harm.

Now a note to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Putting the words ''small business'' in the title of a bill does not magically make it a bill good for small business or good for our national security. Facts are stubborn things, and the fact is that this bill is dangerous to American national security. However, my amendment can change this.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would ensure the safety and security of the American people. It would ensure that they would not be hindered by additional bureaucratic procedures by ensuring that this act would not apply to any rule that stops the proliferation, spread, or development of nuclear weapons.

The United States has long worked to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons worldwide. We have worked to help nations achieve nuclear power without the domestic capabilities to produce weapons-grade uranium. We have worked with the international community to enact United Nations Security Council resolutions to prohibit rogue regimes from procuring materials that could be used for the development of nuclear weapons. This includes a robust sanctions regime aimed at Iran.

Our own Commerce Department has developed detailed procurement regulations to prevent dual use materials from falling into the wrong hands. We have enacted punishing sanctions through the Treasury Department on those who aid in the procurement of materials used for nuclear weapons programs.

Now, let me be absolutely clear about the most important national security threat facing the United States and our allies: a nuclear-armed Iran. All of us here are watching the negotiations closely, and we hope for a diplomatic and negotiated end to the Iranian nuclear weapons program. That is everyone's priority.

However, we must prepare for the possibility that Iran rejects diplomacy. If Iran walks away from the talks, Congress and the President have been clear that we will want to immediately and urgently impose new sanctions. We will need new, fast-moving, antiproliferation actions, and we will have to put immediate pressure on this rejectionist regime.

This bill, in its current form, prevents that. Our national security and that of our allies depends on our agencies acting fast and efficiently. In no uncertain terms, the majority's bill puts our national security at risk.

The proliferation of nuclear weapons will not be stopped by adding new layers of bureaucracy. Iran's sponsorship of terrorist groups is no secret. It openly ships missiles and rockets to Hezbollah and Hamas—designated terrorist organizations that launch attacks on civilians—in direct violation of international law. Now Iran and North Korea are working together, sparking vital proliferation worries. The Ayatollah has declared the two nations share common enemies, and we already know that Iran and North Korea have cooperated on ballistic missiles.

So I would ask my colleagues to imagine a scenario in which Iran walks away from the talks and takes its nuclear program deeper underground, where Iran's activities are sealed and where an arms race is sparked in the region. When it comes to nuclear proliferation and the safety of the United States and international security, the U.S. must have a responsibility to act quickly. Congress cannot—and Congress should not—make it more difficult for our government to act to keep our people safe.

Mr. Speaker, the safety of Americans is too important to tie up in Washington politics. Just this week, Russia announced that it would no longer comply with the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which was specifically designed to ensure the security of existing nuclear stockpiles.

Do we really want, I ask my colleagues, to risk the safety and security of the United States and that of our allies around the world by hindering our ability to halt the dangerous and destabilizing spread of nuclear weapons because an agency must justify the costs or waste resources and time in conducting a costly analysis of alternative ways to eliminate or streamline new regulations? Do we want to hold up regulations, I ask my colleagues, that will help to keep us safe?

All this amendment does is simply protect the American people from the threat of nuclear proliferation. On this, we should be able to come together. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

This motion to recommit presents the perfect opportunity for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to turn the page. Six long years into the Obama administration, our constituents feel trapped in a job depression. This bill offers one of the best chances we have to really start to turn things around for our constituents.

The bill contains clear, commonsense reforms that will take Washington's regulatory boot off the neck of small businesses in all of our districts so they can create the new jobs our constituents need. The bill contains numerous Democrat-sponsored amendments, making it a truly bipartisan product.

The bill, with bipartisan support, has already passed the House three times in the past two Congresses only to die an obstructionist death at the hands of the former Senate majority leader, who, by the way, the voters threw out of the majority last November. We now have a chance to pass the bill again at the very start of this Congress and to send it over to a Senate that will actually consider it. We should all seize this opportunity.

But what would this motion to recommit do?

It would, once again, inflict on the American people the ways of obstruction. It would block the bill from passage. It would prevent the bill from promptly reaching the Senate and helping to create new jobs for our constituents.

Let's all make this a vote to end the obstruction. With this vote, help this Congress turn the page the voters sent us here to turn. Vote against this motion to recommit. Vote for this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEUTCH. 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 passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 240, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

AYES—182

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
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 (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—240

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 (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
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
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—11

Chu (CA)
Collins (GA)
Duckworth
Engel
Gutiérrez
Lee
Lofgren
McDermott
Nunnelee
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1135

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. CONYERS. 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 260, noes 163, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—260

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
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 (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
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 (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—163

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
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
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Chu (CA)
Collins (GA)
Duckworth
Engel
Gutiérrez
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1143

Mrs. DINGELL changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: Rollcall No. 65—no; rollcall No. 66—no; rollcall No. 67—no; rollcall No. 68—aye.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the United States Capitol for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Jack Nicklaus.

□ 1145

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, because I was detained on congressional business yesterday, I inadvertently missed a vote on rollcall No. 62, the amendment offered by Mr. CONNOLLY. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on that.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the schedule for the week to come, and I yield to my friend, Mr. MCCARTHY.

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 p.m.

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 around noon.

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 consider S. 1, the Senate Keystone bill. After 6 years of waiting, this bipartisan bill, which will create more than 40,000 jobs, will finally be placed on the President's desk. I do sincerely hope he considers his longstanding veto threat and sides with the American people by signing this important jobs bill.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider two critical tax packages next week that will provide much-needed certainty for Americans and small businesses.

H.R. 644, the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act, sponsored by Representative TOM REED, will make charitable giving tax provisions permanent. This will also include provisions authored by Representatives ERIK PAULSEN, AARON SCHOCK, and MIKE KELLY.

Together, this package will make a real difference in the lives of Americans by encouraging donations of property for conservation and enhancing deductions for food contributions for those in need.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 636, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act, sponsored by Representative PAT TIBERI, with additional provisions authored by Representative DAVE REICHERT.

This bill is essential to creating stability for our Nation's best job creators, small businesses, by making increased expensing permanent.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information he has given us. I have some questions on that information, but before getting to the bills that we are going to consider next week, I note the absence of the Homeland Security bill.

That continues to, unfortunately, be mired in controversy, Mr. Speaker. It is a bill that I would remind our Members, Mr. Speaker—and I know the majority leader knows this—has been agreed to, essentially.

There really is no controversy with respect to the funding of the Homeland Security Department. There are no amendments being offered to change the numbers or anything of that nature.

There is, however, the holding hostage, Mr. Speaker, of this bill for the purposes of overturning the President's actions which, in our view, he was forced to take because of the inaction of this body after over a year of even considering the comprehensive immigration reform bill that the Senate passed by over 60 votes, with almost two-thirds of the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, voting for that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned and the American people are concerned that a bill which is so critically important for the defense of our borders, for the security of our country, and the security of our people is languishing, notwithstanding the fact that we have agreement on the underlying bill. There is no disagreement in my view.

The Homeland Security bill, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, would pass with over 400 votes if it were brought to this floor, but for the fact that it is being held hostage to force the President to do something that the Senate clearly has indicated they are not going to approve.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the majority leader to bring to the floor a clean bill. By clean, I mean the Republican-reported bill—not our bill, but a compromise bill—a Republican-reported bill in December, conferenced—conference may overstate it because it was the four leaders, Republicans and Democrats meeting—and they brought out of that meeting to this floor a Homeland Security bill that could pass overwhelmingly.

Every day that we delay puts us closer to the February 27 deadline that was set in December for the funding of this bill, taken out of the omnibus appropriation bill that we passed, put on a short-term leash, putting our homeland security at risk.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. Majority Leader, I would ask you: Is there any plan at some point in time to say we are not going to snatch defeat from the jaws of compromise?

The leader knows. The leader is very astute. He understands this body very well and knows full well that the underlying bill has consensus.

If there is anything that is frustrating the American people, it is that when we have something that we agree upon, we turn it into something that we can't agree on.

I yield to my friend, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of telling me what his view is as to when we are going to be able to pass an appropriation bill to ensure

that the Homeland Security Department can operate in an effective, efficient manner to protect America and Americans.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I share the gentleman's frustration. Knowing the timeline of dealing with funding of Homeland Security, Republicans want to make sure it is funded. That is why we took up legislation. I agree with the gentleman. Why is it being held hostage by the Democrats in the Senate?

As my good friend knows, the Senate has changed hands. In watching what has happened on Keystone, you get open debate. I know you didn't have amendments for the last number of years, but now, you have the opportunity.

If people disagree with the House bill, all they have to do is take the bill up. As my good friend knows, what is happening in the Senate day after day is the Senate Democrats are voting now to allow the bill to come up. If you disagree with the bill, you can't offer amendments, you can't change the bill.

I would say to my friend: I share your frustration. I think our direction should be at the Senate Democrats and getting them to allow the bill to come up because nobody wants Homeland Security not to be funded. That is why we took the bill up very early, so the Senate could have time.

It is unfortunate that they play these actions in a time and place—as you said, the American people want to see this done, and we want to see it done in a bipartisan manner as well.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, Mr. Speaker, but, frankly, the American people ought not to be confused. There is a bipartisan agreement. We did not send, however, the bipartisan-agreed bill to the Senate.

We did, as we so often do, add to a bipartisan agreement something that does not have agreement, and that undermines the ability of this Congress to work on behalf of the American people in an effective way.

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader knows that. He knows it because I have had discussions with him. He knows it because, publicly, the President has said, Democrats have said: We don't agree with the provision you're adding to something that has been agreed upon in a bipartisan fashion by the Senate and by the House.

The majority leader knows full well that if we sent a clean bill that has already been agreed upon by the Appropriations Committee in the House, by the Appropriations Committee in the Senate, by Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee in the House and by Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee in the United States Senate, already agreed to—now, let me, Mr. Speaker, read you some comments by someone who I had a great opportunity to serve with in this Congress.

Secretary Tom Ridge—the first Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, a Republican—and Michael Chertoff, who was also a Republican Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, joined with Secretary—now president—Napolitano. The president wanted great educational institutions in our country; she was then Secretary and former Governor of Arizona.

All three of them said:

> Funding for the entire agency should not be put in jeopardy by the debate about immigration.

Again, I remind you that this is Secretary Ridge, former Republican Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the former Republican Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; and Michael Chertoff, former Republican Secretary of the Homeland Security Department; as well as Secretary Napolitano.

They said:

> It is imperative that we ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is ready, willing, and able to protect the American people. To that end, we urge you not to risk funding for the operations that protect every American and pass a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

I agree with Secretary Ridge. I agree with Secretary Chertoff.

When my friend says, ''Oh, it's the Senate,'' I disagree with my friend. It is the Senate who has not passed a bill. Of course, complaining about the 60-vote requirement after having required the most number of cloture votes in history in the last Congress by the current majority leader of the United States Senate when he was minority leader is a little difficult to understand. I choose my words carefully on that.

The fact of the matter is we are putting at risk the security of the American people. We have seen in Canada, we have seen in France, and we have seen in the Middle East horrific terrorist acts. This Department was created to prevent such acts.

By God's grace and their work, America has been very fortunate since September 11, 2001.

□ 1200

The Secretaries are saying don't put that at risk.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge once again not only the majority leader but the majority party in this House to accept the fact that we do not have agreement on immigration.

I accept the fact that they believe the President has acted incorrectly. What I do not accept, Mr. Speaker, is that they are holding hostage the budget for the Department of Homeland Security in order to make their point on immigration. I would hope that the majority leader would urge his side of the aisle to not do that.

I close on this particular issue with this quote. When asked what was going to happen when time ran out on February 27 on this funding of the Department of Homeland Security, JOHN MCCAIN, former Presidential candidate on the Republican side of the aisle, former Republican Member of this body and now the Republican chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the United States Senate, said this when asked what was going to happen on February 27. He said: ''Your guess is as good as mine.''

What do you think our adversaries think when, on the Department of Homeland Security, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee says: ''Your guess is as good as mine''?

He goes on and says this: ''I believe in one fundamental principle; that is, we cannot shut down the Department of Homeland Security.''

Unfortunately, the Republican whip, my friend, observed that, well, we maybe just can do that.

Now, the theory is, Mr. Speaker, that because it is funded out of fees and because they are critically important employees, that we won't shut down the Department in one sense. But in another sense, we will preclude it from being empowered by the bipartisan bill passed out of the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, and which we considered in December, to perform its duties.

I will yield to my friend, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to make an additional comment. If not, I will go on to some of the other legislation that needs discussion.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding because I listened a long time.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. But you also very well know, the votes in the Senate that just took place for the last 2 days were to bring the bill up. And that quote you gave from JOHN MCCAIN? He is frustrated because he would like to get on to the bill.

There are two different Chambers. If it is, as you say, a strong bipartisan vote over there, the only people holding up bringing this bill to the floor are the Senate Democrats. It is unfair to claim anything other.

They have denied for 2 days straight. If they want to make an amendment, if they want to change the bill—but they deny the American people the chance to even bring the bill up.

So let's be honest with the American people on where we are because nobody on this side of the aisle wants Homeland Security in any trouble.

We passed the bill early. We sent it to the Senate early. For 2 days in a row, the majority has asked to allow the bill to come to the floor, and for 2 days straight, the Democrats have said ''no,'' not even to debate it. That, to me, is unacceptable.

If you have a difference of opinion, you debate the opinion. But to deny the American public the chance to have that debate, that is unacceptable, and I will not stand for it.

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to hear the majority leader will not stand for it.

Over a year ago, the United States Senate passed, overwhelmingly, a comprehensive immigration reform bill. The reason they are holding hostage the Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Speaker, is because they don't agree.

But the majority leader has just said, Bring it to the floor. Let us vote. Let us offer amendments. We have asked that the Senate bill on immigration reform—which the House Republicans apparently don't agree with but on which the overwhelming majority of Americans in polling are saying yes, they agree with it.

So the majority leader complains about a bill not being brought to the floor. The minimum wage bill is a very, very important bill that the overwhelming majority of Americans support. In five States on which it was on the ballot, it was passed, in some red States and, yes, some blue States, mostly red States, by the way, and there is a refusal to bring it to the floor.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the majority leader complain about not letting that bill come to the floor, the majority leader knows, and everybody in this body knows, that if that bill should squeak by the Senate, it would be vetoed by the President. And I guarantee the majority leader, that veto would be sustained here.

I would remind him the reason the Secretaries say bring a clean bill to the floor, your Secretaries, as well as one of mine on our side of the aisle, the reason they say that is because they know that what I say is absolutely correct.

So, Mr. Speaker, I tell the majority leader, who is my friend and whom I have great respect for, that complaining about not bringing bills to the floor, we all need to look in the mirror, because if the issue is comprehensive immigration reform and you don't like what the President is doing, bring a bill to the floor.

Show us what you want to do. Let us vote on it. Send it to the Senate, see what they do, and then if they pass it, send it to the President.

But don't hold hostage the Department of Homeland Security. Don't put Americans at risk. Don't turn a bipartisan consensus agreement into partisan gridlock, which the Americans hate, and which puts them at risk.

I will go on to other matters, unless the majority leader would like me to yield to him one more time.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I would ask that you yield

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

We were talking about looking into the mirror. Twenty-two times the President said he did not have the power to take the action that he did. From the time he said that to the time he took that action, what changed? The Constitution did not.

I will remind the gentleman, because he was at the lunch that I was at with the President. I reminded the President, after the election but prior to being sworn in, we had this discussion with him, with Senate and House leaders.

The President had the opportunity, when you were majority leader, he was President, and the Democrats controlled the Senate, to deal with immigration. They did not.

We asked the President: Would you even give us 1 day in the majority to deal with it? He did not.

So when we look into the mirror, I will gladly look into the mirror because I think the idea should win at the end of the day.

But if the Senate Democrats will not even allow you to bring the bill up to debate, I think it is very hard for your argument to stand ground.

This is a time that we want to make sure Homeland Security is funded. We took the bill up early. Just as the Constitution says, the House has their position, the Senate can have theirs. It doesn't say whatever the Senate says they can and cannot do we should just follow. No, we should lead, and we have. And I look forward to solving this problem before the 27th.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Is the gentleman prepared to bring a comprehensive immigration bill to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And if you looked at our committees, we are working on it, just as we say this body should. It should go through committee, have debate on both sides, and be open.

I believe this immigration system is broken, and I think that is the process we should take, not the action that the President took.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information, but I would observe that we have spent the first 4 weeks considering an awful lot of legislation that didn't go to committee at all—no hearings, came right to the floor through the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am confounded by the representative of the majority party complaining about what the Senate Democrats have done and saying we are not for this bill when, more than at any other time in history, his party did that in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there are other pieces of legislation I am concerned about. Let me ask the leader, if I can, with respect to the apparently seven bills which the Ways and Means Committee has considered, are those bills going to be considered, Mr. Leader, seriatim, one by one? Or is the expectation, as apparently I think I am reading in the comments you made, going to be packaged? And if so, does the gentleman know how many bills are going to be in which package and how many packages there are going to be?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman brought up about how we bring the bills to the floor, the gentleman remembers that there was a bipartisan agreement toward the end of last year with the Senate and with the House. It gave greater certainty, and it was going to be into one package.

Unfortunately, the White House disagreed, so we did not get that work done. In essence, it got stopped, saying it was too big.

Our intention next week is to bring them up individually, have the opportunity for the debate, listening to the White House. Whether they want a bill too big, too small, I am just trying to get the American public moving forward, so I took that advice and did it individually.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment and the information.

There are six or seven bills. Does that mean we will consider each one of those individually?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. No, they will be in the two packages.

Mr. HOYER. In the two packages.

I know that it is usually the practice in both bodies, or in both parties, not to have open to amendment. Is that your expectation, that neither of the packages will be open to an amendment?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for asking. You asked a question similar to this last week.

It is always my intention to yield to the Rules Committee their jurisdiction to decide on the format of the bill coming to the floor and the number of amendments, whether it has a structured rule or an open rule. That is their job, and as soon as they make that decision, I will notify all.

Mr. HOYER. Same question, same answer

Mr. MCCARTHY. Consistency.

Mr. HOYER. When I get an answer, I will stop asking. How about that, Mr. Speaker?

In terms of the deficit, I know your side is very concerned about the deficit. My side is very concerned about the deficit, and I certainly am very concerned about the deficit, as the gentleman knows. I have worked in a lot of ways to try to bring this down.

One of my propositions is that we need to pay for things. Whether we spend money or reduce revenues, we need to offset that.

Does the gentleman know whether there is any intention to offset that so we do not exacerbate, make the deficit worse?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know you are concerned with the deficit. I am very concerned, especially with this administration adding more debt than all the other Presidents combined. That is why we are trying to spur the economy.

I firmly believe that if government takes less, that is more in the hands of

the public, and they are able to spend, and more revenue will come in, and history has shown that.

So I firmly believe that our actions taking place will actually bring greater revenue, greater job creation, and help lower the deficit.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I can't help but observe, however, that this President inherited the deepest recession that you and I have experienced in our lifetime and, as a result, we had to respond to that. We responded to it vigorously.

Unfortunately, it made the debt worse, but what it also did was grow our economy better and faster than any other economy on Earth. We now have an economy that is growing, creating jobs, 58 months solid.

We have increased, however, the debt by about 70 percent—too much. I will tell my friend, he may not know this. That is a percentage of GDP that—under Ronald Reagan, who could have vetoed every spending bill, the debt increased by 189 percent, almost three times as much.

Now, in real dollar figures, it is easy to say that, like saying $7.25 is much higher than the minimum wage of 1968, when actually it is reduced to 46 percent of its purchasing power.

So the numbers, per se, but as a percentage of our wealth, as a country, this President has increased the debt, having to respond to the deepest recession since the Depression, almost about a third of what Ronald Reagan saw in his Presidency, the increase of our debt as a percentage of the GDP.

□ 1215

I would tell my friend, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to come together, work together to make sure that this country is on and remains on a fiscally sustainable path, and I look forward to working with him toward that end.

But if we pass tax bills, as we did in 1981, 2001, and 2003, and pretend they are going to pay for themselves, it doesn't happen. We know it doesn't happen. And we look at it, and it doesn't happen.

Frankly, many of us on this side are for a number of the bills that are going to be in these packages. Some of us will be constrained to vote ''no'' because we don't want to make the deficit worse.

If the gentleman has a comment, I will yield to him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This has been the slowest recovery. If you compare the recession during Ronald Reagan's time and how fast we came out of it, there is no comparison.

The participation rate in America today is 62.7 percent, the lowest it has been since 1978. When you give up on participating, you give up on your future; you give up on your dreams. That is not an economy that we want.

When you look at the tax package that we are bringing forward, charitable contributions, maybe people on your side of the aisle think government should solve that problem. I see charitable contributions back home in my own community solving a lot of problems locally very fast and very direct. And I think these are things that could be bipartisan, so I look forward to it.

As you talk about the deficit, yes, I want to work on it. I looked at the President's budget. I do not believe government needs an 11 percent increase. That is how much new in taxes that he would give to the Federal Government. I think people keeping that would be better. And I think that lowering how we spend our money here in Washington would go a long way, and I welcome the opportunity to work with you on that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Just so that the American people are clear on the record, Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan, about whom the gentleman spoke, didn't get to 5.6 percent unemployment until his eighth year as President of the United States. And he did not confront nearly as deep a recession as this President inherited from his predecessor, in which 4 million people had lost their job in 2008 and 878,000 people lost their job when he took office in 2009. So it has been a tough time.

But the good news is—not the bad news—that we have increased our economy faster, better, and more sustainably than any other country on Earth. That is good news, and we ought to tell the American people that is good news.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2015

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING DANIEL REID SIMPSON

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Daniel Reid Simpson. Unfortunately, on January 24 of this year, he lost a courageous battle with Lewy body dementia and went on to meet his Maker.

Senator Simpson, as many of us knew him, was a father and a husband to Mary Alice for some 63 years. He served the State of North Carolina in the State senate for six terms.

It was not just his service to our great State that made this man truly a remarkable example of a community servant. One of his proudest accomplishments, as he would tell it, was introducing the bill and shepherding it through the State legislature to set up Western Piedmont Community College.

Additionally, he helped set up the Glen Alpine Recreation Foundation. In 2007, they honored him for that work by naming the field the ''Simpson Field,'' for not only the recognition of his great work for the kids of that community who wanted to play baseball and football, but also for his lifelong commitment to the folks of Burke County.

Senator Simpson also served in the military. He fought with MacArthur's forces in the Philippines and served in the occupation forces in Japan.

Not only was he of service to our great State and our great country, but he was of service to Burke County and to his family. So it is with sadness, but certainly with great honor, that I remember his life.

Our prayers are with his wife, his three children, and all of his family at this time.

REFORM OUR TRADE POLICIES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the millions of high-quality jobs this Nation has outsourced over the last quarter century because of flawed free trade deals. These job-killing deals, like NAFTA, have been incredibly harmful to the American economy, racking up a massive, massive trade deficit of $9.5 trillion. And they have failed to live up to the promise of creating jobs. Instead, they have wiped out good jobs, high-paying jobs across our country.

Take Motorola Solutions, for example, which shut down plants all over our country, from California to Florida. Motorola shut down those operations and moved production to China, to South America, to Eastern Europe.

Take Walgreens, which has outsourced its information technology operations to Mexico, to India, leaving its Illinois employees jobless.

Meanwhile, 6 years after the recession, Ohio and 14 other States have job markets that have not yet recovered from the number of jobs during the recession. Hundreds, thousands, millions of quality, good-paying manufacturing jobs have not returned. Citizens of these States, like Ohio, are fighting for honest employment.

Since 1976, America has literally outsourced 47.5 million good jobs. We have a budget deficit because we have a $9.5 trillion trade deficit.

We must support job seekers. More lopsided trade deals are not the answer. We simply have to reform our trade policies.

IN MEMORY OF FRED STOLLEY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great man and a great soldier.

In 2013, I had the honor of meeting Fred Stolley and presenting him with the Soldier's Medal, the highest honor a servicemember can receive for an act of valor in a noncombat situation.

Private First Class Stolley proudly served his country during World War II; and in 1944, he saved a fellow soldier from drowning. Stolley's commanding officer wrote a commendation letter praising him for saving the soldier who was twice his size and deeply troubled by the devastating news of losing his brother in combat.

After the war ended, Stolley returned home to Decatur, Illinois. He worked nights, weekends, and, between classes, building houses and hauling water to graduate from my alma mater, Millikin University, with a degree in business.

Out of respect for the soldier he saved, Stolley never requested a medal to recognize his act of heroism, but 70 years later, my office was able to present him with the medal in front of his family and friends.

This week, we lost a hero. Fred Stolley passed away at the age of 90.

It is because of people like him and all of our men and women in uniform that we are able to enjoy the freedoms that we have today.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends as they lay him to rest in Decatur this afternoon.

LEAH CHASE, THE QUEEN OF CREOLE CUISINE

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the spirit of Black History Month to honor Leah Chase, also known as the ''Queen of Creole Cuisine,'' a renowned chef, author, and a civil rights icon in New Orleans.

As executive chef at her historic restaurant, Dooky Chase's, she has served luminaries such as Duke Ellington, Thurgood Marshall, President George W. Bush and President Barack Obama, among countless others.

In 1946, she married local musician Edgar ''Dooky'' Chase, Jr., whose family owned a small street corner stand.

At a time when New Orleans was starkly divided by segregation, Dooky Chase's Restaurant was one of the few places where groups of mixed races could gather publicly. As a result, the restaurant became a central hub for leaders of the civil rights movement to meet and discuss strategy.

Of course these types of gatherings were highly illegal, but due to the immense popularity of Dooky Chase's, there would have been a public uproar had law enforcement interrupted business. Leah took full advantage of this and hosted Black voter registration campaigns, NAACP meetings, and countless other gatherings, and fed them well.

To this day, people from across the world are blessed by Mrs. Chase's warmth, hospitality, and, of course, her cooking. She has received countless awards, has been immortalized in song by Ray Charles, and inspired Disney's first African American princess, but she remains rooted in her ministry and committed to service.

This month, Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor some of the people who have paved the way for my generation and some of the people whose shoulders I stand on. So today, I congratulate and commemorate Leah Chase.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS BURDEN SMALL BUSINESSES

(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, small businesses, the backbone of our economy, continue to be unfairly saddled by one-size-fits-all regulations. Most small businesses do not have the capacity to retain in-house legal or compliance departments, and unfortunately, many agencies often neglect their duties of assessing how new regulations may impact small businesses. There is also a pattern of Federal agencies providing inadequate analyses of the long-term economic costs of the rules that they propose.

Despite the President's promise in January of 2011 to ''eliminate excessive and unjustified burdens on small businesses,'' very little has been done by this administration.

Yesterday, the House passed H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015, which would require greater transparency of the Federal Government costs associated with unfunded mandates. I joined my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to approve a commonsense solution to reducing cost by improving transparency, awareness, and accountability in our Federal agencies. Just moments ago, the House passed H.R. 527, which would require better economic analyses of direct and indirect costs on small businesses.

I thank my colleagues in both parties for supporting these commonsense reforms.

TERRITORIAL VOTING RIGHTS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, this month, as we pay homage to the many achievements and contributions to our great Nation by African American men and women, and earlier this week my colleagues spoke on this floor commemorating the 50th anniversary of the march on Selma and the subsequent passage of the Voting Rights Act, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues here in Congress that there are still American citizens today that do not have equal voting rights—some 4 million citizens, to be exact. These are citizens and residents of America's island territories: the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and Northern Mariana Islands.

These overseas U.S. territories have been part of the United States for over 115 years. That is more than half as long as there has been a U.S. Constitution.

Our service has gone above and beyond, giving this great Nation even its very banking system, through fellow Virgin Islander Alexander Hamilton. Our service has gone even to having the highest rate of military service in the United States, with some 7 percent higher than other areas, the national average, in casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I implore this Congress and urge them to pass the Voting Rights Act, and also to extend those rights to its U.S. citizens abroad.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DAVID NORTHERN, SR.

(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, today, I rise to recognize the leadership and accomplishments of David Northern, Sr. He is a resident of Grayslake and a good friend. On January 25, Mr. Northern was presented with the Most Influential African American of Lake County Award for 2015.

I have known David for several years in his role as a community leader and as the executive director and chief executive officer of the Lake County Housing Authority. Under David's leadership, the housing authority has become a more effective, people-centered, and collaborative agency.

He and his team have found a balance allowing them to successfully serve those in need of housing while also being mindful to the fiscal effects on the county as a whole.

David is a kind and genuine person who feels a personal responsibility to his community. For David Northern, building a strong community is not just his job, but his passion.

I want to congratulate David on his well-deserved award and say that it is an honor to call him my friend and to recognize his contributions to the people of Lake County.

MATTERS OF GRAVE CONCERN TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized

for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to have a discussion with my fellow colleagues and with those people throughout the United States who are watching this and reading this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The issue I wish to discuss is a matter of grave concern to me and I believe to the American people as well.

I came here 26 years ago. Prior to my arrival in the United States Congress, I had served 7 years in the Reagan White House. I was a speechwriter to President Reagan, and I was a special assistant to the President, which was a designated rank at the White House.

I recall what it was like in the time leading up to Ronald Reagan's election, and I recall specifically how Ronald Reagan dealt with the great challenges he faced. Before Ronald Reagan came to the White House, America was in retreat.

There was a sense of pessimism throughout our country. Our economy was topsy-turvy. There were high levels of inflation and high levels of unemployment. Our country was in jeopardy. Our country felt a danger because while we were in retreat, communism—Soviet communism—was on the offensive throughout the world.

Well, Ronald Reagan, in 8 short years, turned that situation totally around. He turned the economy around, and he turned around the spirit of the people. We went from being pessimistic to being the most optimistic and forward-looking people in the world. Yes, he helped the economy, but foremost, Ronald Reagan ended the cold war.

Mr. Speaker, I am 67 years old. During my life, most of us felt that some day, we would be at war with the Soviet Union—a shooting war—and that it might take the lives of millions of people. We were told to hide under our desk when we were young and cover up our heads in case there was a nuclear attack on our country.

Ronald Reagan expanded the United States military. Many times, when people look back and they understand the success that we had in ending the cold war, they believe that it was due to the increase in the size of our military.

Let me note that did play a factor because it was a deterrent factor, and it was a factor that awed many people in the developing world, as well as our enemies in the communist world, but that is not what switched and that is not what changed our retreat in the cold war to a great victory and the bringing down of the Berlin Wall.

What changed it was a change in strategy that Ronald Reagan initiated during the time that he was President. He was a strong leader. We came into the White House and people asked: What is your strategy for dealing with the Soviet threat to our freedom and the peace of the world? He said: The strategy is very simple. We win, and they lose.

That is what he set out. The guidelines that he set out for us who worked for him in the White House and throughout the administration were that our goal was to be that the United States would win the cold war and the Soviet Union would lose.

Well, during that time period, Ronald Reagan did not deploy American troops overseas like people think that he did. Yes, he expanded our military power, but he made very few deployments—major deployments—of American troops.

In fact, in one deployment which he made to Beirut, where he sent thousands of marines to Beirut, I personally was arguing against it in the White House and went around finding out what it was all about.

After a few short weeks, it turned into a fiasco. It turned into a tragedy, as well as a fiasco, I might add. 300 Americans, marines and sailors, lost their lives when their headquarters was blown up—their bunker, you might say. Their barracks in Beirut was blown up.

Ronald Reagan's advisers at that time advised him to send in tens of thousands of more American troopers, send in the entire 2nd Marine Division and show these terrorists they can't kill marines and get away with it.

Ronald Reagan made his best decision as President at that time not to make such a huge, major deployment of troops into Beirut; otherwise, we would have been in a quagmire for the rest of his administration. They would have been there, stuck in this war zone in Beirut, a no-win situation. Reagan knew that.

He also knew when he told us, No, we are going to get out of there as soon as we can rather than get stuck in the quagmire, he initiated another policy, a security policy based on a different doctrine from sending American troops to garrison in the world or sending American troops to fight other people's battles.

What it was, was Ronald Reagan initiated the Reagan Doctrine. The Reagan Doctrine was basically to recognize that the enemy of our enemy was our friend and to do everything we could to identify our friends around the world who would help us defeat the Soviet Union.

The Reagan Doctrine had us helping people in Nicaragua who were fighting against the Sandinista dictatorship which was allied with the Soviet Union. It was in Africa where you had Cuban troops being confronted by insurgency movements that we supported that were pro-democracy, or at least anti-Soviet, and in Afghanistan where the Soviet Army itself was being confronted.

The doctrine supported those who were struggling for freedom against oppression. We helped people in Europe, the Lech Walesas and the various leaders throughout Eastern Europe who organized resistance against the Soviet domination of their countries. Whether it was Poland or Czechoslovakia or Hungary, they received covert support from President Reagan.

Reagan wanted, yes, to defeat the Soviet Union, and that is what we did. We did it in a way by helping those who were on the front lines, struggling against what we saw as an evil—that is, a government in Russia that was controlled by an atheistic theory that an atheist dictatorship imposed upon people could reestablish new values among human beings and, thus, create a whole new world.

That monstrous philosophy—monstrous because it had monstrous implications in terms of human freedom, but also in the control and slaughter of those people who did not agree with that vision—that had to be defeated because it threatened the entire world.

By the time Ronald Reagan was finished with his Presidency and the leadership that he provided to the free world and all those who were struggling against communism, we succeeded. The Berlin Wall came down. This was done because of great leadership and a great strategy on the part of this man.

Today, we look at a totally different world from the world that Reagan left us. Unlike the world that he inherited from his predecessor, President Carter, Reagan left us a world where the upward trend toward our civilization was undeniable, that it looked like we could have generations of peace and that our enemies respected us to the point that they would not put us in jeopardy because it would be putting themselves in jeopardy. Reagan gave us chances for peace, prosperity, and freedom throughout the world.

Today, we face a totally different world. It is a frightening world. We have, today, an adversary that is every bit as evil, potentially harmful, and destructive to the people of the world as what we faced when Ronald Reagan came to the Presidency at the height of the cold war.

Yes, everything was dangerous at that time, and Reagan gave us peace and security. Today, we are facing evil and danger as even before in the cold war, but perhaps we can compare this even to the evil and danger that America and the Western world faced in the early thirties and the late twenties when nazism and fascism raised its ugly head.

What happened? During that time period, had we and the Western Allies been able to deal with Adolf Hitler, perhaps there would not have been this huge conflagration of World War II which took the lives of hundreds of millions of people.

But they did not deal with that as Ronald Reagan dealt with communism when he became President, and Hitler and the fascist threat eventually, with their aggression, put the free world and those other people who sought a better world in such a spot that war erupted and World War II, that great conflagration, happened. It was avoidable.

Well, today, we face a similar threat. We face an evil that, as I say, is every bit as dangerous as the evil that was faced by Reagan and faced before World War II.

It is a radical Islamic philosophy that will slaughter people in the West without thinking twice about it or, what is even worse, will slaughter people in great numbers in the West after strategizing of how to do it more effectively—not only slaughtering Christians and other non-Muslims, but this evil force is seeking to dominate that part of the world in which the majority of people are of the Islamic faith.

This radical Islamic terrorist evil murders more Muslims than, indeed, they murder Christians, although they have been very aggressive in their murder of Christians in a very demonstrable way, in a way that would try to intimidate the Christian world and the non-Muslim world, but we have brave and courageous people within the Muslim world.

We must not let ourselves be brought to the point that the radical Islamic movement wants us to be in, and that is to alienate the rest of the billion of Muslims who occupy this planet and make them our enemy.

Like Ronald Reagan, we must seek out our friends throughout the world who are struggling against radical Islamic terrorism and dictatorship and make sure that we back them up, so they will have a chance to defeat this threat and this ongoing murder and chaos that is engulfing their own countries.

Today, we have such heroes overseas. Let us note, in the last 6 years, this threat has grown, has gone from miniscule to being a threat that, if we do not deal with it, could erupt into the same type of global conflagration that we saw in World War II and perhaps—or at best—would leave us with a war, with a global split in the world like happened under communism that we defeated under Ronald Reagan.

□ 1245

Yes, we could see, if this threat of radical Islam is not confronted with American leadership, 10 years down the road, there could be a massive conflagration that would encompass, for example, what would happen if we do lose total control and things go totally out of control into the gulf areas, in the Persian Gulf and in the Arab world. If that part of the world becomes dominant, if the dominant force in that part of the world becomes this radical Islamic philosophy, it will then move to the ''stans.'' It will then move to the great parts of Africa and of Central Asia, and that will tip the balance of power in this planet and will lead to the type of global conflagration that all of us want to avoid and to prevent.

But we must have the type of decisive leadership and the type of actual commitment to winning this battle against the radical Islamic dictatorship that these people are trying to superimpose upon the world. We need the strong commitment that we saw under Ronald Reagan. We need that, and we do not have it. We do not have the leadership we need or the type of chaos that is now erupting in the Arab world would not be happening.

What is happening in this chaos that we see is this rise of ISIL, a group of people who are so committed to establishing a Muslim dictatorship throughout their part of the world and throughout Africa and, yes, even throughout the rest of the world where other non-Muslim communities live. These people are dedicated to terrorizing the world into submission to their authority, and they see their authority as coming from their radical version of God, through their radical version of Islam.

Again, most Muslims deny and reject that type of Islam. But let us not forget, let us not ignore the fact that this radical philosophy is based on their interpretation of Islam. That it is a religious fanaticism that could, just like communism was a religious fanaticism—it was an atheism fanaticism. And we have seen Christian fanaticisms in the past, and they did great damage and cost the lives of great numbers of people in their day. This radical fanaticism, unless we defeat it now, will perhaps drag the entire planet into a World War II-like conflagration. How do we stop that? How was Ronald Reagan able to stop the rise of communism, the Soviet expansionism that he faced when he took office and, in 7 or 8 short years, managed to turn that around and defeat that very enemy?

First, he had the commitment to defeat it. And I will say today that I don't believe our President has the commitment to defeat and destroy radical Islamic terrorism and the radical Islamic dictatorship that these fanatics would superimpose upon us. Instead, I think our President believes, in good faith, that he can reach an accommodation with these folks, with these fanatics, that an accommodation can be reached and that we should try to prove to them that we are not their enemy.

Well, they know they are our enemy because they get their word from God, not from the President of the United States. That is what they believe. They see these overtures, the fanatic radicals like in the Taliban, they see it as a weakness, and it only encourages the radical Islamic movement for our President to try to reach accommodation or to say pleasant things to them without being aggressive, with seeming to be unwilling to actually draw a line in the sand.

Our President, as most people know, has trouble even uttering the words ''Islamic terrorism'' in one sentence. We are not going to be successful in defeating this threat that would murder us by the millions of people if they get the chance if our President is not even willing to utter the words ''Islamic terrorism'' in the same sentence.

We have a President that, after our Ambassador was murdered in Benghazi, tried to foist off on the American people the false story that our Ambassador was killed because a demonstration against a movie that insulted Islam got out of control and the demonstrators killed our Ambassador. For weeks, this President himself participated in spreading that lie.

Now, what message does it give us? First of all, my gosh, our President isn't going to tell us the truth about radical Islam. But what did the Muslim terrorists think? At that moment, the Muslim terrorists were thinking: My goodness, we have a guy that is so weak that he can't even condemn us and condemn the killing of his own Ambassador by our movement. This emboldened them.

And that is why, we heard early on support for various ''reform movements,'' and we all hoped that the Arab Spring would be a reform movement. Instead, our President, unlike Ronald Reagan, who sought to help those people who were the most aggressive opponents of Soviet communism, this President has tried to seek out those people in the Muslim Brotherhood and elsewhere and reach an accommodation with them.

That is why today we see enormous chaos and the rise of a radical, fanatic Islamic movement, ISIL, that will burn people alive, that will recruit people throughout the West to murder people in a newspaper, like we just saw in Paris, for drawing a cartoon that in some way made fun of their beliefs, as if people aren't free to make fun of other people's beliefs. No, they think it is all right to murder those people, and that is less civil—that is not even a sin, that is a mandate, as compared to murdering unarmed people.

An unarmed cartoonist, newspaper cartoonist in France and his colleagues, a policeman who happened to be a Muslim, laying there helpless on the ground, and they murdered him outright. This is fanaticism. This is part of a fanatic, radical Islamic movement that has to be stopped. They will not stop at killing one policeman who happens to be a Muslim on the ground. They will murder millions of others if they get the chance. They are trying to establish themselves throughout the Arab world right now. We need to make sure we stand by our friends.

Yet, unlike Ronald Reagan, and there was no doubt he was standing behind our friends who opposed Soviet communism, but what are we projecting to those people who are standing firm against this fanatic, radical Islamic movement that would put an Islamic dictatorship on the people? What are we telling our friends who are standing up against that?

Well, how about President el-Sisi of Egypt? El-Sisi was a general who stepped in at a time when Egypt could have gone either way. We had a radical Islamic movement going there. Yes, there was an elected President, and he

broke his word to his own people in trying to institute a caliphate in Egypt. They rose up against him in an aggressive shout from the people of Egypt, saying: We will not let our country become an Islamic caliphate. This is Egypt. We believe in a democratic government here, and we believe in an Egyptian government—not some radical, fanatic Arab government that was superimposed on them by members of some Muslim Brotherhood that operates behind the scenes.

Well, we almost lost Egypt. And if Egypt would fall today or would have fallen then, there would be no chance of stopping this fanatic movement that threatens the world and threatens especially other Muslim countries. There would have been no chance at all. President el-Sisi is a courageous man who has stepped forward, and our President took a long time and is still taking a long time in getting solidly behind the effort to prevent Egypt from becoming a bastion of fanatic Islamic radicalism that would threaten the world.

General el-Sisi, I visited him a year ago, and he expressed: My goodness, we bought all of these helicopters from the United States, and we need them now because there is an insurgency going on with radicals out in the Sinai desert. We need these helicopters. And it took forever for our administration, this government, to provide them the spare parts, the spare parts for that effort. They have jumped through hoops. We were doing them a favor. No, we should look at these people as doing us a favor. They are on the front lines battling this.

And President el-Sisi just recently did something that all Americans and peace-loving people throughout the world should applaud, and that is he went directly to Muslim groups in Egypt and spoke to them and spoke on the record saying we have got to cleanse ourselves from this fanaticism in which we are intolerant of other people's religions, these people who would murder other people and commit acts of terrorism. President el-Sisi, that was courageous of him. We need other leaders to follow in his footsteps.

Has our administration done anything to congratulate President el-Sisi in making that incredible stand? What type of things have we done to prove that we are behind him in this effort? He also did something else. President el-Sisi was the first President of Egypt ever to visit a Coptic church, a Christian church in Egypt. Yet this administration has been just so-so when it comes to el-Sisi. Yes, we have not undermined him, but we have not given him support, which would have been a signal to all of the other leaders there to stand firm and America will stand behind you.

We have people like, for instance, the King of Jordan, who was only here just a few days ago, and what happened? A Jordanian pilot was put into a cage and burned to death as a public spectacle. A Jordanian pilot. Why did they do that? Why did these fanatics do that? Because they meant to terrorize the people of the world, terrorize the people of Africa, terrorize other people who would stand up against them. And what was Abdullah's reaction to that? He left his meetings in the United States and flew back to Jordan. It is now being said that he personally flew a bombing mission against the ISIL people who burned that man alive. Now there is a leader, and we should be backing him up.

But what do we hear just in the paper the other day? That Jordan is having difficulty in getting the supplies of weapons and arms that they need to make sure that they can stand firm against ISIL and this horrible, radical fanatic movement that is sweeping through their part of the world.

Ronald Reagan knew that we needed to support great leaders who would help us end the cold war. We will bring about war if leaders like King Abdullah in Jordan and President el-Sisi in Egypt—if people think we won't get behind them, how can we count on others to take that stand.

How about the Kurds up in northern Iraq? They are the ones bearing the burden, bearing the brunt of all of the fighting that is going on now in Iraq. The other people, when we tried to work things through Baghdad and tried to accommodate leaders who were halfheartedly in this battle and really weren't committed, what happened? We gave them enormous amounts of military equipment that ended up in the hands of radicals, ended up being used as vehicles and guns to destroy and kill people who want the type of world that we want to live in, which is a world of tolerance and freedom and peace and prosperity, not radical, fanatic Muslim dictatorship.

□ 1300

Instead, the Kurds have stood firm. The Kurds are the one group in Iraq that have stood firm and are the one group that has received the least support from the United States as compared to the others.

Now, Baghdad, which wants to put their thumb down on the Kurds, we are going along with a demand with those people that all our aid that goes to the Kurds goes to Baghdad first. That is recognizing the people who are not really on our side, their power, over the people who are on our side.

In fact, there was a meeting in London just in the last few days—I guess it was last week—to determine what would go on in Iraq. The United States was, of course, maybe not sitting at the table, but helped organize this and were part of the process of trying to get this meeting together. We didn't even insist that the Kurds were there. The Kurds weren't even at the table.

This is a betrayal of the people who are on the front lines fighting the big fight of today against radical Islamic terrorism. We betrayed them. This is horrible.

What kind of message does that send to other people around the world who have to stand up against this onslaught of radical fanatic Islamic terrorist dictatorship that would be superimposed on them?

We have got to make sure that these people understand—whether it is Abdullah—or how about the Crown Prince of Abu Dhabi, for example? Here is a man who is so strong in his conviction and leadership in that part of the world to try to stop this terrible threat. Yes, he is treated well. We should be honoring him.

Our administration should be leading the efforts to take the Abdullahs and the Crown Prince there in Abu Dhabi and President el-Sisi. These people deserve demonstrable support, not just sort of halfheartedly getting behind them.

What about, for example, even Qatar today? Qatar is trying to make a decision as to what to do in the face of this. For example, they permit us to have airstrikes against ISIL—this radical Islamic group up in Iraq—they are permitting us to use an air base in Qatar to launch those attacks, but we should make sure people understand and are grateful to them for it and be demonstrable about it.

Part of it is, yes, stand up with your friends. If somebody does something good, like Qatar has just done and wants to go back—and, by the way, has taken some steps in the right direction after taking some steps in the wrong direction—they lost faith in us, I believe, and now, they are coming back in our direction. We should encourage that.

The other half of the equation is we need to be tough on the guys who are our enemies, who are going the wrong way, who are supporting radical Islamic fanatic terrorism, like, for example, Pakistan.

We are still giving billions of dollars over a 10-year period to Pakistan. We are giving hundreds of millions of dollars of military equipment and foreign aid to a country that is, yes, supporting the Taliban.

Almost all of the people that we have lost in Afghanistan can be traced back to terrorists who are using Pakistan as a home base, but not only as a home base, the ISI have been actively involved in helping these fanatic terrorists that our people were up against in Afghanistan.

How do we know that? Well, we do know that it is known, but maybe just the fact that they were giving safe haven to Osama Bin Laden—the murderer of 3,000 Americans on 9/11—they gave safe haven to this man. This was, ''Oh, we didn't know.'' No one believes that. They knew.

Now, to add insult to injury, they have taken the doctor who gave us the location of Osama Bin Laden and helped us bring Osama Bin Laden to justice, that doctor, Dr. Afridi, is now languishing in a dungeon, in a 10-by-10-foot cell in Pakistan.

That act by Pakistan is a hostile act to the United States, and for us to walk away and ignore it is to encourage others to treat us in the same way.

We must be tough on our enemies and friends to our friends. Is that a difficult formula? Is that too difficult for people to understand?

We are losing today because I believe this President has been treating our enemies better than he has been treating our friends in many cases, in terms of willing to reach out to them. We should be reaching out and trying to do everything we can to help the friendly countries rather than reaching out to seek accommodations with these evil countries.

Nowhere is that better demonstrated than the announcement that we had secretly negotiated a deal with Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba—secretly negotiated. Congress didn't know what was going on, and now, he has announced by edict his executive orders.

Here is a President—maybe he likes Castro a little bit because Castro, after all, he could rule with edicts, just like our President now likes to rule with edicts, rather than go through what we call your regular order as seeking the legislative branch and seeking compromises and establishing policy in that way.

Instead, this President reversed 50 years of American policy towards Cuba on his own rather than coming here to Congress and working out something with us and trying to find what was the best way and opening up Cuba to having the beginning of an economic relationship and having Americans go freely there and then to come to the United States.

Well, he did that, and there were no concessions, none, that the Cubans made for this President to give up that 50 years, 50 years of ''this is what our policy is, you are going to have to do this—free elections, opposition parties, et cetera—then we will recognize you.'' This President gave it up and no concessions on the other side.

Now, by the way, what message does that send to all these other countries? Again, it is not just Cuba. What message does that send to all these other countries when we complain about human rights or we try to set a standard, some standard, that will, indeed, take that country in the right direction?

We end up giving up a 50-year policy with no concessions; thus every little petty dictator in the world or, even worse, every group that is out there who is trying to decide whether or not to go with radical Islamist terrorism or not, they know they can make whatever decision they want and eventually the United States is going to cave in because we are projecting weakness.

As I say, the one thing Ronald Reagan did that was terrific was to rebuild our military, and it did—it created a sense of awe, but it was a sense of strength. He used that sense of strength, but it was his strategy in helping those people throughout the world who are our friends and the friends of things we believed in and the enemy of our enemies. That is what worked. We are sending the wrong message to the people who will be the enemy of our enemies.

We are undermining by not providing positive and forceful support for those people who are standing up—the Crown Prince of Abu Dhabi and these others and Abdullah and Jordan and President el-Sisi in Egypt—by not demonstrably standing with them, we send the wrong message throughout the world. That is why things are falling apart. That is why things are not going in the right direction.

This isn't we just happen to live in a time when things are chaotic. That is not the case. Just like Ronald Reagan didn't just live in the times when there was a Soviet communist threat that was undermining the peace of the world. That didn't just happen. It was the basis of things that, yes, what they did, but also our response to that threat.

Today, this administration, I believe, has led us down a path that has created the chaos that we now see, created a situation where you have a radical fanatic Islamic dictatorship movement that not only tries to take over and dominate the Islamic part of the world, but is threatening terrorist acts and has engaged in terrorist acts.

We will have more and more bombings like we saw at the Boston Marathon. We will have more and more terrorist actions taken in Western Europe as we saw in Paris or in Africa, unless we step forward and let the world know that we are strong, we are strong in our commitment, and we stand by those who will help us in this battle.

I recently visited New York City, and I had not been there for a long time. I had never gone to the 9/11 Memorial. I visited the 9/11 Memorial, and I would advise anyone who has not been there to go there.

This is a memorial to the 3,000 Americans who died on 9/11, most of them there at the World Trade Center in those two great towers that were brought down on that day. You should go. Anyone hearing my voice—my colleagues, others—should go and see this.

They have managed to get a picture of almost every one of the victims who died that day. Many, of course, were firemen and policemen who, when the airplane struck that building, instead of running away and rushing away, they ran towards the building, they ran there to see what they could do to help, and they gave their lives, these heroic people.

We have to have a government as heroic as our own people if we are going to triumph over the people that slaughtered those people today. They slaughtered them in 9/11, and they will slaughter them today.

I looked at those pictures of those 3,000 people—and I was in the government when that happened, and I worked with Reagan before that, but on 9/11, we had been here a long time, and we are all part of this.

We owe it to the people of the United States, all of us on both sides of the aisle and in the executive branch and whoever else who is the government of this country, we owe it to our people to make sure we are doing the right thing—and I looked into their faces, and I brought my children with me to see this, and I said: Look, all of those people, do you know what they are telling us? They are telling us, to me and to all of us here in this body, you let us down, you let us down.

Don't do it again. Don't let there be another wall in another city with 20,000 pictures on it because they have got some sort of dirty bomb or something. These people that we are facing today are capable of that.

I am not arguing for major deployments of military units overseas, occupation, garrison in the world, like we did for too long, and I do not think it was right for us to go into Iraq in the first place.

I do argue that when we find people on our side, like Ronald Reagan did, we need to have a strong military, and we need to make sure that the world respects us.

Then we need to have stands and activities and actions that win their respect, them knowing that we stand with those people who will stand firm against this threat to the world.

Otherwise, some day, there could be another World War II-like thing 10 years down the road when we say: Why didn't you stop that fanatic Hitler when he was just walking around, goose-stepping around in these towns in Germany when he could have been stopped? Why didn't you stop him then?

Then there was hundreds of millions of people. This could lead to that type of conflagration.

One thing we know, unless we stop this radical movement there now, they will find ways of killing thousands of Americans, and there will be other walls, with other pictures, saying: Why didn't you do something?

I call on my colleagues now to seriously look at this challenge that we face. My negative comments about what I believe is the President not dealing with this situation in the right way is something that I am saying from the heart, and I am not doing this for political reasons.

□ 1315

Let me just say today that we see examples of where we need to take stands. We need to make sure, for example, that the nouveau regime in Iran is facing a President of the United States and an American Government that are making demands that they do not use this system that they are developing now. They have signed a treaty saying they would not have a nuclear weapon. We should hold them to that treaty, and we should be helping

the people in Iran, who are struggling against that nouveau regime. I do not say we should attack Iran with American military might. We should be supportive, and we should have been so all along.

There were demonstrators in the streets of Tehran, and there was no message. There was no message at all of support from our government at that time. That was one of the first things this President did—he refrained from helping and supporting those young activists for democracy in Iran. The Baloch people are fighting against the corruption and oppression of the Pakistani Government, which is dominated by these radicals. We should be helping the Baloch, who can also be active in Iran, I might say.

There are options that we can have throughout the world today—actions both in terms of policy and in terms of actually helping people struggle for freedom—that will ensure the peace of the world 10 years down the road, as Ronald Reagan did when he took over. He left us a better world. We need to take the steps now to make sure that, when we leave this body, when we leave Congress—and whoever becomes President the next time around—that we leave this government so that our people have a greater chance for freedom, a greater chance to live in peace. We need to make sure that our people can live in peace and prosperity.

Those pictures on the wall at the 9/11 Memorial shout out to us: Do your duty. You didn't do it. You let us down. Don't do it again. Make sure the American people are safe. You have a challenge now. Meet that challenge. Stand firm. Stand strong behind those who are with you.

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

SILENCING A PRESCIENT VOICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about protocol this past week, and it all centers around the invitation by the Speaker of this House to the Prime Minister of Israel to come and speak to the body, as he has done twice before.

It is worth pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that Bibi Netanyahu is one of the most prescient voices that we have in the entire world to address some of the subjects and some of the dangers that face the United States of America, and yet this administration is caught up in a conundrum over protocol.

While it might be worth reminding this administration that ours is a government made up of three equal branches, it is even more important to remind this administration that, when Iran is pursuing a nuclear weapons capability with which to threaten the peace and security of the entire world, when ISIS and groups like it are slaughtering people the world over, when ISIS is crucifying and killing and torturing people in Iraq—when they are burning their prisoners alive in cages—this administration is caught up in protocol. Mr. Speaker, that is a profound distortion of priority.

Ironically, this administration, for all of its talk of protocol, not only violated protocol when it traded five Taliban leaders for Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl, but it broke the law itself. This administration has repeatedly sought to unconstitutionally usurp the powers of the legislative branch by brash fiat. It chooses to listen to these mysterious voices of those who did not vote in our Nation's election. Its constitutional overreach is evidenced by Cuba, immigration, ObamaCare, and a number of others.

Let us put that litany aside for a moment and just consider the arrogance of this administration as it comes now to proclaim that the Speaker of this House has somehow broken protocol by inviting the Prime Minister of our most vital ally on Earth to speak on this floor.

Worse, Mr. Speaker, it has sought to go after and silence the guest speaker, himself. In hearing the visceral rhetoric of this White House, one would think our Speaker had invited the prime minister of an enemy nation instead of one of our best friends on the planet. Unfortunately, this administration's claims of breached protocol are an attempt to overshadow the real elephant in the room, and truth itself.

The actual outrage here is not about the Israeli elections, as some might say. It is not about the doomed diplomatic overtures of this administration. The real crisis and the real threat is a nuclear-capable Iran, and Prime Minister Netanyahu—with the greatest credentials on Earth related to this threat—in coming to speak to all of us is acting as a trusted ally should act. I hope this administration and this Congress and the American people will listen to him very carefully.

The true problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that an outspoken enemy of our Nation, one that is, indeed, the leading state sponsor of global Islamic terrorism, is actively pursuing nuclear weapons that could create the gravest of threats to the United States, Israel, and the entire free world.

How quickly we forget that Iran considers the United States of America the ''Great Satan.'' How quickly we forget that last year, on November 4, Iran, once again, celebrated ''Death to America Day,'' commemorating the 1979 seizure of the United States Embassy. How quickly we forget that ''death to America'' is the rallying cry of Hezbollah, which has been backed by Iran, and it launched attacks on Israel just last week, killing and wounding good men.

How quickly we forget that one of Iran's stated goals is ''wiping Israel off the map.'' How quickly we forget that Iran collaborates with anti-U.S. regimes in South America and is actively seeking to exploit our borders and, of course, this administration's complete inattention to them. How quickly we forget that Iran continues to cooperate with North Korea in the development of long-range missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, is this administration so naive or, worse, so arrogant as to believe that we can have any type of credible, diplomatic agreement with the leadership of such a regime?

I think it is embarrassing, Mr. Speaker, to the United States of America that this supposed breach of protocol has somehow permitted this administration through anonymous, yet somehow authoritative, sources to politically threaten the elected leader of our only democratic ally in the region—calling him names in the media and being vindictive in its every interaction with him. None of this salve for the administration's wounded ego has furthered the interests of the United States one iota. Ultimately, it has only diminished America's national security and Israel's right to defend herself.

Mr. Speaker, there are, unfortunately, only three things that will prevent Iran from eventually gaining nuclear weapons: one is a fundamental change of the regime in Iran; two is a direct military action to destroy their capability to build a nuclear weapons capability; or, finally, Mr. Speaker, it is the conviction in the minds of the jihadist leadership in Iran that military action will occur if that capability is not dismantled.

Mr. Speaker, indifference, cowardice, diplomacy—call it what you will, but in the end, ignorance, whether intentional or unintentional, is not a viable alternative to the truth. Along with so many others in this body and, really, in America, itself, I have every conviction that when Prime Minister Netanyahu speaks on the threat that Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons and its sponsorship of terrorism pose to global security, he will be speaking the truth. Once again, for the sake of America, for Israel, and for the free world, I pray that we all listen very carefully.

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

DISASTER ASSISTANCE FAIRNESS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR) for 30 minutes.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, on October 29 of 2012, Super Storm Sandy battered the coast of my State, New Jersey, leaving behind a wake of devastation and interrupting the lives of many, many thousands of people in our communities.

We are still recovering from this. It was the second-costliest hurricane in

United States history. Yet, out of that destruction, our communities came together. Neighbors took each other in, people looked after each other, families started over, small businesses slowly started to rebuild, and there was hope again in New Jersey. My heart goes out still to the many friends and neighbors who are still trying to put their lives back together again.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has had a vital role in our recovery. Disaster assistance came through the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA. Nearly 183,000 disaster victims were awarded $1.3 billion in disaster assistance—money to rebuild homes or to find new ones, money to help people get their lives back again. That is why it is so upsetting for these victims to now, 2 years later, be receiving letters from FEMA demanding the repayment of those aid grants. I am referring to a process called ''recoupment,'' and it goes like this:

FEMA receives an application for aid. It makes a determination, it gives a grant, and it later changes its mind. It could be for fraud or applicant error, in which case FEMA has my full support, but sometimes FEMA just changes its mind. The application is correct. An examiner evaluates the claim, makes the payment, and then, later, a supervisor can change his mind and say: ''We don't think you got this one right,'' and a letter goes out months—even years—later, demanding repayment.

Mr. Speaker, I worked for 30 years in the insurance industry. I started as a claims adjuster. I had the privilege at the end of my career of running a large insurance service company, and sometimes errors did get made. Sometimes a supervisor disagreed because there was just a difference of opinion. I might have even made a few errors myself. But in the private sector, companies can't just reach out and demand those funds back again and, in the case of the Federal Government, demand with an ''or else.'' An ''or else'' from the long arm of the Federal Government is a serious matter, indeed—wage garnishment or worse.

Mr. Speaker, by October 31 of 2014—2 years after Sandy—1,200 of my fellow New Jerseyans had received letters demanding that $8 million be returned to the Federal Government. These are people who used these funds to rebuild their homes, to find new places to live, to repair what was broken, to replace the clothes on their backs, and begin again. Now the government wants to take it back. It is a terrible blow to these dear people, our fellow citizens, whose lives were overwhelmed in just a few short hours. It is something that could happen to every one of us.

That is why I have introduced the Disaster Assistance Fairness and Accountability Act of 2015. Like it says in the title, it is about bringing fairness and accountability back to this process, and it does it, Mr. Speaker, in a few simple ways.

First, fairness. It allows FEMA to recoup funds if there is an applicant error or if there is fraud, but not if FEMA just changes its determination on an application that was accurate and later just subjects itself to a change of opinion.

□ 1330

It applies the same standard to FEMA that applies to the private sector, and it is fundamentally fair.

Accountability. My proposed act requires FEMA to prove that the applicant was guilty of error or fraud instead of the other way around. It shifts the burden of proof from the individual to the government, which is where it should be. Only at FEMA are you guilty until proven innocent. That is fundamentally un-American and something my bill will change. Where there is fraud or applicant error, FEMA has full authority to recover funds so that the hardworking taxpayers of our country are getting a fair shake as well.

Lastly, the bill is reasonable. It imposes a 3-year statute of limitations on FEMA for these recoupment actions. Now there is no limit. They can reach in many years after if they choose to. Nearly every other law in the United States is subject to a statute of limitations, and this should be no different.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ways that we can help the survivors of Superstorm Sandy, and they need and deserve our help. This bill is just a start, but this bill will also help victims of future disasters.

I think one of our most important responsibilities as legislators is to listen to our constituents and to find ways that we can improve this government on their behalf. This is an important step in that direction. I am hopeful that we can work together, Republicans and Democrats, and bring this bill to a successful vote to bring some fairness and accountability back to this one small part of the Federal Government.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a death in the family.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, February 5, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,

Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to House Rule XI, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology adopted its rules for the 114th Congress on January 27, 2015, and I submit them now for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

RULE I. GENERAL

(a) Application of Rules.

(1) The Rules of the House of Representatives (''House Rules'') are the rules of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and its Subcommittees with the specific additions thereto contained in these rules.

(2) Except where the term ''Subcommittee'' is specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee and its Subcommittees as well as to the respective Chairs and Ranking Minority Members.

(b) Other Procedures. The Chair may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out these rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee.

(c) Use of Hearing Rooms. In consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chair of the Committee shall establish guidelines for the use of Committee hearing rooms.

RULE II. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meetings. The regular meeting day of the Committee for the conduct of its business shall be on the first Thursday of each month, if the House is in session. If the House is not in session on that day, then the Committee shall meet on the next Thursday of such month on which the House is in session, or at another practicable time as determined by the Chair.

(1) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chair, there is no need for the meeting.

(2) The Chair may call and convene, as he considers necessary and in accordance with the notice requirements contained in these rules, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business.

(b) Bills and Subjects to be Considered.

(1) The Chair shall announce the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(2) At least 48 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

(3) To the maximum extent practicable, amendments to a measure or matter shall be submitted in writing or electronically to the designee of both the Chair and Ranking Minority Member at least 24 hours prior to the consideration of the measure or matter, and the Chair may oppose any amendment not so submitted.

(c) Open Meetings.

(1) Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with the House Rules.

(2) Any Member who is not a Member of the Committee (or any Committee Member who is not a Member of the Subcommittee) may have the privilege of nonparticipatory attendance at Committee or Subcommittee

hearings or meetings in accordance with clause 2(g)(2) of House Rule XI. Such Member may not:

i. vote on any matter;

ii. be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum;

iii. participate in questioning a witness under the 5-Minute Rule, unless permitted to do so by the Chair;

iv. raise points of order; or

v. offer amendments or motions.

(d) Quorums. A majority of the Committee shall form a quorum, except that two Members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, and one third of the Members shall form a quorum for taking any action other than for which the presence of a majority of the Committee is otherwise required. If the Chair is not present at any meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee, the Vice Chair on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting, unless another Member of the Committee is designated by the Chair.

(e) Postponement of Proceedings.

(1) Pursuant to clause 2(h)(4) of House Rule XI, the Chair may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment. The Chair may resume proceedings on a postponed vote at any time after reasonable notice.

(2) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(f) Time for Statements and Debate.

(1) Insofar as is practicable, the Chair, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall limit the total time of opening statements by Members at a Committee meeting to no more than ten minutes, the time to be divided equally between the Chair and Ranking Minority Member. When requested, ex officio Members of any Subcommittee shall also be recognized at a Subcommittee hearing for five minutes each to present an opening statement.

(2) The time any one Member may address the Committee on any bill, amendment, motion, or other matter under consideration by the Committee will be limited to five minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chair. This time limit may be waived by the Chair pursuant to unanimous consent.

(g) Requests for Recorded Vote. A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of one-fifth of the Members present.

(h) Transcripts. Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and may be published in the same manner as hearings before the Committee. Transcripts shall be included as part of the legislative report unless waived by the Chair of the Committee.

(i) Motion to Go to Conference. Without further action of the Committee, the Chair is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of House Rule XXII whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

RULE III. HEARINGS

(a) Notice of Hearings.

(1) The Chair shall publicly announce the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(2) The Chair shall publicly announce a list of witnesses to testify at a hearing as soon as a complete list of witnesses, including those to be called by the minority, is compiled. When practicable, the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member will seek to have a complete list of witnesses compiled at or as soon as practicable after the time that the hearing is publicly announced.

(b) Witnesses.

(1) Insofar as is practicable, no later than 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file, in printed copy and in electronic form, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and a curriculum vitae.

(2) Each witness shall limit his or her presentation to a five minute summary, however additional time may be granted by the Chair when appropriate.

(3) The Chair, or any Member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

(4) Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the Minority Members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(5) In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing. The disclosure shall include the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof), cooperative agreement, or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government. Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(c) Questioning of Witnesses.

(1) The right to interrogate a witness before the Committee shall alternate between Majority and Minority Members of the Committee. Each Member shall be limited to five minutes in the interrogation of witnesses. No Member may be recognized for a second period of interrogation until each Member present, who wishes to be recognized, has been recognized at least once.

(2) Notwithstanding clause 1, upon a motion the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may:

i. Designate a specified number of Members of the Committee from each party to question a witness for a period of time equally divided between the majority party and the minority party, not to exceed one hour in the aggregate; or

ii. Designate staff from each party to question a witness for a period of time equally divided between the majority party and the minority party, not to exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(3) Members of the Committee have two weeks from the date of a hearing to submit additional questions in writing for the record to be answered by witnesses who have appeared in person. The letters of transmittal and any responses thereto shall be included in the hearing record.

(d) Claims of Privilege. Claims of common-law privileges made by witnesses in hearings, or by interviewees or deponents in investigations or inquiries, are applicable only at the discretion of the Chair, subject to appeal to the Committee.

(e) Publication of Transcripts. The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, when it is decided they will be printed, shall be published in substantially verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Individuals, including Members, whose comments are to be published as part of a Committee document shall be given the opportunity to verify the accuracy of the transcription in advance of publication. Any requests by those Members, staff, or witnesses to correct any errors other than errors in the transcript, or disputed errors in transcription, shall be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Prior to approval by the Chair of hearings conducted jointly with another Congressional Committee, a memorandum of understanding shall be prepared which incorporates an agreement for the publication of the transcript.

(f) Pertinence of Testimony. At the discretion of the Committee, brief and pertinent statements may be submitted in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee is the sole judge of the pertinence of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

RULE IV. REPORTS

(a) Bills and resolutions approved by the Committee shall be reported by the Chair pursuant to clauses 2–4 of House Rule XIII.

(b) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the Members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days).

(c) Every investigative or oversight report shall be approved by a majority vote of the Committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present. If at the time of approval of such a report a Member of the Committee gives notice of intent to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views that Member shall be entitled to file such views.

(d) Only those investigative or oversight reports approved by a majority vote of the Committee may be ordered printed, unless otherwise required by House Rules.

RULE V. BROADCASTING

(a) Whenever a meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clause 4 of House Rule XI.

(b) To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall provide audio and visual coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings, and maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public. Operation and use of any Committee internet broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan, and in accordance with clauses 4(b) and (f) of House Rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

RULE VI. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Committee Jurisdiction. The Committee shall have jurisdiction over such matters as determined by the Chair,

(b) Subcommittees and Jurisdiction. There shall be five standing Subcommittees of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, with jurisdictions as follows:

(1) Subcommittee on Energy. Shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: all matters relating to energy research, development, and demonstration projects therefor; commercial application of energy technology; Department of Energy research, development, and demonstration programs; Department of Energy laboratories; Department of Energy science activities; energy supply activities; nuclear, solar, and renewable energy, and other advanced energy technologies; uranium supply and enrichment, and Department of Energy waste management; fossil energy research and development; clean coal technology; energy conservation research and development, including building performance, alternate fuels, distributed power systems, and industrial process improvements; pipeline research, development, and demonstration projects; energy standards; other appropriate matters as referred by the Chair; and relevant oversight.

(2) Subcommittee on Environment. Shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: all matters relating to environmental research; Environmental Protection Agency research and development; environmental standards; climate change research and development; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including all activities related to weather, weather services, climate, the atmosphere, marine fisheries, and oceanic research; risk assessment activities; scientific issues related to environmental policy, including climate change; remote sensing data related to climate change at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); earth science activities conducted by the NASA; other appropriate matters as referred by the Chair; and relevant oversight.

(3) Subcommittee on Research and Technology. Shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: all matters relating to science policy and science education; the Office of Science and Technology Policy; all scientific research, and scientific and engineering resources (including human resources); all matters relating to science, technology, engineering and mathematics education; intergovernmental mechanisms for research, development, and demonstration and cross-cutting programs; international scientific cooperation; National Science Foundation; university research policy, including infrastructure and overhead; university research partnerships, including those with industry; science scholarships; computing, communications, networking, and information technology; research and development relating to health, biomedical, and nutritional programs; research, development, and demonstration relating to nanoscience, nanoengineering, and nanotechnology; agricultural, geological, biological and life sciences research; materials research, development, demonstration, and policy; all matters relating to competitiveness, technology, standards, and innovation; standardization of weights and measures, including technical standards, standardization, and conformity assessment; measurement, including the metric system of measurement; the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce; the National Institute of Standards and Technology; the National Technical Information Service; competitiveness, including small business competitiveness; tax, antitrust, regulatory and other legal and governmental policies related to technological development and commercialization; technology transfer, including civilian use of defense technologies; patent and intellectual property policy; international technology trade; research, development, and demonstration activities of the Department of Transportation; surface and water transportation research, development, and demonstration programs; earthquake programs and fire research programs, including those related to wildfire proliferation research and prevention; biotechnology policy; research, development, demonstration, and standards-related activities of the Department of Homeland Security; Small Business Innovation Research and Technology Transfer; voting technologies and standards; other appropriate matters as referred by the Chair; and relevant oversight.

(4) Subcommittee on Space. Shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: all matters relating to astronautical and aeronautical research and development; national space policy, including access to space; sub-orbital access and applications; National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its contractor and government-operated labs; space commercialization, including commercial space activities relating to the Department of Transportation and the Department of Commerce; exploration and use of outer space; international space cooperation; the National Space Council; space applications, space communications and related matters; Earth remote sensing policy; civil aviation research, development, and demonstration; research, development, and demonstration programs of the Federal Aviation Administration; space law; other appropriate matters as referred by the Chair; and relevant oversight.

(5) Subcommittee on Oversight. Shall have general and special investigative authority on all matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(c) Composition of Subcommittees.

(1) The Chair shall assign Members to the Subcommittees. Minority party assignments shall be made only with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member. The Chair shall determine the ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members of each Subcommittee; provided that the ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members on each Subcommittee (excluding any ex officio Member) shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Committee.

(2) The Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall be ex officio Members of each Subcommittee to which such Chair or Ranking Minority Member has not been assigned by the Chair They are not authorized to vote on Subcommittee matters. Unless they are regular Members of the Subcommittee, they shall not be counted in determining a Subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for taking testimony.

(d) Referral to Subcommittees. The Chair shall expeditiously refer all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee to the Subcommittee or Subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction, unless the Chair deems consideration is to be by the Committee. Subcommittee Chairs may make requests for referral of specific matters to their Subcommittee if they believe Subcommittee jurisdictions so warrant.

(e) Subcommittee Procedures and Reports.

(1) Subcommittee Chairs shall set meeting dates with the concurrence of the Chair and after consultation with the other Subcommittee Chairs with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible. No Subcommittee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the Committee without authorization from the Chair.

(2) Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony or evidence, mark up legislation, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. For matters within its jurisdiction, each Subcommittee is authorized to conduct legislative, investigative, forecasting, and general oversight hearings; to conduct inquiries into the future; and to undertake budget impact studies.

(3) Each Subcommittee shall provide the Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the Subcommittee and such other records with respect to the Subcommittee as the Chair of the Committee deems necessary to ensure compliance with the House Rules.

(4) After ordering a measure or matter reported, a Subcommittee shall issue a report in such form as the Chair shall specify. To the maximum extent practicable, reports and recommendations of a Subcommittee shall not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of 48 hours from the time the report is submitted and made available to the Committee. Printed hearings thereon shall be made available, if feasible, to the Committee, except that this Rule may be waived at the discretion of the Chair after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE VII. VICE CHAIRS

(a) The Chair of the Committee shall designate a Member of the majority party to serve as Vice Chair of the Committee, and shall designate a Majority Member of each Subcommittee to serve as Vice Chair of the Subcommittee. Vice Chairs of the Committee and each Subcommittee serve at the pleasure of the Chair, who may at any time terminate his designation of a Member as Vice Chair and designate a different Member of the majority party to serve as Vice Chair of the Committee or relevant Subcommittee.

(b) The Chair may assign duties, privileges, and responsibilities to the Vice Chairs of the Committee or the various Subcommittees.

RULE VIII. OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its jurisdiction, including all laws, programs, and Government activities relating to nonmilitary research and development in accordance with House Rule X.

(b) Not later than February 15th of the first session of the 114th Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plan for submission to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of House Rule X.

(c) Any investigation undertaken in the name of the Committee shall be approved by the Chair Nothing in this subsection shall be interpreted to infringe on a Subcommittee's authority to conduct general oversight of matters within its jurisdiction, short of undertaking an investigation.

RULE IX. SUBPOENAS

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chair as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of House Rule XI.

RULE X. DEPOSITION AUTHORITY

The Chair may authorize the staff of the Committee to conduct depositions pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, and subject to any regulations issued pursuant thereto.

RULE XI. COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with House Rule VII.

(b) The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee of any decision, pursuant to clauses 3(b)(3) or 4(b) of

House Rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

RULE XII. OFFICIAL COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chair shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee Members and other Members of the House. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may maintain a similar website for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee Members and other Members of the House.

RULE XIII. COMMITTEE BUDGET

From the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in the 114th Congress, the Chair shall designate one-third of the budget, after adjustment for the salaries of the shared administrative functions for the Clerk, Printer and Financial Administrator, under the direction of the Ranking Minority Member for the purposes of minority staff, travel expenses of minority staff and Members, and all other minority office expenses.

RULE XIV. AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended or repealed, in the same manner and method as prescribed for the adoption of committee rules in clause 2 of House Rule XI, but only if written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each such Member at least 3 days before the time of the meeting at which the vote on the change occurs. Any such change in the rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 30 calendar days after their approval.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and clause (b) of rule I of the Rules of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I submit the Rules of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the 114th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record. On January 27, 2015, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session and adopted these Committee Rules by voice vote with a quorum present.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

RULE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees.

(2) SUBCOMMITTEES.—Each subcommittee is part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its rules so far as applicable.

(3) INCORPORATION OF HOUSE RULE ON COMMITTEE PROCEDURE.—Rule XI of the Rules of the House, which pertains entirely to Committee procedure, is incorporated and made a part of the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable. Pursuant to clause 2(a)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the Committee is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(b) PUBLICATION OF RULES.—Pursuant to clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chairman is elected in each odd-numbered year.

(c) VICE CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman shall appoint a vice chairman of the Committee and of each subcommittee. If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, the vice chairman shall preside. If the vice chairman is not present, the ranking member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

RULE II. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) REGULAR MEETINGS.—Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held on the first Wednesday of every month to transact its business unless such day is a holiday, or the House is in recess or is adjourned, in which case the Chairman shall determine the regular meeting day of the Committee for that month. A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need for the meeting. This paragraph shall not apply to meetings of any subcommittee.

(b) ADDITIONAL MEETINGS.—The Chairman may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(c) SPECIAL MEETINGS.—If at least three members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Committee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the Committee shall notify all members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting. Such notice shall also be made publicly available in electronic form and shall be deemed to satisfy paragraph (d)(1).

(d) NOTICE.—

(1) MINIMUM NOTICE PERIOD.—Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of a Committee or subcommittee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof.

(2) CHANGES IN MEETING TIMES.—A meeting may commence sooner than announced if the Chairman, with concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner or the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business. The Chairman shall make a public announcement of the meeting time change at the earliest possible opportunity.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF DAILY DIGEST CLERK.—The clerk of the Committee shall notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after a public announcement of a time change for a Committee or subcommittee meeting is made under this paragraph.

(e) PROHIBITION ON SITTING DURING JOINT SESSION.—The Committee may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

RULE III. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS GENERALLY

(a) MINIMUM PERIOD FOR AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE MARKUP TEXT.—Pursuant to clause 2(g)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman shall make publicly available, in electronic form, the text of any legislation to be marked up at least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of a meeting announcement under paragraph (d)(2) of Committee Rule II if made within 24 hours before such meeting.

(b) OPEN MEETINGS.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public, except as provided by clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(c) MEETINGS TO BEGIN PROMPTLY.—Each meeting or hearing of the Committee shall begin promptly at the time so stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(d) ADDRESSING THE COMMITTEE.—Except as provided under paragraph (e) of Committee Rule VI, a Committee member may address the Committee or a subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration—

(1) only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose; and

(2) only for 5 minutes, or for a period of time designated by the Chairman with concurrence of the ranking minority member, until such time as each member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to address the Committee or subcommittee.

A member shall be limited in his or her remarks to the subject matter under consideration. The Chairman shall enforce this paragraph.

(e) PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS IN SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.—All members of the Committee who are not members of a particular subcommittee may, by unanimous consent of the members of such subcommittee, participate in any subcommittee meeting or hearing. However, a member who is not a member of the subcommittee may not vote on any matter before the subcommittee, be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum, or raise points of order.

(f) BROADCASTING.—Whenever a meeting for the transaction of business, including the

markup of legislation, or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. Operation and use of any Committee Internet broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House. Further, pursuant to clause 2(e)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings. The Committee shall also maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(g) ACCESS TO THE DAIS AND LOUNGES.—Access to the hearing rooms' daises and to the lounges adjacent to the Committee hearing rooms shall be limited to Members of Congress and employees of Congress during a meeting or hearing of the Committee unless specifically permitted by the Chairman or ranking minority member.

(h) USE OF CELLULAR TELEPHONES.—The use of cellular telephones in the Committee hearing room is prohibited during a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(i) AVAILABILITY OF TEXT OF AMENDMENTS IN ELECTRONIC FORM.—Pursuant to clause 2(e) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chairman shall cause the text of the amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE IV. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; POWER TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS; OATHS; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) AUTHORITY TO SIT AND ACT.—For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee and each of its subcommittees, is authorized (subject to paragraph (d)(1))—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings; and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary.

(b) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by Rule X, clause 6 of the Rules of the House) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(2) MAJOR INVESTIGATIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEES.—A subcommittee may not begin a major investigation without approval of a majority of such subcommittee.

(c) OATHS.—The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(d) ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena may be issued by the Committee or subcommittee under paragraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. Such authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any member designated by the Committee. If a specific request for a subpoena has not been previously rejected by either the Committee or subcommittee, the Chairman of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee, may authorize and issue a subpoena under paragraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, and such subpoena shall for all purposes be deemed a subpoena issued by the Committee. As soon as practicable after a subpoena is issued under this rule, the Chairman shall notify all members of the Committee of such action.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or subcommittee under paragraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(e) EXPENSES OF SUBPOENAED WITNESSES.—Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his or her testimony before the Committee or any subcommittee, may report to the offices of the Committee, and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D.C., the witness may contact the counsel of the Committee, or his or her representative, before leaving the hearing room.

RULE V. QUORUMS AND RECORD VOTES; POSTPONEMENT OF VOTES

(a) WORKNG QUORUM.—One-third of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than the closing of a meeting pursuant to clauses 2(g) and 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, the authorizing of a subpoena pursuant to paragraph (d) of Committee Rule IV, the reporting of a measure or recommendation pursuant to paragraph (b)(1) of Committee Rule VII, and the actions described in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this rule.

(b) QUORUM FOR REPORTING.—A majority of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of a measure or recommendation.

(c) APPROVAL OF CERTAIN MATTERS.—A majority of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for approval of a resolution concerning any of the following actions:

(1) A prospectus for construction, alteration, purchase or acquisition of a public building or the lease of space as required by section 3307 of title 40, United States Code.

(2) Survey investigation of a proposed project for navigation, flood control, and other purposes by the Corps of Engineers (section 4 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 4, 1913,33 U.S.C. 542).

(3) Construction of a water resources development project by the Corps of Engineers with an estimated Federal cost not exceeding $15,000,000 (section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965).

(4) Deletion of water quality storage in a Federal reservoir project where the benefits attributable to water quality are 15 percent or more but not greater than 25 percent of the total project benefits (section 65 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974).

(5) Authorization of a Natural Resources Conservation Service watershed project involving any single structure of more than 4,000 acre feet of total capacity (section 2 of P.L. 566, 83rd Congress).

(d) QUORUM FOR TAKING TESTIMONY.—Two members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(e) RECORD VOTES.—A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present.

(f) POSTPONEMENT OF VOTES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with clause 2(h)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee or subcommittee, may—

(A) postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment; and

(B) resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice.

(2) RESUMPTION OF PROCEEDINGS.—When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(g) AVAILABILITY OF RECORD VOTES IN ELECTRONIC FORM.—Pursuant to clause 2(e)(1)(B)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman shall make the result of any record vote publicly available for inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote.

RULE VI. HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING.—

(1) MINIMUM NOTICE PERIOD.—Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of a Committee or subcommittee hearing, which may not commence earlier than the one week after such notice.

(2) CHANGES IN HEARING TIMES.—A hearing may commence sooner than announced if the Chairman, with concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner or the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business. The Chairman shall make a public announcement of the hearing time change at the earliest possible opportunity.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF DAILY DIGEST CLERK.—The clerk of the Committee shall notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after a public announcement of a time change for a Committee or subcommittee hearing is made under this paragraph.

(b) WRITTEN STATEMENT; ORAL TESTIMONY.—

(1) FILING OF STATEMENT.—So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee or subcommittee, at least 2 working days before the day of his or her appearance, a written statement of proposed testimony. The Chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, may take the following actions for failure to comply with this requirement: (A) exclude such witness' written testimony from the hearing record; (B) bar such witness' oral presentation of the testimony; or (C) both (A) and (B). Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of the written statement.

(2) TRUTH IN TESTIMONY INFORMATION.—Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, in the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), or the amount and country of origin of any contract or payment originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION IN ELECTRONIC FORM.—Statements filed under this

paragraph, with appropriate redaction to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(c) MINORITY WITNESSES.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee or subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) SUMMARY OF SUBJECT MATTER.—Upon announcement of a hearing, to the extent practicable, the Committee shall make available immediately to all members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the Chairman shall make available to the members of the Committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter.

(e) OPENING STATEMENTS; QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES.—

(1) Opening statements.—

(A) CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER.—At a hearing of the Full Committee, the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee shall each be entitled to present an oral opening statement of five minutes. At a hearing of a subcommittee, the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee and the Chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee shall each be entitled to present an opening statement for five minutes.

(B) OTHER MEMBERS.—At a hearing of the Full Committee or a subcommittee, other members of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, may submit written opening statements for the record. The Chairman presiding over the hearing may permit oral opening statements by other members of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member.

(2) QUESTIONING OF WITNESS.—The questioning of witnesses in Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority parties. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority nor the members of the minority. The Chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(f) PROCEDURES FOR QUESTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A Committee member may question a witness at a hearing—

(A) only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose; and

(B) subject to subparagraphs (2) and (3), only for 5 minutes until such time as each member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

A member shall be limited in his or her remarks to the subject matter under consideration. The Chairman shall enforce this subparagraph.

(2) EXTENDED QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES BY MEMBERS.—The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee or subcommittee by motion, may permit a specified number of its members to question a witness for longer than 5 minutes. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this subdivision shall be equal for the majority party and minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(3) EXTENDED QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES BY STAFF.—The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee or subcommittee by motion, may permit Committee staff for its majority and minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this subdivision shall be equal for the majority party and minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(4) RIGHT TO QUESTION WITNESSES FOLLOWING EXTENDED QUESTIONING.—Nothing in subparagraph (2) or (3) affects the right of a member (other than a member designated under subparagraph (2)) to question a witness for 5 minutes in accordance with subparagraph (1)(B) after the questioning permitted under subparagraph (2) or (3).

(g) ADDITIONAL HEARING PROCEDURES.—Clause 2(k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House (relating to additional rules for hearings) applies to hearings of the Committee and its subcommittees.

RULE VII. PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND REPORTS

(a) FILING OF REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee shall report promptly to the House any measure or matter approved by the Committee and take necessary steps to bring the measure or matter to a vote.

(2) REQUESTS FOR REPORTING.—The report of the Committee on a measure or matter which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure or matter. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chairman of the Committee notice of the filing of that request.

(b) QUORUM; RECORD VOTES.—

(1) QUORUM.—No measure, matter, or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(2) RECORD VOTES.—With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) REQUIRED MATTERS.—The report of the Committee on a measure or matter which has been approved by the Committee shall include the items required to be included by clauses 2(c) and 3 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views, all members shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such written and signed views in accordance with clause 2(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(e) ACTIVITIES REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 2 of each odd numbered year, the Committee shall submit to the House a report on the activities of the Committee.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report shall include—

(A) separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House during the Congress;

(B) a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee under clause 2(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House;

(C) a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to the oversight plans specified in subdivision (B);

(D) a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon; and

(E) a delineation of any hearings held pursuant to clauses 2(n), (o), or (p) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(3) FILING.—After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, or after December 15 of an even numbered year, whichever occurs first, the Chairman may file the report described in subparagraph (1) with the Clerk of the House at any time and without approval of the Committee, provided that—

(A) a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days; and

(B) the report includes any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(f) OTHER COMMITTEE MATERIALS—

(1) IN GENERAl.—All Committee and subcommittee prints, reports, documents, or other materials, not otherwise provided for under this rule, that purport to express publicly the views of the Committee or any of its subcommittees or members of the Committee or its subcommittees shall be approved by the Committee or the subcommittee prior to printing and distribution and any member shall be given an opportunity to have views included as part of such material prior to printing, release, and distribution in accordance with paragraph (d) of this rule.

(2) DOCUMENTS CONTAINING VIEWS OTHER THAN MEMBER VIEWS.—A Committee or subcommittee document containing views other than those of members of the Committee or subcommittee shall not be published without approval of the Committee or subcommittee.

(3) DISCLAIMER.—All Committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report: ''This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members.''.

(4) COMPILATIONS OF LAWS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall publish a compilation of laws under the jurisdiction of each subcommittee.

(g) AVAILABILITY OF PUBLICATIONS.—Pursuant to clause 2(e)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form to the maximum extent feasible.

RULE VIII. ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES; SIZE AND PARTY RATIOS

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be 6 standing subcommittees. These subcommittees, with the following sizes (including delegates) and majority/minority ratios, are:

(1) Subcommittee on Aviation (35 Members: 20 Majority and 15 Minority).

(2) Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation (17 Members: 10 Majority and 7 Minority).

(3) Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management (17 Members: 10 Majority and 7 Minority).

(4) Subcommittee on Highways and Transit (49 Members: 28 Majority and 21 Minority).

(5) Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials (31 Members: 18 Majority and 13 Minority).

(6) Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment (31 Members: 18 Majority and 13 Minority).

(b) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee shall serve as ex officio voting members on each subcommittee.

(c) RATIOS.—On each subcommittee there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Full Committee. In calculating the ratio of majority party members to minority party members, there shall be included the ex officio members of the subcommittees.

RULE IX. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) AUTHORITY TO SIT.—Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Full Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(b) CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE.—Each bill, resolution, or other matter favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the Committee. Any such matter reported by a subcommittee shall not be considered by the Committee unless it has been delivered to the offices of all members of the Committee at least 48 hours before the meeting, unless the Chairman determines that the matter is of such urgency that it should be given early consideration. Where practicable, such matters shall be accompanied by a comparison with present law and a section-by-section analysis.

RULE X. REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION TO SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) GENERAL REQUIREMENT.—Except where the Chairman of the Committee determines, in consultation with the majority members of the Committee, that consideration is to be by the Full Committee, each bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee established in Committee Rule VIII referred to or initiated by the Full Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to all subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks. All bills shall be referred to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee.

(b) RECALL FROM SUBCOMMITTEE.—A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of a majority of the members of the Committee voting, a quorum being present, for the Committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(c) MULTIPLE REFERRALS.—In carrying out this rule with respect to any matter, the Chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee after the first), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or make such other provisions as he or she considers appropriate.

RULE XI. RECOMMENDATION OF CONFEREES

The Chairman of the Committee shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members (1) of the majority party selected by the Chairman, and (2) of the minority party selected by the ranking minority member of the Committee. Recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Committee.

RULE XII. OVERSIGHT

(a) PURPOSE—The Committee shall carry out oversight responsibilities as provided in this rule in order to assist the House in—

(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of—

(A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress; or

(B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation; and

(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate.

(b) OVERSIGHT PLAN.—Not later than February 15 of the first session of each Congress, the Committee shall adopt its oversight plan for that Congress in accordance with clause 2(d)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House.

(c) REVIEW OF LAWS AND PROGRAMS.—The Committee and the appropriate subcommittees shall cooperatively review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, the Committee and the appropriate subcommittees shall cooperatively review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(d) REVIEW OF TAX POLICIES.—The Committee and the appropriate subcommittees shall cooperatively review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

RULE XIII. REVIEW OF CONTINUING PROGRAMS; BUDGET ACT PROVISIONS

(a) ENSURING ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved.

(b) REVIEW OF MULTI-YEAR APPROPRIATIONS.—The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefore would be made annually.

(c) VIEWS AND ESTIMATES.—In accordance with clause 4(f)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget—

(1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(2) an estimate of the total amount of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) BUDGET ALLOCATIONS.—As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the Committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocations made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) RECONCILIATION.—Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process, it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE XIV. RECORDS

(a) KEEPING OF RECORDS.—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action which shall include—

(1) in the case of any meeting or hearing transcripts, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved; and

(2) a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is taken.

(b) PUBLIC INSPECTION.—The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(c) PROPERTY OF THE HOUSE.—All Committee records (including hearings, data, charts, and files) shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as Chairman of the Committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF ARCHIVED RECORDS.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the

House. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of the Committee of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of such rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

(e) AUTHORITY TO PRINT.—The Committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee shall be paid as provided in clause 1(c) of Rule XI of the House.

RULE XV. COMMITTEE BUDGETS

(a) BIENNIAL BUDGET.—The Chairman, in consultation with the chairman of each subcommittee, the majority members of the Committee, and the minority members of the Committee, shall, for each Congress, prepare a consolidated Committee budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee.

(b) ADDITIONAL EXPENSES.—Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen Committee expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions processed in the same manner as set out herein.

(c) TRAVEL REQUESTS.—The Chairman or any chairman of a subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Committee Rule XVII within the limits of the consolidated budget as approved by the House and the Chairman may execute necessary vouchers thereof.

(d) MONTHLY REPORTS.—Once monthly, the Chairman shall submit to the Committee on House Administration, in writing, a full and detailed accounting of all expenditures made during the period since the last such accounting from the amount budgeted to the Committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of such expenditure and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed. A copy of such monthly report shall be available in the Committee office for review by members of the Committee.

RULE XVI COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) APPOINTMENT BY CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority. The staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(b) APPOINTMENT BY RANKING MINORITY MEMBER.—The ranking minority member of the Committee shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the staff assigned to the minority within the budget approved for such purposes. The staff assigned to the minority 18 shall be under the general supervision and direction of the ranking minority member of the Committee who may delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(c) INTENTION REGARDING STAFF.—It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the Committee staff shall be available to all members of the Committee.

RULE XVII. TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

(a) APPROVAL.—Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of Committee members and staff. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel shall be authorized by the Chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel.

(2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made.

(3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made.

(4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) SUBCOMMITTEE TRAVEL.—In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the chairman of such subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a) and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Committee Rule VI.

(c) TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the Committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the Committee or pertinent19 subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairman, or, in the case of a subcommittee from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel will occur.

(C) The names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) An agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of Committee jurisdiction involved.

(E) The names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) INITIATION OF REQUESTS.—Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the Committee.

(d) REPORTS BY MEMBERS AND STAFF.—Within 15 legislative days from the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting, or conference for which travel has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each member and staff member involved in such travel shall submit a written report to the Chairman covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS, RULES, POLICIES.—Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, and by the travel policy of the Committee.

RULE XVIII. COMMITTEE PANELS

(a) DESIGNATION.—In accordance with clause 5(b)(2)(C) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the Committee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and 20 take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(b) DURATION.—No panel designated under paragraph (a) shall continue in existence for more than six months after the date of the designation.

(c) PARTY RATIOS AND APPOINTMENT.—The ratio of majority members to minority members on a panel designated under paragraph (a) shall be as close as practicable to the ratio of the Full Committee. All majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all minority members shall be appointed by the ranking minority member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the majority members so appointed to serve as Chairman of the panel. The ranking minority member of the Committee shall similarly choose the ranking minority member of the panel.

(d) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee may serve as ex-officio members of a panel designated under paragraph (a). The Chairman and ranking minority member are authorized to vote on matters that arise before the panel and shall be counted to satisfy the quorum requirement for any purpose.

(e) JURISDICTION.—No panel designated under paragraph (a) shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF COMMITTEE RULES.—A panel designated under paragraph (a) shall be subject to all Committee Rules herein.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 9, 2015, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

333. A letter from the Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities (HSACU) (RIN: 0524-AA39) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

334. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-80; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0051, Sequence No. 8] received January 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

335. A letter from the Chair, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, transmitting the Commission's final report and legislative proposals, pursuant to Public Law 112-239, section 374(f)(6), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

336. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Northampton County, VA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8369] received January 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

337. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

338. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Revisions to Emissions Inventory Requirements, and General Provisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0636; FRL-9922-25-Region 6] received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

339. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule; notice of administrative change — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Idaho and Oregon: Negative Declarations [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0567; FRL-9922-34-Region 10] received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

340. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Polyvinyl Chloride and Copolymers Production Area Sources Wastewater Limit Withdrawal [EPA-HQ-OAR-2002-0037; FRL-9921-80-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS45) received February 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

341. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), a-(3-carboxy-1-oxosulfopropyl)-w-hydroxy-, (C10-C16)-alkyl ethers, disodium salts; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0514; FRL-9920-44] received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

342. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0714; FRL-9919-68] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

343. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the twenty-sixth quarterly report to the Congress on Afghanistan Reconstruction, pursuant to Public Law 110-181, section 1229; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

344. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to Revise the Code of Federal Regulations for Species Under the Jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service; Correction [Docket No.: 130501429-4999-03] (RIN: 0648-XC659) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

345. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Fishing Year 2014; Interim Gulf of Maine Code Management Measures; Correction [Docket No.: 141002822-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-BE56) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

346. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Office of General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Smoking/No Smoking Areas [BOP Docket No.: 1140-F] (RIN: 1120-AB42) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

347. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Division, American Legion, transmitting a financial statement and independent audit of The American Legion, proceedings of the 96th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Charlotte, North Carolina from August 22-28, 2014, and a report on the Organization's activities for the year preceding the convention; (H. Doc. No. 114—7); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

348. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Biodiesel and Alternative Fuels; Claims for 2014; Excise Tax [Notice 2015-3] received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

349. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Procedures to change a method of accounting for federal income tax purposes (Revenue Procedure 2015-13) received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

350. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2015-3) received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

351. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application for Recognition as a 501(c)(29) Organization [TD 9709] (RIN: 1545-BK64) received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

352. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — List of automatic changes (Rev. Proc. 2015-14) received February 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 9. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 746. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require humane treatment of animals by Federal Government facilities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 747. A bill to establish the Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Committee; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 748. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide additional educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to certain eligible individuals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 749. A bill to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount excluded from gross income for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 751. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards for information on the kidnapping and murder of James Foley, Peter Kassig, Steven Sotloff, or the kidnapping and murder of any other citizen of the United States by a foreign terrorist organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of

Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 752. A bill to prohibit the transfer or possession of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 753. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations to improve the tracking of aircraft in flight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 754. A bill to amend the weighted child count used to determine targeted grant amounts and education finance incentive grant amounts for local educational agencies under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 755. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal mandates, direction, or control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 756. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for the dissemination of information regarding available Federal programs relating to energy efficiency projects for schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 757. A bill to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Financial Services, and 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. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 758. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 759. A bill to enhance public safety by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Federal prison system with offender risk and needs assessment, individual risk reduction incentives and rewards, and risk and recidivism reduction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 760. A bill to rename the Bureau of Prisons as the Bureau of Corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 761. A bill to designate the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Monument in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. KIND, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and modify the credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 763. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which eligible veterans may elect to receive hospital care and medical services at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. JONES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. LEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 764. A bill to enhance reciprocal market access for United States domestic producers in the negotiating process of bilateral, regional, and multilateral trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 766. A bill to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BOST, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BUCK, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and reset the excise tax on beer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 768. A bill to provide for an effective HIV/AIDS program in Federal prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 769. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain educational institutions from the employer health insurance mandate, 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. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 770. A bill to reauthorize the Impact Aid Program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. REED, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 771. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to strengthen rules applied in case of competition for diabetic testing strips, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 772. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations to improve flight recorder and aircraft crash location requirements on certain commercial passenger aircraft in accordance with new International Civil Aviation Organization flight recorder standards; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr.

FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 773. A bill to repeal programs under the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 774. A bill to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. LONG, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLE, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 775. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 776. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create alternative sanctions for technical noncompliance with the Stark rule under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 777. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide funding for the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Appropriations, 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. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 778. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to redistribute Federal funds that would otherwise be made available to States that do not provide for the Medicaid expansion in accordance with the Affordable Care Act to those States electing to provide those Medicaid benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 779. A bill to authorize project development for projects to extend Metrorail service in Northern Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for offsetting certain past-due local tax debts against income tax overpayments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 781. 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 Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 782. A bill to eliminate the sequestration under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 783. A bill to address the urgent need for a Federal strategy to ensure that individuals who encounter minors at risk of female genital mutilation are fully prepared to take action to prevent the practice, and individuals who have been subjected to female genital mutilation can seek necessary services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WALZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 784. A bill to reinstate overnight delivery standards for market-dominant products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 785. A bill to repeal the revised annuity employee and further revised annuity employee categories within the Federal Employees Retirement System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and 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 Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 786. A bill to improve access, certainty, and innovation with respect to vaccines; 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. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 787. A bill to assess the State by State impact of Federal taxation and spending; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary dividends received deduction for dividends received from a controlled foreign corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARLETTA, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 789. A bill to provide for research with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 790. A bill to allow the manufacture, importation, distribution, and sale of investigational drugs and devices intended for use by terminally ill patients who execute an informed consent document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 791. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized remote shut down of a cellular phone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 792. A bill to provide for no net increase in the total acreage of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of

Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service, 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. GRIFFITH (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 793. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 794. A bill to establish a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Master Teacher Corps program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 795. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make publicly available on the official Medicare Internet site Medicare payment rates for frequently reimbursed hospital inpatient procedures, hospital outpatient procedures, and physicians' services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 796. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the South Sacramento County Agriculture and Habitat Lands Water Recycling Project in Sacramento County, California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 797. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to waive certain debts owed to the United States related to disaster assistance distributed to individuals and households in error, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 798. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to prohibit the flying of unmanned recreational aircraft near commercial airports; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAULSEN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 799. A bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COOK, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 800. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide veterans the option of using an alternative appeals process to more quickly determine claims for disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NORCROSS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 801. A bill to waive and repay certain debts relating to assistance provided to individuals and households; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 802. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a plan to provide chiropractic health care services and benefits for certain new beneficiaries as part of the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. COLE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 803. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 804. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to Medicare data; 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. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 805. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility over the Internet domain name system until the Comptroller General of the United States submits to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to such system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 806. A bill to provide for a land exchange involving a parcel of real property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army on the site of the former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 807. A bill to designate a peak in the State of Nevada as Maude Frazier Mountain; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANCE:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring Admiral Ben Moreell and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ESTY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 91. A resolution congratulating the New England Patriots on their victory in Super Bowl XLIX; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. VELA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SIRES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BASS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. PETERS):

H. Res. 92. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of Project Head Start; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. WALZ):

H. Res. 93. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the regulations promulgated by the Speaker to carry out the rule prohibiting admission to the Hall of the House by former House officials with business before Congress from providing an exemption for admission to the Hall for ceremonial or educational functions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. MENG:

H. Res. 94. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a

commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the Chinese railroad workers from 1865 to 1869, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H. Res. 95. A resolution recognizing the importance of transformative breakthroughs in biomedicine, biotechnology, and life sciences in the diagnosis, management, curing, and treatment of illness and the existence of a ''Valley of Death'' in biotechnology and life sciences funding that stifles innovation and impedes translational medical research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H. Res. 96. A resolution honoring the life of Trayvon Martin, urging the repeal of Stand Your Ground laws, and calling on the United States Government to address the crisis of racial profiling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 808. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to James Megellas, formerly of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, and currently of Colleyville, Texas, for acts of valor on January 28, 1945, during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 809. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Parlak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 9.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 8 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 18

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the bill is authorized by Congress' power to ''provide for the common Defense and general Welfare—of the United States'' pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States).

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have the Power to . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States); Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 (To . . . make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water); and 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).

With regard to Clause 1, the bill's intent is to offer cash incentives to individuals who will help in the fight against foreign terrorist organizations. Therefore, the bill will yield additional security to the United States. With regard to Clause 11, the bill creates new legal frameworks and incentives, or ''Rules'', by which the United States may make ''Captures on Land''. With regard to Clause 18, the bill provides specific language, means, and authorizations to carry out the missions set forth in Clauses 1 and 11.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and including, but not solely limited to the 14th Amendment.

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 757.

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. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1, Clause 1; and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Sec. I

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress the ability to make laws necessary to carry out that power. Additionally, Article I, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be made law; and therefore it implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution,

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, and Amendment VIII to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which empowers Congress, in part, to ''lay and collect Taxes'' and ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . .'' The bill will exempt certain educational institutions from taxes imposed by public Law 111–148, as amended. Congress has the power to repeal such taxes and provide for the general welfare of those who have been and will be harmed by their imposition.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X 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 Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which provides Congress with the power to lay and collect taxes and regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 or article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 provides that Congress has the authority ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.'' Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, ''to promote the general welfare.''

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec.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. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I, of section 8, of article I.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 790.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 793.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Acticle I, Section 8 enumerates the legislative powers which include:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Acticle I, Section 8 enumerates the legislative powers which include:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make rules to provide for the common defense, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 803.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 805

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 18240 of title 10, United States Code

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 14 of Section 8 of Article I

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to ''establish an uniform rule of Naturalization''.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 59: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 67: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 69: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 131: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 156: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 187: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 197: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 214: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 220: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 243: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 249: Ms. MOORE and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 284: Mr. PITTENGER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 289: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 308: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 310: Mr. OLSON and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 314: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 344: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 360: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 362: Ms. NORTON and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 366: Mr. JONES, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 381: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 383: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 387: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 400: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 401: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 414: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 416: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 431: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 453: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 457: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 485: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 494: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 495: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 519: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 529: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 532: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 540: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 546: Mr. OLSON, Mr. LONG, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 551: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 559: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 560: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 572: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 578: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 581: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 590: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 594: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 598: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 601: Mr. HILL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PAULSEN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 609: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 636: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KLINE, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 638: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 641: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 642: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 644: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 662: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 663: Mr. HANNA, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 665: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 670: Mr. HARPER and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 674: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 676: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 699: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 703: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 704: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 732: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 733: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 742: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. JORDAN.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. COLE.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. GOSAR.

H. Res. 14: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 28: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H. Res. 54: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SIMPSON.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2015 No. 20

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who transforms common days into transfiguring and redemptive moments, may we honor Your Name.

Make our lawmakers great enough for these momentous times as they seek to live worthy of Your great Name. May Your precepts keep them from life's pitfalls, guiding them through the darkness to a safe haven. Cleanse the fountains of their hearts from all that defiles so that they may be fit vessels to be used for Your glory.

Lord, because of Your unfailing love, we are determined to walk on the path You choose. Let Your peace be within us as Your Spirit inspires us to glorify You in our thoughts, words, and actions.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 5, H.R. 240, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 596

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 596) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday Democrats voted once again to protect politicians by blocking Homeland Security funding. I do not understand why they would want to block the Senate from even debating a bill to fund Homeland Security. It really does not make sense. You would think our Democratic friends would at least want to give the Senate an opportunity to make improvements to the bill, if they want to make such improvements. Why would our friends want to stand tall for the ability of politicians to do things President Obama himself has described as ''unwise and unfair''? Why would our friends go to the mat to protect the political class from the consequences of ''overreach'' that President Obama himself has referred to as ''ignoring the law''?

Well, here is the good news. There is a way forward. There is a way to end this Democratic filibuster. All it requires is a little common sense and a little Democratic courage. Remember, several Democrats previously indicated unease with the idea of overreaching in ways President Obama has seemed to imply would ''violate the law.'' So now is the time to back up those words. Now is the time for our friends on the other side of good conscience to vote with us to break this party's filibuster of Homeland Security funding and help us protect American democracy.

I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to H.R. 240 be agreed to and that it be in order for the managers or their designees to offer amendments in alternating fashion, with the majority manager or his designee being recognized to offer the first amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there is bipartisan objection to the request by the majority leader. It is worth our spending a minute or two hearing what Republicans Senators have had to say in the last few hours.

JOHN MCCAIN, the senior Senator from Arizona: Is that the definition of insanity, voting on the same bill over and over again?

JIM INHOFE: I think three is enough. There is a division within the conference on this.

JEFF FLAKE of Arizona: We can go through the motions, sure, but I don't think we are fooling anybody.

Another Republican Senator: I wish we could take no for an answer and figure out the next step.

Well, what has happened in the last 30 hours? We knew 30 hours ago about ISIS. We have watched their brutality, killing thousands and thousands of innocent people, going back, I guess, in memory to the days we thought would never exist again: Tamerlane killing thousands and thousands of people those many centuries ago, Genghis

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Khan killing thousands and thousands of innocent people. ISIS has been doing this, but they have also added some things that we have watched not because we wanted to but because they forced us to: beheadings. Somebody kneels down in front of them, and they cut off their head with a knife. They film that and send it around the world for us to watch.

But what happened 30 hours ago? The brutality we thought had reached its pinnacle got worse. What ISIS did approximately 30 hours ago is put a Jordanian pilot in a cage—a cage—dump flammable liquid over that cage, and then film that man being burned alive for 22 minutes. We have been forced to watch that. Yes, ISIS is awful. The worst. Uncivilized. But that is what we are dealing with. We are dealing with that. Now Republicans forced an entirely unnecessary debate.

All the papers—not only the Nevada papers, but pick up the New York Times, pick up the Washington Post, and you will see a picture of a young woman from Nevada. Her name is Blanca Gamez. A young woman now, she came to the United States as a baby—a baby. Because of the direction taken by the President of the United States, this young woman and hundreds of thousands of others who dreamed of being able to lead a different life are now leading a different life. Blanca has gotten two college degrees. She is going to law school next year. She works. She pays taxes. Why in the world are Republicans afraid of Blanca Gamez? Why?

It has been said by MARTIN HEINRICH and by CLAIRE MCCASKILL that it appears Republicans in the Senate are more afraid of the DREAMers than they are of ISIS. Well, I know the chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, as it relates to appropriations, came to the floor yesterday and talked about regular order. I say to my friend that regular order in the Senate has a number of different connotations. One of them is clear, so clear, and that is why JOHN MCCAIN spoke out, JEFF FLAKE, JIM INHOFE, and others spoke out, because in the Senate we need to fund our different subcommittees on appropriations. We have done that, except Homeland Security.

We have these terrorist acts all over the world taking place right now. We saw it in Canada. We saw it in Australia, all over the European Union, in Paris. All over. We have had so many frightening things happen. We in the United States of America are in a position where we are not going to fund Homeland Security because of Blanca Gamez.

We would love to debate immigration. We have done it here on the Senate floor before. It was a wonderful bipartisan debate. We are willing to do it again.

I am going to offer a consent request. I am going to object to my friend's consent request. That is on the record. I am going to make my own consent request. I am going to make a consent request that seems to me to be pretty good.

I ask unanimous consent that following the enactment of the text of S. 272, which is the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for this year, 2015, at a time to be determined by Senator MCCONNELL, after consultation with me, but no later than Monday, March 16, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, as passed by the Senate by a vote of 68 to 32 on June 27, 2013, the text of which is at the desk. That is my consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an objection to the request of the majority leader.

Is there an objection to the request of the Democratic leader?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, just a correction to my good friend the majority leader. There is no Republican opposition to the consent request that the Democratic leader objected to. It is clear on our side. It would allow us to have a fair amendment process. If there are differences with the House, regular order has a remedy. It is called going to conference. None of this is possible while the Democrats continue filibustering even getting on the bill. So therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me again state words I did not make up. JOHN MCCAIN—he is actually paraphrasing what Albert Einstein said: The definition of insanity is someone who keeps doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.

That is what JOHN MCCAIN said. Is that the definition of insanity—voting on the same bill over and over again and expecting a different result?

JIM INHOFE: I think three is enough.

JEFF FLAKE: We can go through the motions, sure, but I don't think we are fooling anybody.

Another Republican said: I wish we could take no for an answer.

There is bipartisan support to move forward on a freestanding bill that sends Homeland Security funding directly to the President. We want to do that. That is what should be done. That is regular order.

If the Presiding Officer and the rest of the Republicans want to come and debate immigration, we are willing to do that. That is what my consent request calls for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as my good friend the Democratic leader reminded me for 8 years, the majority leader always gets the last word. So let me say again that the consent request that I offered, to which the Democratic leader objected, was unanimously approved on our side. What it would do would be to set up an order for amendments, rotating from side to side, which is exactly the open amendment process the Democratic leader seems to feel somehow we are preventing. That is exactly what I offered. I am not going to propound it again, but I will just lay out what it said: to offer amendments in an alternating fashion, with the majority manager or his designee being recognized to offer the first amendment. We would go back and forth and back and forth. So that is about as open as I can imagine. And there were no objections to it on the Republican side. Regardless of how Members who are being quoted by the Democratic leader may have observed the overall process for going forward, there is no objection over here to having amendments on both sides, alternating from one side to another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. The American people are crying out that we defend our homeland. They are doing it around the rest of the world, why shouldn't we? That is what this is all about.

If they want to debate immigration, go ahead and debate immigration but not on the back of Homeland Security, leaving it totally naked and not giving us the ability to do what needs to be done to protect our homeland.

Mr. MCCONNELL. There is a bipartisan desire to fund the Department of Homeland Security, and I am sure we will resolve this sometime in the next few weeks.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Calendar of Business has been put on the desk of Senators. The Calendar of Business makes reference on page 12 to S. 272.

That is a bill that has been introduced by Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire, who is on the floor and is the ranking member of the Appropriations subcommittee responsible for the Department of Homeland Security, as well as Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland, who is the ranking Democrat on the Appropriations Committee.

On page 128 is the answer to our dilemma. This solves our problem.

S. 272 is a bill that is going to fund the Department of Homeland Security for the remainder of this year. This Department that we count on every minute of every day to protect America will receive all the funds they need and they will receive them almost immediately because there is no debate between the House and the Senate about how much to send the Department. The debate comes down to all the other extraneous matters which

the House Republicans added to this bill.

So if we are looking for a solution to the problem, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Maryland. We have page 12, S 272.

What the Senate heard just a few moments ago from our Democratic leader is something none of us will ever get out of our minds. Imagine—imagine—this Jordanian pilot captured by ISIS, put in a cage, covered with flammable fluids, liquids. They started a fire and burned him to death.

The King of Jordan was visiting the Capitol when that horrible news came out and rushed back to be with his countrymen. He has now vowed that Jordan, which has played a judicial role in trying to find peace in the Middle East, is now dedicated to stopping ISIS even more.

So if ISIS thought they were going to break the resolve of the King of Jordan and the Jordanian people, exactly the opposite occurred. If ISIS is resolute in their barbarity, we need to be resolute in protecting our country. To think that we are caught up in this political debate over immigration, the President's actions, and not funding the Department of Homeland Security is disgraceful.

The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security came to our lunch just 1 or 2 days ago and he said: Trying to operate this Department, the Department of Homeland Security, with this temporary funding is like trying to drive a car with a gas tank that only holds 5 gallons and you don't know where the next gas station is going to be.

That is what he is up against. So the Department of Homeland Security is unable to fund critical, necessary investments.

So what is the issue? What is the political issue that is so important to the Republicans that they would stop the funding for the Department of Homeland Security? Well, I will say what the lead issue is. The lead issue is DREAMers.

Fourteen years ago I introduced the DREAM Act that said if you were brought to America as a child—a toddler, an infant, a small child by your family—and they didn't file the papers so you could be legal in America, and you knew grew up in this country and had no serious problems in your background, graduated from high school and wanted to be part of America, we would give you a chance. You would get a chance at the dream. Oh, you have to go on to school beyond high school or enlist in our military, and we will put you on the path to legal status. We couldn't pass that despite 14 years of efforts. It would pass in the Senate, not in the House, and so forth.

Finally, President Obama stepped up 2½ years ago and said: OK. There are about 2 million young people in America—just like this—brought to the country when they were kids, and now they want a chance to work here, to live here, and to even go to school here without fear of deportation.

He created something called DACA. The DACA Program allowed them to register, pay their fees, and be protected from deportation—600,000 signed up, 35,000 in the State of Illinois.

They signed up so they could get protection from deportation. The House Republicans and the Republicans in the Senate have insisted we deport these young people. I wish to give the story of one of these young people very quickly because I know there are other Senators seeking recognition.

This is Everardo Arias. He was brought to the United States from Mexico in 1997 at the age of 7. He grew up in Costa Mesa, CA. He was an outstanding student in school. He dreamed of being a doctor. It was not until he applied to college that he realized his immigration status made that next to impossible. He was accepted at the University of California, Riverside, but because he was undocumented he didn't qualify for a penny of Federal assistance to get through school.

When he was a sophomore, he met with a counselor to ask him: How am I going to get to medical school? The counselor told him: You can't go to medical school. You are undocumented in the United States of America.

He didn't give up. He did not give up. In 2012 he graduated from the University of California, Riverside, with a chemistry major and research honors. Then a miracle occurred. President Obama issued an Executive order called DACA and Everardo Arias was given a chance to sign up for protection with this Presidential order and he did.

After he received this DACA protection, Everardo worked for 1 year as a mentor for at-risk kids in his own hometown of Costa Mesa. The following year, through AmeriCorps, Everardo worked as a health educator with seven local clinics, volunteering and working through AmeriCorps with some of the poorest people in his community.

During his year as a health educator, he decided now, with the protection of DACA, to apply to go to medical school. Everardo Arias is in his first year at Loyola University in Chicago, Stritch School of Medicine. He is one of seven protected by DACA who had a chance to go to school, but there is a catch. Loyola University said: You can go to medical school here, but for every year you are in medical school, you have to promise to give 1 year of your professional life working with the poorest people in my home State of Illinois, in small towns and rural areas as well as big cities, and he agreed to it.

He has a giving, caring heart. He agreed to it, to finish medical school, and to give the years of service necessary to the poorest people in my State.

Why do the Republicans want to deport Everardo Arias. Why do they want to take this outstanding individual who has struggled and succeeded in life, who knows no other country but America, and deport him to Mexico?

Will we be a better nation if this young man is not a doctor? Will we be a better country if he is not given a chance to give back?

This is what he wrote to me in a letter about this DACA Program which the Republicans want to abolish. Everardo wrote:

> DACA changed my life. It opened the door to the future ahead of me. If it weren't for DACA I would not be here and I probably would not have pursued medicine. I'm blessed to have the opportunity to do what I love to do and to give back to the country that has given me so much.

We are a nation of immigrants. Immigrants have come to this country and made it what it is. We should never forget that. This is the latest generation of immigrants who want to give back to America and make us a stronger nation. Why the Republicans are opposed to giving them that opportunity, I cannot understand. They clearly have not met these young men and women. If they did, their feelings would change.

So let's debate. Let's have the debate on DACA but not at the expense of the appropriations for this Department.

Page 12 of the Senate Calendar, S. 272, offered by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator MIKULSKI is our answer, a clean bill to fund America to protect against terrorism and, as the Democratic leader suggested, then start the debate on immigration. That is the right thing to do for our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in light of the eloquent remarks from the assistant Democratic leader who is my friend, I hope he will listen carefully to the proposal I am about to outline.

In just over 3 weeks the law that funds the Department of Homeland Security will expire, jeopardizing the Department's ability to carry out its critical mission. Legislation to provide funding to the Department throughout the remainder of this fiscal year has passed the House and is awaiting action in the Senate, but progress has stalled. The Democrats have blocked it from even being considered because it is not a clean bill.

On my side of the aisle House Republicans have insisted that provisions remain in the bill directing the administration to spend no funds implementing a series of Presidential orders issued over the past few years.

The Senate has held two votes this week to try to begin debate on this bill, both of which have failed on near-party lines. Thus, we have reached an impasse.

In an attempt to find a path forward, yesterday I filed an amendment in the nature of a substitute that would accomplish three goals. First, it would ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is fully funded to perform its vital mission to protect our

people. Second, it would allow the Senate to go on record in strong opposition to the President's extraordinarily broad immigration Executive order issued last November. Third, it would protect the DREAMers whom Senator DURBIN just talked about.

I wish to go back to the November Executive order. This particular Executive order represents a misuse of the President's authority that threatens to undermine the separation of powers doctrine in our Constitution. As the President himself has said more than 20 times, he does not have the authority to expand the law in this manner. He made the exact point in remarks of July 2011 when he said:

> I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books. . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. . . . But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.

The President was exactly right when he stated that reality. The substitute I proposed would block the sweeping 2014 Executive order, but it does not overturn the more limited Executive orders from past years.

Specifically, my amendment would not undo the 2012 deferred action program that allowed DREAMers, young people brought to the United States by their parents years ago, to receive legal status as long as they meet certain requirements.

The House bill includes a controversial amendment, which I do not support, that would invalidate this 2012 program retroactively.

My substitute accomplishes my third goal of protecting these children who have grown up here, who speak English, have clean criminal records, and often know no other country. They did not make the choice to come to America. That decision was made by their parent or parents.

My substitute amendment, therefore, is straightforward. First, the amendment mirrors the underlying bill with respect to the funding levels provided to the Department of Homeland Security so it can carry out its functions. Ironically, there is no dispute over those funding levels. Second, it strikes the House provision restricting the expenditure of funds to implement the DREAMers Program that I described and that Senator DURBIN just commented on.

And third, it retains the House prohibition on expenditures to fund the President's unauthorized action on immigration announced in November of last year.

Now, let me make clear that Congress should consider comprehensive immigration reform. The fact that there are now an estimated 11 million illegal immigrants in the United States is irrefutable evidence that our immigration and border security systems are badly broken. That is why I supported the bipartisan immigration reform bill that passed the Senate in 2013.

While I was disappointed that immigration reform legislation of some sort did not become law, I reject the notion that its failure can serve as the justification for the action taken by the President last November. He cannot do by Executive fiat what Congress refused to pass, regardless of the wisdom of Congress's decision. Such unilateral action is contrary to how our constitutional system is supposed to work, and it risks undermining the separation of powers doctrine, which is central to our constitutional framework.

Our Constitution vests the power to make law in the legislative branch—with Congress—not with the President. To the President it assigns the obligation to take care that the laws are faithfully executed. That was the rule used by the Supreme Court in 1952 in the famous Youngstown Sheet & Tubing case that overturned President Truman's Executive Order nationalizing the steel industry to prevent a strike during the Korean War.

As the Court explained, the President's power to faithfully execute the laws does not make him a lawmaker. The Court said:

> (T)he Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws that he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad.

In other words, the President is not free to pick and choose among laws, enforcing the ones that he likes and ignoring the ones that he doesn't.

The President is fully aware of this fact. He has often made the point that he could go no further than to protect the DREAMers. Here is what he said:

> Congress has said ''here is the law'' when it comes to those who are undocumented. . . . What we can do is to carve out the DREAM Act, saying young people who have basically grown up here are Americans that we should welcome. . . . But if we start broadening that, then essentially I would be ignoring the law in a way that I think would be very difficult to defend legally. So that's not an option.

Those are the President's own words. The action taken by the President in November is a direct contradiction to his own statements. By acting unilaterally, ironically, the President is making it less likely that Congress will act to pass comprehensive reforms. He is undermining the efforts of those of us who favor immigration reform by diverting energy and attention from that goal.

I urge my colleagues to give consideration to the proposed compromise that I filed as a substitute yesterday. It will ensure that the men and women on the front lines of the Department of Homeland Security can do their vitally important jobs, it will overturn the President's misuse of his Executive authority last November, and it will protect the legal status of children brought to this country by their parents years ago.

Mr. President, I believe I have put forth a reasonable, constructive compromise that could get us out of this impasse that is such a disservice to so many. I hope my colleagues will join together and support the substitute I have proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first I want to compliment once again my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine. She is always looking for a compromise. She is always looking to try to work in a constructive way. While I don't appreciate the results she has asked for—which I will talk about in a second—I always appreciate her efforts.

We have a very simple position here. It is a position that is logical. It is a position that even Republicans, as Leader REID has mentioned, have talked about: Pass a clean homeland security bill and then go to the floor and debate amendments. Debate the amendment of Senator COLLINS, debate the amendment of Senator CRUZ, and debate any immigration amendments you want.

To repeat, we will not be held hostage. The American people don't want a gun to their head, particularly when it involves security, to debate immigration. We know that. We know what the junior Senator from Texas is doing. Everyone on the other side knows it; and, of course, we are not going to go along.

So my dear friend from Maine comes up with a new solution. It is still hostage taking because it is attached to funding the Homeland Security bill. We are now only debating the size of the ransom. We will not do it. We are not going to be pressured, be bullied into doing this or that immigration reform as a price to funding Homeland Security.

Homeland Security is too vital to America. It is too vital to our country. It is not the way legislating should work. My dear colleagues on the other side should have learned this lesson a year and a half ago when they threatened to shut down the government unless they got their way. No matter how deeply they feel about the substance, they lose.

The junior Senator from Texas is leading his Republican colleagues at best into a cul-de-sac and at worst over a cliff, and I don't think they want to follow. But the House is in a box and says: Show us the Senate won't pass the bill. Well, we won't. We are not into hostage taking, we are not into being bullied, and we are not into legislating with a gun to our heads. And my guess is the White House would not support anything like this either.

So I say to my dear Republican friends, go back to the drawing board. You control the Senate. You are in charge. It is your responsibility to find a way out of this. Our way is simple, as Leader REID outlined. First, pass a clean Homeland Security bill to protect our security, and then place on the floor immigration. We welcome the debate. We welcome the debate on the

amendment of Senator CRUZ. We welcome debate on the amendment of Senator COLLINS—but not as a hostage taker. Again, all Senator COLLINS is doing is saying what the size of the ransom is, but we are still doing hostage taking.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to encourage the Senate to start debate on H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2015. I am puzzled by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who insist on blocking debate on this bill, particularly after many of those individuals criticized the majority for spending 3 weeks on the Keystone XL bill.

This body has a constitutional obligation to consider appropriations bills. As a member of the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, I understand the important role that the Department of Homeland Security plays in protecting our Nation at its borders and in our communities. As the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I also understand the substantial amount of resources it takes to fund Customs and Border Protection, FEMA, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Coast Guard, and TSA.

It was not all that long ago, President Obama criticized Congressional Republicans by saying it was time to, ''get out of the habit of governing by crisis.'' Well, here we are just shy of a month before funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires. This bill has already passed the House with substantial support and now the Senate has the time to debate it, amend it, and pass it. However, nobody will get a chance to offer amendments unless our colleagues join us in allowing debate to begin on this bill.

I also believe President Obama acted unconstitutionally with his Executive actions on immigration last year. A number of my colleagues feel the same way and this bill is an opportunity for the Senate to debate and fix this administration's failure to enforce the law.

I do not buy the arguments that the Senate should consider its own bill to fund the Department. I would like to take this time to remind my colleagues that the Constitution requires revenue and spending bills to originate in the House. Why not call up the House bill and then offer our own amendments?

It is important that the Senate continue the regular order that rejuvenated this body with the start of the 114th Congress. I have long spoken on the merits of considering bills, amending bills, and passing bills under regular order. It is a process that our constituents demand and it is one that makes the Senate a healthier institution.

I for one do not wish to play chicken with the Department that keeps our skies safe, protects our borders and enforces a substantial body of Federal law. This is why I encourage my colleagues to move forward with debate on this bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 10½ minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask to be notified after 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the key part of the President's unlawful executive amnesty, the overwhelming majority of it that actually is involved in the House bill, deals with adults and providing them work permits. It is not about the young people, as has been discussed. It involves 4 million-plus people.

We have talked at length about the President's executive action and how he is unlawfully, unconstitutionally making law—Senator COLLINS laid that out—when only Congress can make law. We have shown that the law he has created is law that he proposed and that Congress specifically rejected. We have shown that the President himself has at least 20 times said he does not have the power to take this action, rightly declaring he is not an emperor—those are his words—and that Congress makes laws.

So now Senator MCCONNELL has moved to bring up the House-passed legislation that fully funds all lawful aspects of the Department of Homeland Security and all its lawful actions to protect the homeland. But the legislation has a provision in it that simply bars the President from spending any money to execute his unlawful Executive directions. It stops the Department of Homeland Security from outlaw activities. This is a matter of great constitutional importance.

It is, in addition, a matter of great importance to working Americans. What the President is doing is giving lawful status to over 4 million adults—persons who entered our country against the law or came in and overstayed their time. These persons, under current law, cannot be hired by any business or employer, but the President wants them to work anyway.

Congress considered and rejected this plan. The result is that the President's plan will be a further kick in the teeth to down and struggling American workers. The facts are clear. I am not seeing them disputed.

Median family income since the recession of 2007 to 2009 has declined by almost $5,000. This is a catastrophic event. This is unbelievable damage to America's middle-class workers. Such a decline is unprecedented since the Great Depression 80 years ago. While some say jobs and wages are recovering and we can stop worrying about that, the facts show otherwise. In addition to depressed incomes, America has the lowest percentage of persons in their working years who are actually working in nearly 40 years.

So consider this. There were huge worker layoffs during the 2009 recession, and many more had their hours reduced as a result of ObamaCare and other events.

There are other factors that combine to reveal that job and wage conditions are much worse than the unemployment rates would indicate.

Despite these problems—a slow economy, job-killing automation, and low wages—the President is carrying out his unlawful plan rejected by Congress that we give 5 million persons unlawfully here legal status—a Social Security number, a photo ID, and the right to take any job that may be available in America. The President's policies are in perfect accord with those of his nominee for Attorney General, Loretta Lynch. When I asked her this simple question last week, I got a surprising answer.

Question:

> Who has more right to a job in this country? A lawful immigrant who's here, or citizen—or a person who entered the country unlawfully?

Answer:

> 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.

That is the testimony last week by the chief law enforcement officer in the land who is supposed to be enforcing the laws of the country. That is her view of who should be working: Regardless of how you came here, you are entitled to work and apparently take any job in America.

This was a moment of inadvertent candor. She tried to modify that later, I acknowledge, but essentially all she said was: Well, I don't think anybody should work except those the President says should work—and that would include the 5 million who are here unlawfully.

Let's be clear. These 5 million persons, with their new government-issued documents, will be able to apply for and take any of the few jobs now available in the economy. Sadly, the problem in America is not too few workers, but too few jobs. Last year, the administration celebrated the creation of over 2 million jobs. The President's actions would create from unlawful immigration over twice that many workers in one single amnesty act. Millions more Americans who lost jobs during the recession still haven't found work today.

Is this the right thing to do? I don't think so, and neither do the American people—by a wide margin. But, arrogantly, the President refuses to listen to the legitimate concerns of hurting Americans. He dismisses them, and supported by his palace guards in the Senate who blocked legislation——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has used 7 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair, and will wrap up and save some time for Senator HOEVEN.

He pushes on to advance the interests of immigration activists, political consultants lusting after votes for the next election, and big business interests lusting after low wage labor. Businesses, who have become so transnational that their interests and those of the American workers are often incompatible.

President Obama supports these business interests. But I ask: Who represents the interests of dutiful American citizens and the lawful immigrant who followed the rules? Who is speaking out for their interests? They are the ones who are forgotten.

I am going to make a prediction: Their voices are going to be heard. No longer, in secret, will the legitimate wishes of good and decent Americans be denied. The people's voice will be heard. The day of the special-interest operatives, tone-deaf politicians, and those who would allow this—their voices will end. This time, the American people will get what they rightly demand—the protection of the laws already on the books. They will force the political class to end the massive lawlessness, and to produce an immigration system that serves the national interests, not the special interests. They will force these self-interested forces out of the seats of power and demand policies that protect their wages, their jobs, their national security, and their government budgets.

I thank the Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this, and I hope, when we vote soon, our colleagues will recognize it is time to consider the opportunities Senator COLLINS has said will be provided here—to have amendments and to go forth and do the right thing for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, both from Alabama and from Maine, for coming down to the floor and saying: Let's do the work of the Senate. Let's advance to this Department of Homeland Security bill, let's offer amendments, let's have the debate. Let's fund the Department.

But let's make sure we do it in the right way, and where we protect the checks and balances built into this government by our forefathers.

For the last few days I have come to the floor to call attention to the importance of voting ''yes'' on the motion to proceed to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill for 2015—H.R. 240.

I wish that weren't the case. I had hoped that by now we would be much closer to passing a funding bill for the Department; that the Senate would have proceeded to the DHS appropriations bill, and that we could begin the process of debate, of considering amendments, and of developing consensus—of getting our work done.

Yet here we are on the third day, just trying to proceed to funding the Department of Homeland Security—a Department that everyone agrees is vital.

That is what this bill does: It funds the Department fully and completely, and it does it in the right way by enforcing the law.

I don't have to tell my colleagues that the defining attributes of the Senate come from the Senators' ability to debate and to amend legislation. Debate and amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for another 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I certainly want to give my colleague time to finish his remarks. I just want to make sure there would be an opportunity for me to also speak before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be advised there is 9 minutes 54 seconds remaining.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. That is fine. Thank you.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I would be willing to defer in the order too if my colleague from New Hampshire prefers to go, and I can follow; either way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. I wish to thank the Senator from the great State of New Hampshire.

Debate and amendment. Debate and amendment. That is what we are talking about.

We are talking about going to this bill that funds the Department of Homeland Security and having the debate and offering amendments. That is what I am asking for. That is what we need in order to address the issues such as the one that my good friend and colleague from New Hampshire raised on Tuesday. She is the ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Department of Homeland Security. She made a request in terms of a parliamentary point of order—budget point of order—and she made the inquiry. It is a valid point of order, one that can and should be debated, and we should have the opportunity to vote on it. But we can't vote on it unless we proceed to the bill. So let's proceed to the bill. Let's have that debate. Bring up the point of order, and let's have a vote. And let's have amendments. That is how we do our work in the Senate.

But despite the best efforts of Republicans to provide that opportunity for debate by proceeding to this bill to move forward, we are met with no's from the other side of the aisle. In essence, we are being filibustered—a tactic that was decried as obstructionist in the previous Congress.

In case my friends on the other side of the aisle think this is going unnoticed, they should check the headlines. Look no further than an article from CNN on Tuesday: ''Democrats block funding for DHS to protect Obama immigration orders.''

Or the Washington Times: ''Democrats filibuster DHS spending bill, block GOP on amnesty debate.''

These headlines speak to a central flaw in the arguments of those who say we need a DHS bill, but then vote against this Senate proceeding to that very bill.

On the one hand, they are saying we need a bill, but they won't go to the funding bill that is here before us. That is exactly what we are voting and trying to do, is to proceed to the DHS funding bill—with an amendment process, with open debate.

Yesterday, one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle stated that if the Senate takes up H.R. 240, the homeland security appropriations bill, it would simply be a delaying tactic.

Well, how can moving to the bill that directly addresses the DHS funding issue constitute delay? In order to pass the DHS funding bill, we have to be allowed to proceed to the bill. The truth, of course, is the delay is in fact coming from those who won't allow us to take up the bill, debate it, and consider amendments and pass it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, in a few minutes the Senate is going to have yet another procedural vote on the Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

The bill before us, the House-passed version of the funding bill, can't become law. We have already heard the President reaffirm yesterday that he is going to veto the House-passed bill before us. That means we could face a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security.

At this point, given the threats from terrorism, given the work that is done by the Department of Homeland Security, that is not a tenable position to begin.

Let me say, I very much appreciate the efforts of my colleague from my neighboring State of Maine, the senior Senator from Maine, Senator COLLINS. But the amendment she has put forward still raises some serious concerns about the impact on our security, because it includes language that would defund all of the Department of Homeland Security directives from November 20, 2014. So it would defund those provisions that direct law enforcement officers to place top priority on national security threats, convicted felons, gang members, illegal entrants apprehended at the border. It also defunds the southern border and approaches campaign which establishes three joint task forces to reduce the terrorism risk to the Nation. And, as she has indicated, it defunds the deferred action programs.

While she suggested that it would allow the 2012 Executive action that refers to the DREAMers to stay in place,

it raises serious questions about whether USCIS could effectively process renewables of those DREAMers—such as the young man whom Senator DURBIN spoke so eloquently about—so who knows what the court action could be on that.

While I appreciate the effort, I don't think it adequately addresses the concerns we have in the Democratic caucus, that we need to pass a clean bill. We need to have a separate debate about immigration.

The Presiding Officer worked very hard 2 years ago to help us get a comprehensive immigration reform bill that most of us didn't agree with everything in it, but most of us supported. We are happy to have that debate, but what we need now is a clean bill—one that allows the funding for the Department of Homeland Security to go forward.

I noticed on the news this morning, one of the issues that is at risk in this debate over whether we are going to support funding for the Department and the security of this Nation versus an ideological objection to the President—this morning one of the lead items on the news had to do with the cyber security breach at Anthem, the second largest health insurance company in the country. I happen to have my health insurance through Anthem, so I paid particular attention to this.

But one of the things that is in this clean bill that was agreed to last December by Senator MIKULSKI and Congressman ROGERS was funding for the cyber security center within the Department of Homeland Security to address the next-generation threat to our cyber networks.

That is critical funding we need if we are going to intercept the kinds of breaches we saw with Anthem and heard about this morning. Yet that funding is at risk because there is not agreement to get a clean bill done to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

What we have heard from almost everybody who has spoken is: We agree we should fund the Department of Homeland Security; we agree to the dollar levels that are in that bill; we agree to making sure the safety and security of this country should be paramount. We have heard a number of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle and from the House who have said ultimately this is about getting a clean bill. So we should do that now. We should provide certainty, we should get this done, and we should stop having an ideological debate about whether we are going to support immigration and the President, or whether we are going to support the safety and security of this Nation.

I think we should all be able to agree that the safety and security of America comes first. We should get this clean bill done, and then we can go on and debate immigration reform.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute 20 seconds.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I think it is worth noting some of the great work done by the Department of Homeland Security, which interfaces with the American people more than any other department.

Every day Customs and Border Protection processes nearly 1 million travelers entering the United States and seizes 19,000 pounds of illegal drugs between the ports of entry. The Transportation Security Administration—the people who work at our airports—screen 2 million passengers and their baggage. The Coast Guard patrols 3.4 million square miles of U.S. waterways and conducts 54 search and rescue missions that save lives annually.

Every day FEMA provides $3.7 million in Federal disaster grants to individuals and households and provides $22 million to States and local communities for disaster response and recovery. Every day the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center trains 8,000 officers from across the country. This work is just too important for our security to be delayed or disrupted because of ideological reasons concerning immigration reform.

We need to pass a clean, full-year Homeland Security funding bill. We need to pass it without controversial riders, and I hope we will do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

Mitch McConnell, Thad Cochran, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, David Vitter, Jerry Moran, Daniel Coats, Michael B. Enzi, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, John Boozman, John Thune, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, James Lankford, Jeff Sessions.

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 motion to proceed to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Ayotte	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Gardner	Roberts
Boozman	Graham	Rounds
Burr	Grassley	Rubio
Capito	Hatch	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	
Enzi	Paul	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Nelson
Bennet	Heller	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Reid
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Manchin	Shaheen
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McCaskill	Tester
Donnelly	McConnell	Udall
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Heinrich	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Boxer

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, Republicans in the Senate are ready to begin debating the bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. But in order to do that, we must first vote to proceed to the bill, and Democrats have blocked us from doing that. They have done that yet again today.

This is simply a procedural vote, but it is a very important procedural vote. It is a threshold vote, without which other votes cannot and will not occur.

Voting yes on a motion to proceed to this bill doesn't mean you support the bill. Regardless of which way you vote, it doesn't signal which way you lean on the underlying merits of this bill. It doesn't mean you support this or that amendment. It simply means you are willing to engage in an open, transparent, and public debate about the future of Homeland Security and about making sure the Department charged with this task is funded.

Why would our friends across the aisle be afraid of that? Some may argue that they voted against proceeding to this bill somehow because they support funding Homeland Security, but that is not true. This bill

funds Homeland Security. Why then are my friends on the other side of the aisle voting against proceeding to this bill?

Well, the difference that might be found is that many of them also support the President's incredibly unpopular and controversial action to grant amnesty to 5 million illegals who are here illegally inside the United States, individuals who will now be eligible for work permits and in some cases entitlement benefits. But the American people do not support that. They certainly do not support the action the President took and the way he did it. They oppose the way President Obama went around Congress. They oppose the fact that President Obama ignored the law. They oppose the damage this policy will do to American workers who are already struggling to find work and remain employed. They oppose the crisis this kind of action is creating and will continue to create at the border, as we saw last summer with so many children making that dangerous trip to get into the country and to do it the wrong way, to get here illegally.

Now that the American people have put Republicans in charge, in the majority, in the Senate, we are trying to keep our promise to them, to do what they sent us here to do, and to hold a vote on President Obama's action in this regard. But the Democrats seem to be reluctant to take that vote. They seem to not want to take it. Perhaps they are afraid of it; I do not know. Maybe that is why they refuse to even begin consideration of this bill, plain and simple. This effort to try to hide from the American people is embarrassing, and it is wrong.

My friends across the aisle may say that they have an alternative bill and that we should pass their alternative bill immediately. There are at least two problems with this approach.

First, that may have been the way the Senate functioned under the previous majority—writing bills in back rooms, waiting until the last minute to make bills public, then filling the tree, which means making it impossible for anyone to amend the bill once it gets to the floor, having virtually no debate, and then ramming the bill through without any input from the American people, without adequate debate here, without virtually any debate here. That is not the way the Senate is supposed to work. That is not the way the Senate does work and will continue to work under the Republican majority.

Second, traditionally appropriations bills do not start in the Senate. In fact, the House has not considered a Senate-originated appropriations bill for over 100 years—since at least 1901, the period for which these kinds of records are readily available. Unfortunately for them, the bill the Democrats want is not supported in the House. Why? Well, precisely because it is not supported by the American people.

It is time to stop delaying democracy. It is time to stop hiding from the American people. It is time to fund the Department of Homeland Security. It is time to have this debate and this discussion about the President's actions—actions that many people regard as unlawful, actions that people have different feelings about as far as the underlying policies but that the overwhelming majority of the American people look at and say: Look, even if I like the underlying policy here, I do not like the way the President did it.

If the President does not like the law, he needs to change the law. The way to change the law under our constitutional system is to go to Congress and to get something passed through Congress. Ours is not a government of one; ours is a government in which we have two entities within Congress that are charged with making the law. The President cannot act alone.

So my plea to my colleagues, particularly those across the aisle, is let's have a vote and then let's have a debate. When we have a vote and we have a debate, we will get to the point where we can fund the Department of Homeland Security and keep our Nation safe. We should not be keeping these important programs—we should not be holding them back simply out of a desire to protect the President and his actions that are outside the law.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEE. Madam 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.

The Senator from Hawaii.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise to urge my colleagues to pass a clean appropriations bill that funds the Department of Homeland Security, DHS. Listening to my friend the Senator from Utah, it is very clear that the Republicans' position on this bill that is before us today is totally dependent on their assertion that the President's recent actions on immigration are illegal. Democrats do not concur with that. In fact, I thought illegality of any actions should be determined by courts of law. What the President did recently is no different from like Presidential actions taken by Presidents Reagan and Bush, I might add. So we must fund DHS and resist the temptation to govern though manufactured crises and political games. Our national security is at stake.

Surely my colleagues remember when DHS was created in direct response to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Just 11 days after 9/11, DHS started to take shape. President George W. Bush named Gov. Tom Ridge to lead an office to oversee and coordinate a comprehensive and national strategy to safeguard our country against terrorism and respond to any future attacks.

DHS's mission is to protect our homeland, as its name makes perfectly clear. DHS is responsible for border security and immigration enforcement. It is tasked with keeping our airports safe through TSA, with emergency management response through FEMA, and protecting our coasts through the Coast Guard.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I know how important the work DHS does is in keeping our Nation safe. Let's take a step back and remember why DHS was created in the first place and what their mission is. Why should we play politics with the Department that exists to protect America?

DHS's funding runs out at the end of this month. The clock is ticking. The nearly 200,000 who work for DHS do not want us spending valuable time scoring political points; they want the certainty that their important work will be funded by Congress. If the Department is not funded by the end of the month, we probably will once again resort to passing a continuing resolution to keep the Department going. A continuing resolution is only a stopgap; it is a waste of time and money.

DHS Secretary Johnson said: Operating in a stop-and-go cycle of continuing resolutions is like trying to drive a car across the country on no more than 5 gallons of gas at a time and without knowing the distance to the next gas station.

Of the nearly 200,000 DHS employees across the country, 2,000 are based in Hawaii. Nobody will get paid if DHS gets shut down. Some will be furloughed, while many others will be forced, as essential employees, to continue showing up for work without pay. We count on the Coast Guard, the TSA, Customs, and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services—which are all part of the DHS—to be on the job every day.

Some of my Republican colleagues insist that before we fund the critical work of Homeland Security, we must first undo the President's commonsense immigration actions that helped millions of families across the country. The House bill before us holds DHS funding hostage to make political points against the President. This is a manufactured standoff.

The House bill attacks undocumented persons who have American-born children. Those are U.S. citizen children. The President's actions enabled these families to step out of the shadows, pass background checks, pay their taxes, and work in the open without the daily threat of deportation.

The House bill attacks DREAMers, the students who have been helped through the DACA problem for nearly 3 years. Just yesterday President Obama met with six DREAMers in the Oval Office who represent some of the very

best our country has to offer. The House bill says to these DREAMers: You, too, like the parents of U.S.-born children, should live under the daily threat of deportation. There are 600,000 DREAMers in the DACA Program throughout the country.

The House bill reverses longstanding enforcement priorities and directives that DHS has implemented. These directives tell immigration enforcement officers to focus on the bad guys rather than on the moms, the dads, and other contributing members of our communities. The House bill, in removing all administrative discretion on who should be deported, in effect says that all 12 million undocumented persons in our country can be deported. This is totally unrealistic and unnecessary.

I stand with my colleagues who are ready and willing to come together to pass bipartisan immigration reform. We did that last Congress with 68 bipartisan votes. As Republican Senator HELLER said recently, the House bill that is before us ''only includes language that complicates the process of finding a solution when it comes to immigration reform.''

This House bill emphasizes a policy of mass deportation that would harm our economy, costing trillions in economic loss, not to mention the devastating impact on the people. Economists have told us that comprehensive immigration reform will provide an enormous boost to our economy, helping all workers across the country.

The House bill does not reform our system. The House bill does not help millions of students and families come out of the shadows. It does not provide more resources to our hard-working Border Patrol agents. It does not help those who have been stuck in our visa backlog for decades.

Rather than debating comprehensive immigration reform, the House has once again ducked the issue, this time holding DHS hostage so that a small minority of their colleagues can have their way. This is like ''Groundhog Day''—a repeat scenario that brings us continuing resolutions to keep government going in a stop-and-go fashion and indeed a scenario that brought us the government shutdown in 2013. We do not have to keep repeating failed scenarios. Let's bring a clean DHS funding bill to the floor. Let's get that done and then move on to a debate on comprehensive immigration reform that is long overdue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

IMMIGRANT INVESTOR PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, 2 days ago ABC ran a story on its ''Nightline'' program that brought to light issues with the immigrant investor program. This program is also known as EB–5. This immigration program was created by Congress in 1990. It was created to stimulate the U.S. economy through job creation and capital investment by foreign investors. In 1992 Congress further added the regional center component that allows participants to pool dollars for foreign investors.

The story on ''Nightline'' detailed how visas and green cards are for sale for more than $500,000. It also highlighted how spies and terrorists can use the program to enter the country, risking our national security and undermining the real intent of the program.

For the past few years, whistleblowers have come to me about the fraud, abuse, and national security problems with that program.

A December 2013 audit of the EB–5 program conducted by the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General substantiated several of these concerns. The OIG report concluded that the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services is unable to demonstrate the benefits of foreign investment into the U.S. economy—in other words, questioning whether the original intent of the program was being accomplished.

Specifically, the Office of the Inspector General found that the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services could not validate whether the EB–5 program actually created 49,000 jobs.

In addition, a 2013 internal memorandum from the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Homeland Security Investigations noted that ''the nature of indirect job growth is problematic.''

Allow me, please, to discuss the fraud issues related to the program.

The EB–5 program requires a foreign national to invest $1 million in order to obtain a visa. However, there is a lower threshold for projects that are in high unemployment or rural areas.

Investors have exploited this loophole. As noted in press reports, some metropolitan areas are drawing their own maps or gerrymandering in order to meet this low threshold. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ignores the problem and doesn't question it.

Additionally, there are serious concerns that the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services does not adequately verify the documentation and the source of funds from investors.

Adjudicators do not thoroughly check how an investor has received $500,000 and whether the funds are even legitimate.

Finally, I wish to elaborate what is probably more important, the national security concerns. Remember, the Federal Government's No. 1 responsibility is the national security of this country.

In regard to those national security concerns, in 2012, several agencies came together to draft a forensic assessment of financial flows relating to the EB–5 Regional Center Program, and the Department of Homeland Security Office of Intelligence and Analysis produced an intelligence report of the program's vulnerabilities. The same ICE memorandum that highlighted its issues with regional centers also identified seven main areas of vulnerability within the EB–5 program. I won't go into all seven of them, but I wish to use four as an example.

No. 1, export-sensitive technology and economic espionage;

No. 2, use by foreign government agents and espionage;

No. 3, use by terrorists; and,

No. 4, illicit financing and money laundering.

Let me make it very clear that this ICE memorandum identified seven areas of vulnerability and I just gave us four dealing with sensitive technology and economic espionage, use by foreign government agents and espionage, use by terrorists, and illicit financing and money laundering.

I know I repeated that, but the EB–5 program is being undercut by people who don't mind hurting the national security of our country.

So to be repetitive on an important point, there are numerous national security concerns. That is why, in my September 2014 ''Dear Colleague'' letter, I invited my colleagues—all of them—to review classified information on this program.

Today I renew this invitation and urge Senators and those staff who have clearances to view these documents to do so in the Office of Senate Security.

I will be sending another copy of that ''Dear Colleague'' letter, which contains the document numbers to access the material at the Office of Senate Security.

Summing up, we have whistleblower allegations supported by documentation. We have findings by the Office of the Inspector General. We have classified information about attempts to exploit the vulnerabilities of the program and, finally, we have numerous press reports that highlight the fraud and the abuse.

So I think it is time Congress asks whether this program is worth the national security risks posed and whether this program can be fixed to accomplish the goals that were set out in 1990.

The EB–5 program will require reauthorization by the end of fiscal year 2015 and I want my colleagues to know that I will be demanding reform before this is done, or in conjunction with any renewal.

I do believe that if changes are made, the EB–5 program could benefit the U.S. economy as originally intended by Congress in 1990.

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.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I come today to support legislation to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, without any extraneous or politically controversial policy riders.

Let me be clear. The immigration provisions that are approved in the House are bill killers. We have now had three votes on cloture. The votes have held steady. It is clear the votes are not here to pass a bill out of the Senate with the riders attached to it.

I just want to speak of the importance of the Department of Homeland Security because I was in the Senate when the Department was developed. It is a combination of 22 agencies. It has over 200,000 employees. Over the years it has become more and more vital to efforts to prevent terrorist attacks on this country.

So how, you might ask? TSA, a member of that Department, funded by that Department, screens airline passengers within the United States, while Customs and Border Protection screens passenger data of travelers entering the country. So it is irresponsible to endanger these missions in the wake of terrorist attacks in Paris, Ottawa, Sydney, and elsewhere.

Secondly, DHS plays a critical role in responding to natural disasters. Resources and personnel from FEMA, which is funded through DHS, are vital in times of flooding, earthquakes, hurricanes, wildfires, and other disasters.

Third, DHS also guards against cyber warfare through network security, electronic crimes investigations, and State and local cybercrime training. So it is hard to fathom delaying $861 million for cyber security the same day we learn about the massive cyber attack against Anthem Blue Cross.

A number of key national security programs unrelated to immigration would also be in danger. These include the Federal Air Marshal Service, the Secret Service, the Transportation Security Administration, and DHS intelligence activities.

Ironically, blocking this bill over immigration riders would also delay increased funding for border patrols and more manpower to combat human smuggling and trafficking, which so many Members of this Congress want.

Holding up this bill will also delay and reduce more than $2.5 billion in grants for State and local law enforcement agencies and emergency responders. This puts our country in jeopardy. These grants help with transit and port security, firefighter assistance, and State homeland security.

Make no mistake, the Department of Homeland Security is very active in securing our borders and deporting dangerous individuals.

It has a wonderful Secretary. I think every Member of this body appreciates Jeh Johnson and knows the role he played with managing the sudden influx of children into our country on the southern border. We know of his effectiveness in bringing together what has been a very ungainly combination of 22 agencies into a smoothly run entity. This must be very disappointing to him.

In fiscal year 2014, Immigration and Customs Enforcement deported 315,943 people, focusing its efforts on removing criminals, and the agency was successful in that goal. Fifty-six percent of those removed last year had been convicted of crimes. That is 177,960 fewer criminals on our streets. I would say good job.

Rather than holding DHS and our national security hostage, I urge my colleagues to support the bill introduced by Senators MIKULSKI and SHAHEEN to provide full funding for DHS at levels necessary to do its job. We can't keep funding this agency with short-term continuing resolutions. It doesn't make sense. We certainly can't keep threatening to shut it down.

Yesterday in our joint meeting I had an opportunity to say what this body was like when I came to it. I think I can say with certainty this wouldn't have happened 20 years ago. We would have recognized the importance of the agency and told people to come back with another bill at another time.

The importance of getting some regular order in our appropriations bills is important because we are not getting regular appropriations bills passed. This is so important that I think everyone thought it wouldn't be disturbed. Instead, these policy riders are stuck on it, and the people who put them on know they are offensive to just about half of this body and it is going to present a major challenge to get a bill passed.

Let me talk a little bit about the issue; that is, the five riders that Republicans want to add to the bill. The goal of the riders, I think—and I think everyone would agree with this—is to unravel temporary actions President Obama has taken in an effort to make sense of what is, we all admit, a broken immigration system.

These actions, I would note, wouldn't have been necessary if the House had voted on the bipartisan Senate immigration reform bill that passed in 2013 by a vote of 68 to 32—68 to 32. It was the product of months of intense negotiations and hearings.

I remember it well. There were eight bipartisan Members who negotiated a bill to put before the Judiciary Committee. I am a member of the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee debated the bill for weeks. A total of some 300 amendments were filed, with 212 amendments in committee that were considered, half of which were Republican, and 136 amendments were adopted.

The House refused to even debate this bill, which in my view—and I have been here a long time—has been the result of one of the most profound bipartisan efforts on a big bill in the last 20 years. The House even refused to recognize it by a debate, let alone a vote, let alone passing something, some part of the bill, so there could be a conference and differences reconciled.

Now the House comes to us by putting what they know are going to be highly problematic riders on what is an absolutely crucial appropriations bill. This is the kind of thing I tried to say yesterday. It just doesn't make sense to me.

It would not have happened some time ago. People would not have tried to force their will through on an important bill when they knew they didn't have the votes. If three votes on cloture don't show that, I don't know what really will.

The Presiding Officer knows this as well as I do. But the root of the problem is that we have more than 11 million unauthorized immigrants in our country, and Congress only provides enough funding to deport around 400,000 people a year. Clearly we can't deport everybody. So choices have to be made.

So do we focus limited enforcement resources on real threats, such as criminals and terrorists? I say yes. Or, do we spread our resources thin, treating murderers the same way we treat school children who have been in the country for years? I say no. I stand firmly with the President in the belief that we must focus on actual threats and we must prioritize.

One of the temporary programs that the other side seeks to eliminate is known as the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. I hate acronyms, but the acronym is DACA.

This program allows law-abiding individuals brought to the United States as children to remain here without fear of being deported from the only home they have ever known. They can stay for 3-year increments as long as they don't break the law. Republicans want to scrap this program and place these individuals into the same category as dangerous criminals.

In California, my State, that would mean 450,000 young people who were brought to the United States as children, who have lived nowhere else, would immediately be eligible for deportation.

The House riders also seek to remove protections for parents of United States citizens and permanent residents, including 1.1 million parents in California. That would have the effect of breaking up many families that have lived here for years.

I personally know of it happening in San Diego, when, in the middle of the night, immigration officers came into a home, picked up the parents and deported them, leaving the three children in the home. The parents had been here, they were working, they had paid their taxes, and now the children were left. Fortunately, as I understand that incident, relatives were able to come because the children were born here, and they helped to take care of them. But we can imagine the cases where there was no one to help. So this clearly has an effect of breaking up many

families that may have lived here for years.

So let me be clear. The political—I really believe they are political—riders weighing down this appropriations bill are not designed to fix our immigration system but rather to weaken it—and with the goal of embarrassing the President. We should not do that on any bill—let alone a bill as important as this one.

It is not just Senate Democrats who think these riders are bad policy. Sixty-two percent of Americans in last month's January poll supported ''an Executive Order that would allow some illegal immigrants already in the United States to stay here temporarily and apply for a work permit if certain requirements are met.'' So 62 percent of the people said yes to that question. That is precisely what the President has done.

A combined 69 percent of Americans supported an immigration policy that lets unauthorized immigrants remain in the United States, 54 percent supported a path to citizenship, and another 15 percent supported legal status but no path to citizenship.

So to the extent we get our guidance from the American people rather than from this or that political party, we can see what the view of Americans are on this. I think it is because we have had this issue debated in this forum several times. This isn't the first big immigration bill. It is the second in about the last 6 or 8 years that has come out of committee, come to the floor with an agreement, and fallen apart. And it had been negotiated in a bipartisan manner.

So then to have this bill that we passed go to the House, and the House would have a legitimate chance to make any amendments they might want to make—rather than put this rider on this bill—and pass over to us a bill which could then go to conference and we could work on around a table—the way business should be done—to come together to present what we can agree upon in both Houses to pass into law.

That is the process here, and that is one of the really big changes in this body over recent history. We always tried to follow regular order. Appropriations bills in regular order now are really nonexistent. It is really too bad because it weakens the committee structure, it weakens the institution as a whole, it makes us beholden to a few, and it doesn't do the people's business. And, as I said yesterday, it is one of the reasons why our favorability rating as a Congress is something near 16 percent favorable.

So I say, please, let's take these policy riders off. Let's learn from the experience. Let's pass this bill. It is a new Congress. I recognize the bill has to be reintroduced, but the immigration bill certainly can be reintroduced. We have had a lot of experience in working it, and we can do it once again. Then perhaps the House would be willing to look at it, to debate it, and maybe even then to give us the respect of voting on it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. 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 remarks of Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. MANCHIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 405 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, this afternoon I would like to discuss an issue of very serious concern to tens of millions of Americans; that is, the Republican effort to cut Social Security disability insurance benefits and perhaps benefits for Social Security retirees. In my view and in the view of seniors throughout the State of Vermont, this is a very bad idea.

As you know, on the very first day of the new Congress, House Republicans passed a rule—later adopted by the full House—which would prevent the common practice of rebalancing funds from the Social Security retirement program to the Social Security disability program. This rule adopted by the Republicans in the House would lay the groundwork for a 19-percent cut in disability benefits next year.

President Obama, in his budget, did exactly what has been done on 11 separate occasions in the past, always—and here is the point I want to make time and time again and why this is a manufactured crisis—this has been done 11 times in the past, always in a noncontroversial way, and that is to rebalance the funds between the two programs. This is not a big deal. The Republicans are manufacturing a crisis where none exists. Time and time again, Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents, with absolutely no controversy, have done what President Obama has proposed. This was done in 1968 under President Johnson; in 1970 under President Nixon; in 1978, 1979, and 1980 under President Carter; in 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1987 under President Ronald Reagan; in 1994, 1996, 1997, 2000, and beyond under President Bill Clinton. In other words, this is a totally noncontroversial process that has been done time and time again under Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents.

What the President is suggesting today is that we reallocate funds from the senior retirement fund to the disability fund. But interestingly enough, of the 11 times the funds were reallocated, it turns out that on five occasions it was money going from the disability fund to temporarily help out the retirement fund.

There are some people who sadly are trying to divide the senior population from the disability population. What they are saying in a way that is untruthful and unfair is that by reallocating money into the disability fund, we are taking funding away from seniors and the retirement fund. This is absolutely untrue because, as I have indicated, on 11 occasions we have seen this reallocation, and sometimes, in fact, it comes from the disability fund to help the retirement fund.

I am very happy to tell you that virtually every senior organization in America—organizations representing tens of millions of senior citizens—has made it clear that we must reallocate funds, we must prevent a cut in disability benefits, and we must do what has been done time and time again.

Let me briefly read a letter from the AARP. The AARP is the largest senior organization in America. This letter was written on July 22, 2014. It went to chairman RON WYDEN and ranking member ORRIN HATCH of the Finance Committee. What the letter says:

> As the largest nonprofit, nonpartisan organization representing the interests of Americans age 50 and older and their families, we write in advance of the Committee's legislative hearing on the Social Security Disability Insurance program (SSDI) to express our support for Social Security, including its disability insurance functions, and our support of rebalancing payroll taxes to ensure the earned benefits of 11 million disabled Americans and their families are not reduced or put at risk.

Once again, AARP: We ''support the rebalancing of payroll taxes to ensure the earned benefits of 11 million disabled Americans and their families are not reduced or put at risk.''

I ask unanimous consent that letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AARP,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2014.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WYDEN AND SENATOR HATCH: As the largest nonprofit, nonpartisan organization representing the interests of Americans age 50 and older and their families, we write in advance of the Committee's legislative hearing on the Social Security Disability Insurance program (SSDI) to express our support for Social Security, including its disability insurance functions, and our support of rebalancing payroll taxes to ensure the earned benefits of 11 million disabled Americans and their families are not reduced or put at risk. AARP recognizes the need to address the overall funding shortfall

facing Social Security in the next 20 years, and we stand ready to engage with Congress, our members and other Americans on ways to strengthen Social Security, now and in the future. But, we also recognize that without rebalancing in the near-term, SSDI beneficiaries are at risk of significant benefit cuts. This is of particular concern to older workers who are most likely to rely heavily on SSDI in part because of higher rates of chronic illness and disability at older ages.

Income support in the event of a disability is a critical lifeline for millions of American families. Congress wisely added disability insurance protection to the Social Security system in 1956, under President Eisenhower, and has since then modified and improved the program many times. It should be noted that since the creation of the SSDI program in 1956, the United States workforce has more than doubled from 62 million to over 140 million workers, and women today represent half of the workforce and almost half of the SSDI beneficiaries.

By law, Social Security maintains two trust funds—the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) and the Disability Insurance (DI) trust funds—and they operate independently. Congress has faced shortfalls in both the OASI and DI trust funds many times in the past. Most recently, in 1994, Congress rebalanced the allocation of Social Security payroll taxes between the OASI trust and the DI trust, estimating the rebalancing would adequately fund SSDI benefits for approximately 20 years. Congress forecast accurately, as the Social Security Trustees estimate that the payroll taxes allocated to the Disability Insurance trust fund will cease being adequate to pay full benefits in late 2016. After that, according to the Social Security Actuaries as of 2013, ''[p]rojected revenue from non-interest income specified for the DI program is sufficient to support 80 percent of program cost after trust fund depletion in 2016, increasing slightly to 81% of program cost in 2087.'' CBO maintains similar projections.

Many experts, including the Congressional Budget Office, have estimated the shortfall is largely due to: 1) general population growth, 2) women's entrance into the labor force and consequent eligibility for SSDI benefits, 3) the increase in the Social Security normal retirement age from 65 to 67, and 4) the aging of the Baby Boom population leading to a higher percentage of older people vulnerable to illness and disability. All of these factors also contribute to other challenges in the SSDI program.

One of the most significant challenges facing the SSDI program is the unacceptably long delay in processing applications of disabled workers who have earned the right to their benefits. A large and growing backlog both at the initial claims and appeals level has caused lengthy delays and imposes severe hardships on disabled workers and their families. AARP has long urged an increase in funding to meet the increase in the administrative workload. We also recognize that the SSDI program needs greater program integrity efforts both over initial eligibility approvals and continuing disability reviews. AARP has been among the staunchest advocates requesting program integrity funding; we regret that in recent years this funding has been cut, reducing the Social Security Administration's ability to maximize integrity efforts.

The Committee's upcoming hearing is a welcome opportunity to examine the resources that will be needed to ensure the continuing success of the SSDI program. We believe SSDI program reforms and improvements can be identified that would both improve the fairness of the process for disabled claimants and encourage greater work participation for those who have limited ability to work. We support and will continue to urge that Congress provide adequate resources for the Social Security Administration to conduct timely initial and continuing disability reviews. But, the highest priority in the near term is to ensure that SSDI beneficiaries—most of whom are older Americans—are not at risk of a 20% benefit cut in the very near future. To prevent any imminent reductions in SSDI benefits, we urge you to rebalance the allocation of Social Security payroll taxes between the OASI trust and the DI trust, as Congress has done with success in the past.

Because of SSDI, millions of disabled Americans are able to live their lives with dignity and support their families. We look forward to continuing to work with you and the other members of the Committee to ensure that all aspects of the Social Security program remain strong for future generations of American workers and their families. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me, or have your staff contact Michele Varnhagen on our Government Affairs staff.

Sincerely,

JOYCE ROGERS,
Senior Vice President,
Government Affairs.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, it is not just the AARP that holds that view. It is dozens and dozens of senior organizations all across the country. Let me read very briefly from a letter written by the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, dated October 9, 2014. It is a letter that goes to the President—to President Obama. What it says is:

We urge you to include a non-controversial, commonsense legislative adjustment in your 2016 budget for Congress to temporarily reallocate the Social Security payroll contributions to address the anticipated shortfall in the Social Security Disability Insurance (DI) program. We also strongly urge you to reject proposals to cut Social Security benefits, coverage, or eligibility.

That is the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that letter also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL OF AGING ORGANIZATIONS, DEBRA B. WHITMAN, CHAIR,

Washington, DC, October 9, 2014.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: On behalf of the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations (LCAO), a coalition of national not-for-profit organizations representing over 60 million older Americans, we write to ask you to maintain a vital part of our Social Security system in your 2016 budget proposal. We urge you to include a non-controversial, commonsense legislative adjustment in your 2016 budget for Congress to temporarily reallocate the Social Security payroll contributions to address the anticipated shortfall in the Social Security Disability Insurance (DI) program. We also strongly urge you to reject proposals to cut Social Security benefits, coverage, or eligibility.

Social Security's Disability Insurance (DI) fund reserves are projected to be depleted in 2016, at which point revenue coming into the system would cover only 80% of benefits. This projected shortfall is not a surprise and Congress should rebalance income across the Social Security Trust Funds, as it has done 11 times before, to cover the anticipated shortfall. As Treasury Secretary Lew stated in July, ''it's going to be important for there to be legislation that does reallocate the payroll tax to support the disability fund.''

A modest, temporary reallocation of part of Social Security's 6.2% tax rate from the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) fund to the DI fund would put both funds on an equal footing. Congress has rebalanced tax rates between the two funds 11 times since the DI trust fund was established in 1956. About half the time Congress increased the share going to the OASI fund and about half the time it increased the share for DI. Congress has never failed to act when it was necessary to rebalance the two funds, and it has consistently done so in a bipartisan basis. It is time to do so again, and can be done today without compromising the ability of the overall Social Security program to pay full benefits from both trust funds for the next 20 years.

When Congress acted to rebalance the two funds in 1994, it was clear it would have to take action again in 2016. The 1995 Social Security Trustees Report showed that the DI reserves would be depleted in 2016, primarily due to a rapid, but temporary, increase in the number of DI beneficiaries as baby boomers passed through their 50s and early 60s when the risk of disability is greatest.

The typical DI beneficiary is in his or her late 50s. Seventy percent are over age 50, and 30 percent are 60 or older. These beneficiaries depend on Social Security for a significant portion of their income. Without benefits, fifty-five percent of families with a disabled worker would have incomes below the poverty line. And, since the benefits they receive continue as they grow older, the DI program helps to ensure that these disabled workers don't fall into poverty as they age.

Another factor that has led to an increase in the number of DI beneficiaries is a rise in the full retirement age. When DI beneficiaries reach Social Security's full retirement age, they begin receiving Social Security retirement benefits rather than DI. The increase in the full retirement age to 66 has delayed that conversion. In December 2013, more than 450,000 people between ages 65 and 66—over 5 percent of DI beneficiaries—collected DI benefits. Under the rules in place until 2003, they would have received retirement benefits instead. This is just one example of how closely the retirement and disability components of Social Security are interwoven.

The growth in DI is leveling off as boomers enter retirement and shift to OASI benefits. The need to rebalance by 2016 reflects a long-anticipated, but temporary, shift in the funding requirements of the two funds. Rebalancing would not affect the long-term financing of the combined Social Security system, which would remain solvent through 2033. Rebalancing can and should be done without cutting benefits or narrowing coverage or eligibility. This sensible action will give policymakers ample time to strengthen Social Security for the long-term.

For these reasons, the undersigned organizations urge you to include a legislative proposal to rebalance the Social Security funds in your 2016 budget, and to exclude proposals to cut Social Security benefits, coverage or eligibility.

Sincerely,

AFL-CIO, AFSCME Retirees, Alliance for Retired Americans, American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), American Foundation for the Blind (AFB), American Postal Workers Union Retirees (APWU) American Society on Aging (ASA), Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores (ANPPM)/ National Association for Hispanic

Elderly, Association For Gerontology and Human Development in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (AGHDHBCU), Association of Jewish Aging Services (AJAS), B'nai B'rith International, Caring Across Generations, Center for Elder Care and Advanced Illness—Altarum Institute.

Center for Medicare Advocacy, Inc., Easter Seals, Military Officers Association of America (MOAA), National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys (NAELA), National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association (NARFE), National Adult Day Services Association (NADSA), National Adult Protective Services Association (NAPSA), National Alliance for Caregiving, National Association for Home Care & Hospice, National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (n4a), National Association of Retired and Senior Volunteer Program Directors, INC. (NARSVPD), National Association of Social Workers (NASW), National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc. (NCBA), National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare (NCPSSM), National Senior Citizens Law Center (NSCLC), National Senior Corps Association (NSCA), OWL—The Voice for Women 40+, Pension Rights Center, Volunteers of America, Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me be very clear and say that this fight—what some of us see on our TV screens and what we hear from some politicians—the simple truth is that Social Security is not going broke. Social Security is not going broke. Today, Social Security has a $2.8 trillion surplus in its trust fund and can pay out all benefits to all beneficiaries, the elderly and the disabled, for the next 18 years.

This is not the opinion of Senator BERNIE SANDERS. This is the opinion of the Social Security Administration in their latest report. There is and can be no debate about these simple facts. If we rebalance funds, as President Obama and many others have proposed, all benefits—retiree benefits for our older Americans and disabled benefits for disabled Americans—would be paid out for the next 18 years—the next 18 years.

So people who come before you and say Social Security is going broke, they are simply not telling the truth. While this 18-year period makes it clear that we do not have an imminent crisis with regard to Social Security, I do agree with those who want to make sure Social Security is solvent for a lot longer than 18 years, for our kids and for our grandchildren.

Frankly, when we talk about the long-term solvency of Social Security, and that of course includes disability insurance as well, there are two basic approaches we can take for those who want to extend Social Security for many decades. One approach is what many of my Republican colleagues are talking about. What they are saying, in essence, is that in order to save Social Security we have to cut Social Security. Some are talking about a so-called chained CPI, which would mean a cut in cost-of-living adjustments, some are talking about raising the retirement age, at which point seniors will be able to get benefits, and some in fact are talking about privatizing Social Security and giving that program over to Wall Street. That is one approach. That is one way we could deal with Social Security and the future of the program. Needless to say that is an approach I very strongly disagree with.

The other approach, an approach which is widely supported in poll after poll by the American people, extends Social Security and protects Social Security in a very different way than many Republicans are proposing; that is, it addresses the issue that right now, as most Americans know, there is a cap on the income that is subject to the Social Security payroll tax.

That cap is now at $118,500; in other words, one individual makes $11.8 million a year but only pays 6.2 percent on the first $118,500 he earns. The second individual makes $118,500 and pays Social Security taxes on all of that income. That, I think most Americans believe, is patently unfair.

I have introduced legislation in the past, and I am now working with other Senators who have introduced similar types of legislation which eliminates the cap on income subject to the Social Security payroll tax. My own view is we should apply the Social Security payroll tax to income above $250,000.

If we do that, if we go down that very simple and fair route of asking very wealthy individuals—the top 1 percent, the top 1½ percent—to contribute more into the Social Security trust fund, the fact is we could extend Social Security for decades, disability benefits for decades, and in fact we would have enough money to expand benefits, not cut them.

On March 19, 2013, in response to a letter I wrote to the Social Security Chief Actuary, he wrote back and he told us that taking the approach my legislation lays out, raising the cap on taxable income starting at $250,000, would extend the life of Social Security past the year 2060.

So for anybody to come on this floor and say in order to save Social Security we have to cut benefits, at a time when millions of senior citizens in this country are struggling to pay for the medicine they need, to keep warm in the winter, to buy the food they need, people out there living on $13,000, $14,000 a year—and there are some who say we have to cut Social Security—let me go on record and say I strongly disagree.

The far better and far fairer approach is to lift the cap on taxable income and start at $250,000. So if we are serious about extending the life of Social Security, if we are serious about not cutting disability benefits, there is a path forward. Yes, it does ask the people on top to contribute a little bit more. I know that with all of the lobbyists and all the campaign contributions coming in here that sometimes becomes tough, but it is the right thing to do.

Let's stand with the millions of seniors who are struggling to stay alive economically in these tough times, rather than wealthy campaign contributors.

I ask unanimous consent that the March 19, 2013, letter from the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ACTUARY,
Baltimore, MD, March 19, 2013.

Hon. BERNIE SANDERS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SANDERS: I am writing in response to your request for estimates of the financial effects on Social Security of a proposal to apply the Social Security payroll tax to earned income over $250,000 beginning in 2014. The estimates and analysis provided in this letter reflect the intent, as discussed with Warren Gunnels of your staff, of S. 500, ''Keeping Our Social Security Promises Act,'' which you introduced on March 7, 2013.

We estimate that enactment of this Bill would extend full solvency of the OASDI program for an additional 28 years, with the projected depletion of combined OASI and DI Trust Fund reserves moving from 2033 under current law to 2061 under the proposal. All estimates are based on the intermediate assumptions of the 2012 Trustees Report. The estimates presented reflect the combined efforts of many in our office, but particularly Alice Wade, Christopher Chaplain, Dan Nickerson, Kyle Burkhalter, Katie Sutton, and William Piet. A detailed description of our understanding of the intent of the Bill is included immediately below.

The intent of this proposal is identical to the Bill you introduced in September 2011 and H.R. 797 introduced in the House of Representatives in February 2011 by Mr. DeFazio. Our earlier estimates for both of these Bills, reflecting baseline assumptions from the 2011 and 2010 Trustees Reports, respectively, are available at http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/solvency/index.html.

S. 500 would modify the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to subject a worker's OASDI covered earnings in excess of $250,000 in any calendar year after 2013 to the combined OASDI payroll tax rate of 12.4 percent. This is the same tax rate that is applied, under current law, to OASDI covered earnings up to the contribution and benefit base ($113,700 for 2013). Under present law, the contribution and benefit base is scheduled to increase in the future based on increases in the average wage in the U.S. economy. However, the threshold of $250,000 would be constant after 2014 until the contribution and benefit base exceeds this level (in the year 2033), at which point the threshold would be set equal to the contribution and benefit base for that and all subsequent years. Earnings subject to tax above the threshold would not be included in earnings credited for the purpose of OASDI benefit computation.

All wages and self-employment earnings in OASDI covered employment during a given year would be reflected in the determination of earnings above the threshold. For workers with more than one employer (including self employment) for a given year, total tax liability for the year would be computed as if all earnings had been received from a single employer for the year, but in no case would any employee or employer pay less tax than they would under current law. To the extent adjustments of payroll tax liability are needed for a given year, employees would make such adjustments on their income tax filing forms. SSA would contact employers regarding any additional tax liability due to multiple jobs for employees during the year.

The balance of this letter provides summary and detailed estimates of the effects of enactment of the proposal.

SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON ACTUARIAL STATUS

Figure 1 illustrates the expected change in the combined Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) and Disability Insurance (DI) Trust Fund reserves, expressed as a percent of annual program cost, assuming enactment of this Bill. Assuming enactment, the OASDI program would be expected to be fully solvent for an additional 28 years, under the intermediate assumptions of the 2012 Trustees Report.

The level of reserves for the theoretical combined OASI and DI Trust Funds would decline from 340 percent of annual program cost at the beginning of 2012 until these reserves would become depleted in 2061 (28 years later than projected depletion under current law). At the time of reserve depletion in 2061, the program would be able to pay about 91 percent of then scheduled benefits with continuing taxes (under current law, 75 percent of scheduled benefits are projected to be payable in 2033 after depletion). By 2086, 88 percent of benefits scheduled under the proposal would be payable compared to 73 percent of scheduled benefits payable under present law.

Enactment of this Bill would eliminate about 80 percent of the long-range OASDI actuarial deficit of 2.67 percent of taxable payroll under current law, lowering the OASDI actuarial deficit to 0.55 percent of payroll for the long-range period.

Figure 2 illustrates annual projected levels of cost, expenditures, and non-interest income as a percent of the current-law taxable payroll. The projected levels of cost reflect the full cost of scheduled benefits under both present law and the proposal. After trust fund reserve depletion, projected expenditures under current law and under the proposal include only amounts payable from projected tax revenues (non-interest income), which are less than projected cost.

Figure 2 shows that the estimated cost of the OASDI program would be very slightly reduced under this proposal. A slight decrease in benefits is projected to follow from a small decrease in the proportion of employee compensation that would be paid in the form of wages under the current-law contribution and benefit base. This small reduction in wages as a percentage of employee compensation reflects the assumed behavioral response of employees and employers to the additional payroll taxes under the proposal.

It is also useful to consider the projected cost and income for the OASDI program expressed as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The graph illustrates these levels under both present law and this proposal.

DETAILED FINANCIAL RESULTS

Benefit Illustrations

Benefit illustrations are not provided for the proposal because benefit levels would not be materially changed from the scheduled benefit levels under current law.

Trust Fund Operations

Table 1 shows the annual cost and income rates, annual balances, and trust fund ratios (reserves as percent of annual program cost) for OASDI assuming enactment of the proposal. This table also shows the change from present law in these cost rates, income rates, and balances. Included at the bottom of this table are summarized rates for the 75-year (long-range) period.

Table 1 indicates that the OASDI program is projected to be solvent for an additional 28 years assuming enactment of the proposal. The year in which the combined reserves of the OASI and DI Trust Funds are projected to deplete would change from 2033 under current law to 2061 under the proposal. Even after depletion of the trust fund reserves, however, the actuarial status of the program is improved as continuing income would be sufficient to pay a higher percentage of scheduled benefits than under current law. Under current law, 75 percent of benefits are projected to be payable at trust fund reserve depletion in 2033, declining to 73 percent payable by 2086. Under this proposal, 100 percent of the scheduled benefits would be fully payable through 2060, and 91 percent would be payable at trust fund reserve depletion in 2061, declining to 88 percent payable by 2086.

The actuarial deficit for the OASDI program over the 75-year projection period is reduced by 2.12 percent of taxable payroll, from an actuarial deficit of 2.67 percent of payroll under current law to an actuarial deficit estimated at 0.55 percent of taxable payroll under the proposal.

We project annual balances (annual income rate minus annual cost rate) to become positive for years 2014 through 2021 under the proposal and to be negative thereafter. Annual deficits (negative annual balances) after 2028 are projected to be smaller than the deficits projected under current law by more than 2 percentage points through 2086.

Program Transfers and Asset Reserves

Column 4 of Table 1a provides a projection of the level of reserves for the theoretical combined OASI and DI Trust Funds under the proposal, expressed in present value dollars discounted to January 1, 2012. The table indicates that the proposal includes no new specified transfers of general revenue to the trust funds. For purpose of comparison, the OASDI Trust Fund reserves, expressed in present value dollars, are also shown for the current-law Social Security program both without the added general fund transfers (if any) provided under the proposal (column 6) and with the proposal added transfers (column 7). Note that negative values in columns 4, 6, and 7 represent the ''unfunded obligation'' for the program through the year. The unfunded obligation is the present value of the shortfall of revenue needed to pay full scheduled benefits on a timely basis from the date of trust fund reserve depletion to the end of the indicated year. Gross Domestic Product (GDP), expressed in present value dollars, is shown in column 5 for comparison with other values in the table.

Effect on the Federal Budget

Table 1b shows the projected effect, in present value discounted dollars, on the Federal budget (unified-budget and on-budget) cash flows and balances, assuming enactment of proposal. Table 1b.n provides the estimated nominal dollar effect of enactment of the proposal on the annual budget balances for years 2012 through 2022. All values in these tables represent the amount of the change from the level projected under current law.

The effect of the proposal on unified budget cash flow (column 3) is expected to be positive starting for 2014, reflecting the application of the payroll tax to earnings above the current-law taxable maximum amount.

Column 4 of Table 1b indicates that the projected effect of implementing this Bill is a reduction, starting in 2014, of the Federal debt held by the public, reaching about $7.2 trillion in present value by 2086. Column 5 provides the projected effect of the proposal on the annual unified budget balances, including both the cash flow effect in column 3 and the additional interest on the accumulated debt indicated in column 4. Columns 6 and 7 indicate that the proposal would have no expected direct effects on the on-budget cash flow, or on the total Federal debt, in the future.

It is important to note that these estimates are based on the intermediate assumptions of the 2012 Trustees Report and thus are not consistent with estimates made by the Office of Budget and Management or the Congressional Budget Office based on their assumptions.

Annual Trust Fund Operations as a Percentage of GDP

Table 1c provides annual cost, annual expenditures (on a payable basis), and annual tax income for the OASDI program expressed as a percentage of GDP. These values are shown for both present law and assuming enactment of the Bill. Showing the annual trust fund flows as a percent of GDP provides an additional perspective on these trust fund operations in relation to the total value of goods and services produced in the United States. The relationship between income and cost is similar when expressed as a percent of GDP to that when expressed as a percent of taxable payroll (see Table 1).

Effects on Trust Fund Reserves and Unfunded Obligations

Table 1d provides estimates of the changes due to the proposal in the level of projected trust fund reserves under present law and, for years after trust fund exhaustion, the level of unfunded obligations under present law. All values in the table are expressed in present-value discounted dollars. For the 75-year long-range period as a whole, the present-law unfunded obligation of $8.6 trillion in present value is reduced to an unfunded obligation of $1.4 trillion in present value. This change is the combination of the following:

A $7.1 trillion increase in revenue from applying the payroll tax to covered earnings above the present-law contribution and benefit base (column 2), less

A $0.1 trillion reduction in cost from the behavioral response to additional payroll tax, causing a small decrease in the share of employee compensation that is received in wages, and thus a small decrease in total benefits (column 3).

We hope these estimates will be helpful. Please let me know if we may provide further assistance.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. GOSS,
Chief Actuary.

Mr. SANDERS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from North Carolina.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 338

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise to tell my colleagues that shortly I intend to ask unanimous consent to call up S. 338, but prior to that I would like to say a few things about it. S. 338 was introduced by myself, Senator BENNET, and Senator AYOTTE. What it would do is permanently authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It would also guarantee that a small portion of any appropriated money goes toward maintaining access for those who use our public lands, the American people.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is essential to making public lands public, by securing recreational areas, particularly where opportunities for sportsmen and others to access existing public lands are limited or precluded. As I am sure the Presiding Officer is aware, this program expires on September 30 and we can no longer

wait to reauthorize what I believe is dollar for dollar one of the most effective government programs we have.

This is an investment that rivals any Wall Street honey of a deal that I have ever heard of. Every $1 spent has roughly $4 rates of return in either matching funds or money contributed back into our economy. This is an economic driver. The bait and the tackle shop, the outdoor apparel equipment store, the guide service, the mom-and-pop lodge, these are all local jobs. They cannot be outsourced. I realize this town does not take care of—it does not care much about budgets or responsible spending, but the simple truth is this program is a trust fund codified by law—by law—every year. No less than $900 million in royalties are paid by energy companies drilling for oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf. They are put into this fund—royalties off of energy exploration, something Congress when they in their infinite wisdom set up this program said they were a good thing.

Every year no less than $900 million in royalties are paid and go into this fund. The money is intended to, one, protect areas around national parks, rivers, and lakes. I note to my colleagues not ''create'' national parks, to ''protect''; two, to provide buffers for national forests and national wildlife refuges from development; three, to provide matching grants for State and local parks and recreation projects. In fiscal year 2013, the Department of the Interior collected more than $29 billion from offshore production. How much of that went to LWCF—$306 million. That is barely one-third of the amount deposited at the Treasury Department for this purpose. Talk about highway robbery.

I can point to numerous years where this has been the case. Over the life of the program more than $18 billion of land and water conservation funding has been diverted into the general fund to pay for programs other than what they were intended to be there for. This is a covenant with the American people that we have broken time and time and time again. It needs to stop.

My colleagues, this is not a land grab. It is not a land grab program as some have suggested it is. I would suggest to everyone it is a land solution. It is a tool. The LWCF goes toward the purchase of inholdings, those pieces of property that are inside a protected piece that is valuable for the future. The only reason there are inholdings is that they were not available when that tract was put together. It is used to buy property adjacent to existing boundaries and can help solve management problems rather than add to them.

I wish to give my colleagues one example: Clarks River National Wildlife Refuge in the great State of Kentucky. Acquisition of the tract there completed a connection between the refuge lands and the Clarks River. Previously, access to the river required excessive hiking because there was no approved vehicle access.

These access issues also limited the refuge's ability to provide environmental education and interpretation programs. Now the site provides access to the river for school groups, their transportation, and allows refuge staff to provide hands-on environmental instruction to students.

We went from a situation where you can only walk to this land to an acquisition by a conservation component funded by royalties of oil and gas exploration, and now vehicles can actually ride on it. School children can go there and go through transitional education for the purposes of understanding why this is so valuable to protect.

Most lands acquired with LWCF funds are within the existing boundaries of a Federal park, refuge, forest or other recreational areas. Much of the rest is used for conservation easements and State grants, which do not add to Federal management costs.

Let me state that again. When we allow this process to take place, we actually reduced the burden on Federal agencies from a standpoint of their management responsibilities with Federal dollars.

These partnerships through LWCF easements are a win-win. They keep ranchers and farmers on their land while maintaining wildlife habitat and open spaces. Strategic LWCF purchases can defuse conflicts with private landowners by securing permanent access for sportsmen.

With changing land use and ownership patterns, areas that were once open and usable are now either blocked or cut off. Public lands are often sometimes inherently sequestered from roads and towns by narrow pieces of private-ownership land. LWCF funds bring together sportsmen and willing sellers with the intent of open access for everyone.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a down payment. It is a down payment on an investment that sustains the American way of life. The best part, I say to my colleagues, is that it is paid for.

I am not here to suggest that I want to tackle the pittance that the fund receives and how much it was promised. I am only here today, along with my colleague from Colorado, to call up the bill to permanently authorize this program so that we don't go through this exercise every time that reauthorization is needed.

In a country that continues to explore for energy—and I hope we continue and become self-sufficient—let's use the portion of the resources that we can to fuel the beach renourishment, to rebuild the dunes, to buy those inholdings to get buffer zones around those treasures we try to protect. As we do that, let's open it up to American sportsmen to hunt, to fish, to use. That is what LWCF is about.

Let's start acting as if the agreement we made with the American people 50 years ago actually means something. Let's authorize permanently the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 338; that there be up to 1 hour equally divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of that time, the bill be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is used for a number of purposes, although the primary purpose involves the acquisition of new Federal land. Funding the acquisition of new Federal land at a time when Federal agencies can barely take care of the land they already have does raise some rather significant questions that need to be addressed.

The Department of Interior faces a combined maintenance backlog of over $20 billion—$13 billion in our National Park Service alone. We struggle with ways to fund the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program, the intent of which was to mitigate the burden of Federal land to local communities where there is an abundance of Federal land that can't be taxed.

Coming from a State that is dominated by Federal land ownership—two-thirds of the land in Utah is controlled by Federal agencies. Any new Federal land ownership must be examined with a healthy degree of skepticism. There are many issues that need to be considered and debated before we reauthorize any program that would potentially expand the Federal Government's land holdings.

I certainly support opening our public lands for recreation, including for purposes related to hunting and fishing, and I believe that the Land and Water Conservation Fund could also be used to mitigate the negative impacts of Federal regulations on private property such as listings under the Endangered Species Act.

But reform isn't likely to happen. In fact, reform may well be impossible if we allow this bill to pass as is without going through the proper procedures. This bill should be subject to debate and amendment, first at the committee level and then on the floor of the Senate.

That is what needs to happen, and on that basis I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. I thank my friend from North Carolina for his efforts, and I wish to echo a lot of the points he already made so well, especially about how we stand here today having this fair, reasonable, unanimous consent request that the Senator from North

Carolina has asked for, as we stand here today when essentially what we are talking about is a promise that has been broken by this Congress to the American people for 50 years.

I thank, through the Chair, my colleague from North Carolina for trying to rectify that.

I am disappointed that our unanimous consent request was objected to, but I know this measure has plenty of support. As he mentioned, we led an amendment on the floor last week with the exact same text of the bill that we are discussing today. When the dust settled, that amendment received 59 votes, but I have a hunch that it would comfortably clear the 60-vote threshold were it to be considered again. And it should be considered again.

The measure is simple. As Senator BURR said, it simply reauthorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund and ensures that a dedicated portion of LWCF funds go to provide new access for our Nation's sports men and women.

As most in this body know, LWCF is one of the country's best conservation programs. It provides $900 million annually to preserve our public lands and increase access to them. Not only do we need to pass this bill to reauthorize the program, but we need to ensure that we dedicate full and mandatory funding to the initiative, as Congress intended when we created the program in 1964.

Historically, LWCF resources have been used for all types of projects, ranging from building city parks to purchasing small parcels of isolated land from willing sellers and all the way to preserving our Nation's historic battlefields.

In Colorado, we have used LWCF for a wide variety of projects beyond traditional conservation. For example, LWCF was of critical importance to our State following a major natural disaster in 1976. That year an intense rainstorm caused massive flooding around Colorado's Big Thompson River. The flood claimed the lives of 145 Coloradans and caused more than $35 million in damages.

Once the horrible tragedy passed, the community had to rebuild. Rather than constructing houses back in the flood plain, Larimer County turned to LWCF to acquire the affected land and compensated the families whose homes were destroyed.

Those flood plains are now home to four new county parks—popular destinations for birdwatchers, anglers, and family picnics—instead of vulnerable structures. When another huge flood hit in the fall of 2013, the rivers ran black and eventually surged over their banks, as we can see from this photo I have in the Chamber.

Luckily, the flood plains, protected by LWCF and the creativity of our local folks, saw much less damage this time. The floodwaters inundated the open, undeveloped spaces instead of destroying homes and businesses, and Larimer County avoided about $16 million in estimated property damages.

It is incredible to think that an LWCF investment of just over $1 million in 1976 saved us more than 15 times that amount in 2013.

Beyond the example from Larimer County, communities all across Colorado have used LWCF to preserve sensitive landscapes and to help their local economies. This past summer, we completed a huge LWCF project in the San Juan National Forest near the town of Ophir. I spoke briefly about this project last week, and I will mention it again today because the work of the town of Ophir and the people of Ophir, along with their partners, the Trust for Public Land, were truly remarkable.

If memory serves, it is a project that took 12 years from start to finish. It had to be done in phases. LWCF funds were used to acquire several old mining claims above town, preserving the scenic beauty and ensuring that the area will remain undeveloped forever.

In this picture, if you ignore the center with these people in front of me, we can see how beautiful it is. This is a picture of the newly preserved landscape in Ophir. A group of us gathered to celebrate the accomplishment this past summer.

Most of these mountain communities get huge portions of their revenue and business from recreation and tourism. It is for some of these reasons that the town felt the Land and Water Conservation Fund literally helped secure their economic future.

This is a small, rural community in my home State. It is far away from this floor. LWCF has made a huge difference for Ophir.

These are two stories from Colorado, but I know they have been replicated thousands of times across the country and in all 50 States. Those stories and accomplishments alone make this bill worth supporting.

As I mentioned earlier, Congress wrote and passed LWCF in 1964, and it is beyond time to reauthorize it. Senator BURR has shown great leadership in crafting a bill to do just that.

Conservation policies—from LWCF to farm bill easement programs, from wilderness to national parks—are important to the American people. The American people support this work. Protecting our land and water is part of our everyday lives in Colorado, and I know our State is not the only one.

Conserved lands and wide-open spaces are a huge economic driver across the country, a huge part of our culture. They are who we are in the West. We should do right by the American people and reauthorize this program as soon as possible. Then we ought to work together to ensure that LWCF gets the full and mandatory funding going forward that was promised 50 years ago by Congress.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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 AMBASSADOR ROBERT E. WHITE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on January 13 of this year, our country lost one of its most courageous diplomats—Ambassador Robert E. White. Ambassador White was 88 years old.

I knew Bob White, who graduated from my alma mater, Saint Michael's College in Vermont, in 1952, just 9 years before I did. But I would have admired him greatly no matter what college he went to because he had the qualities every American diplomat should possess—outstanding intellect, unimpeachable integrity, great courage, and a devotion to the ideals and values of this country.

In the 1980s, during the civil war in El Salvador, the United States—in what most historians now know was a tragic mistake—steadfastly supported the Salvadoran Army despite abundant evidence that some of its elite units were operating as death squads, arbitrarily arresting, torturing, and murdering civilians suspected of supporting the FMLN rebels.

Unlike some other U.S. officials who turned blind eyes to the heinous crimes that were being committed in the name of fighting communism, Ambassador White refused to remain silent. He publicly condemned the Salvadoran military and their rightwing backers who were implicated in atrocities such as the assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero, who just days ago was put on the path to sainthood by Pope Francis, and the massacre of four American churchwomen.

For speaking out on behalf of the victims of those crimes, Bob White paid dearly. He was ridiculed by some in Congress and he was summarily removed from his job by then-Secretary of State Alexander Haig.

A January 15 obituary in the Washington Post describes Bob's life and career. As I was reading it, I could not help but wonder how things might have turned out differently if the powers-that-be during the 1980s had listened to him. My wife Marcelle and I talked about that. We asked ourselves: How many lives might have been saved if the Reagan administration, instead of firing Bob in 1981, had recognized the truth of what he was saying and supported negotiations to end the war in El Salvador.

Instead, the war dragged on for another decade, costing the lives of tens of thousands of people, mostly civilians. The tide only started to turn in 1989 after the cold-blooded murder of the six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper and her daughter, at the University of Central America. It was a

horrific crime that top-ranking army officers tried to cover up.

It was thanks to the late Congressman Joe Moakley and his then-staff aide, now Congressman JIM MCGOVERN, Bob Woodward, and Salvadoran investigator Leonel Gomez, whom I also came to know and respect, that the plot was uncovered and the killers identified.

During this time I talked often with Bob and I learned even more about those who were involved. After talking with him I went to El Salvador. The Salvadoran officials wanted me to see how they were investigating what had happened. They knew I had prosecuted murder cases, and they arranged for me to meet with the country's chief investigator. As he described the so-called investigation it just confirmed Ambassador White's suspicions. I told the Salvadoran investigator, and I told the press who were there, that they were conducting an obvious cover-up. Anybody who saw what they were calling an investigation would realize what they were doing.

As I left El Salvador, it was so obvious that rather than shamelessly removing Ambassador White from his post how much better things might have been if the State Department had recognized him for the true patriot he was and treated him as an example of what other U.S. diplomats should emulate.

Bob didn't stop when he left the Foreign Service. He went on to head the Center for International Policy where he continued his advocacy for human rights, defending the ideals and championing the causes he believed in right up to his death.

I like to think that all of our Foreign Service Officers aspire to follow in the footsteps of Ambassador Robert White. I hope they will learn from his example. If they do, the United States will be better served and the world will be a better place.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post obituary, and an article about Ambassador White by Margaret O'Brien Steinfels in Commonweal magazine.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 2015]

ROBERT E. WHITE, WHO CRITICIZED POLICY ON EL SALVADOR AS U.S. AMBASSADOR, DIES AT 88

(By Pamela Constable)

In 1980, when El Salvador was erupting in guerrilla war and military violence, the Carter administration sent a little-known Foreign Service officer into the maelstrom as its new ambassador, hoping he could help the U.S.-backed government there find a reformist middle ground and prevent a full-scale revolution.

Instead, Robert E. White became a controversial and outspoken critic of assassinations and massacres being carried out by American-trained military units and private right-wing death squads. His views cost him his diplomatic career but earned him the respect of many Salvadorans and, ultimately, the vindication of history.

Mr. White, who had previously served as U.S. ambassador to Paraguay, died Jan. 14 at a hospice in Arlington, Va. He was 88. The cause was bladder and prostate cancer, said a daughter, Claire White.

His brief tenure in San Salvador was marked by atrocities that became synonymous with right-wing violence during an era of ideological conflicts in Central America: the assassination of Catholic Archbishop Óscar Romero in March 1980 while he was saying Mass in the national cathedral, and the abduction and killing that December of four American women church workers: Maryknoll sisters Ita Ford and Maura Clark, Ursuline Sister Dorothy Kazel and lay missioner Jean Donovan.

Mr. White, who once said he was inspired to join the Foreign Service by a ''quotient of idealism,'' worked to promote human rights, economic reforms and political negotiations between leftist rebels and El Salvador's civil-military junta. But he soon found himself at loggerheads with the rightist military and land-owning establishment, which had powerful allies in Washington and Miami.

Unable to keep silent as security abuses mounted, Mr. White began denouncing them in diplomatic cables, then in interviews and congressional testimony. He famously called rightist political leader Roberto D'Aubuisson a ''pathological killer'' and charged that he had orchestrated the execution of Romero.

Mr. White also accused the Salvadoran national guard of murdering the Maryknoll women—two of whom he had dined with the night before their disappearance. He was there when the women's bodies were dug up, and he was quoted as vowing angrily, ''This time the bastards won't get away with it.''

''Bob was transformed by those events, especially the killings of the Maryknolls, from a diplomatic functionary into a person whose ethical and moral convictions conflicted with his job,'' said Francisco Altschul, the current Salvadoran ambassador to the United States, who was a leftist political activist at the time. ''It took a lot of courage and integrity to say what he did and to face the consequences.''

Mr. White's outspoken posture drew praise from human rights groups but death threats in El Salvador. His wife once described being warned by her security guard in their affluent San Salvador enclave that ''your neighbors would like to kill you.''

The ambassador also faced strong opposition from powerful Washington hawks including Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), who had been annoyed with Mr. White's earlier human rights activism in Paraguay and compared his posting to El Salvador to ''a torch tossed in a pool of oil.''

By 1981, after the election of Ronald Reagan as president ushered in a new era of anticommunist fervor in Washington, Mr. White's days as ambassador were numbered. After coming into conflict with Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr., Mr. White was removed from his post less than two weeks after Reagan took office. He soon retired from the Foreign Service after a 25-year career, claiming that he had been forced out for political reasons.

''In El Salvador, Bob believed the authoritarian regime was morally repugnant and needed to change, but he worked very hard to avoid the escalation of war and negotiate a solution,'' said William M. LeoGrande, a professor at American University and author of ''Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977–1992.''

''The tragedy was that U.S. policy changed, El Salvador became a Cold War proxy, and another decade of conflict followed,'' LeoGrande said.

Once free of the constraints of diplomacy, Mr. White spent much of the next three decades speaking his mind on U.S. policy and official abuses in Latin America, while holding a series of jobs, including a professorship at Simmons College in Massachusetts and a senior associate position at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington.

He was a sarcastic critic of Washington's Cold War-era policies in Latin America, particularly what he called the ''primitive anticommunism'' that produced the U.S. embargo against Fidel Castro's Cuba and support for hemispheric dictators such as Gen. Augusto Pinochet in Chile and Gen. Alfredo Stroessner in Paraguay. He accused the Reagan administration in 1984 of covering up its knowledge of D'Aubuisson's role in the Romero assassination. Administration officials denied the allegations.

In 1989, Mr. White was named president of the Center for International Policy, a liberal think tank in Washington, and held that position at the time of his death. He also visited numerous countries, from Haiti to Afghanistan, with delegations to monitor elections and human rights.

Robert Edward White was born Sept. 21, 1926, in Melrose, Mass. He served in the Navy as a radio operator in the Pacific during World War II. He attended Saint Michael's College in Vermont on the G.I. Bill, graduating in 1952, and completed a master's degree in 1954 at Tufts University's Fletcher School in Medford, Mass.

He joined the Foreign Service in 1955 and served in a variety of positions related to Latin America. He was posted in Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras and Nicaragua, served as regional director of the Peace Corps and was a U.S. representative to the Organization of American States. He was ambassador to Paraguay from 1977 to 1980, when he was transferred to El Salvador.

Survivors include his wife of 59 years, Maryanne Cahill White of Alexandria, Va.; three children, Chris White of Manassas, Va., Claire White of Cambridge, Mass., and Mary Lou White of Evanston, Ill.; a brother, David White of Alexandria; and three grandchildren.

A son, Kevin White, died in 2009; a daughter, Laura White, died in 2014.

Mr. White always described himself as a diplomat and a democrat rather than a leftist or moral zealot.

''I don't go out looking for windmills to joust,'' he told an interviewer from Commonweal magazine in 2001. ''And the idea that I'm some sort of martyr? Well, I'm not.''

He argued that to avoid ending up on the wrong side of history or in Vietnam-style military quagmires, the United States needed to seek negotiated solutions to all conflicts, maintain a moral component in its dealings with all regimes and respect the will of local populations.

''The military dictators of the world fear democracy more than anything else,'' he told the Fletcher Forum, a publication of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, in 1981. ''U.S. policy toward Latin America can be summed up in three words: fear of revolution. Because we feared revolution, we consistently opposed the forces of change while uncritically supporting dictatorships and small economic elites. We blinked at repression and participated in the perversion of democracy throughout the hemisphere.''

[From Commonweal Magazine, Jan. 19, 2015]

ROBERT E. WHITE, 1926–2015

(By Margaret O'Brien Steinfels)

Robert White, who spent a quarter century in the U.S. Foreign Service and was ambassador to El Salvador at the beginning of its civil war, seems never to have forgotten anything. Among the things he never forgot

were the murders of Jean Donovan and Sisters Dorothy Kazel, Maura Clarke, and Ita Ford. White was present when their bodies were recovered from shallow graves on December 4, 1980. He returned to the embassy as angry as his wife, MaryAnne, had ever seen him. It changed him, she told me in 2001, when I interviewed her for a profile of Bob I wrote for Commonweal. Indeed, his refusal to cover up Salvadoran military involvement in their murders—and those of thousands of Salvadorans, including Archbishop Oscar Romero—led to his resignation from the Foreign Service in 1981. He continued his work for democratic reforms and human rights in the Caribbean and Latin America at the Carnegie Endowment for Peace and the Center for International Policy.

Bob, who died on January 13 at the age of eighty-eight, was a great interview; in 2001 I left his Washington office with tapes full of details. He could summon conversations from years past and recount policy details lost in the fog of diplomatic maneuvering. Not only did he remember names and details of long-past events, he was also forthcoming in his analysis of U.S. foreign policy. He had joined the Foreign Service in 1955; after President John Kennedy announced the ''Alliance for Progress,'' he requested assignment in Latin America. Designed to encourage democracy and human rights, the new policy was a turn away from, as White put it, doing the work of ''the colonial office.'' That derogatory title summed up the tangled political and economic relationship between the U.S. and its neighbors to the South. Even when support in Washington faltered after Kennedy's assassination, White tried to keep the policies of the Alliance in play. Full-blown Cold War policies had returned in 1968 with Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger, coloring White's years in Honduras, Nicaragua, Columbia, Paraguay, and El Salvador. While serving as U.S. representative to the Organization of American States, he faced down Kissinger, whose statements supporting Pinochet were contrary to U.S. policy. This brought White to the edge of dismissal; he won the battle and stayed on to serve in his final post, El Salvador.

A long history of interventions and exploitation of the continent's natural resources made the United States the imperial power that both democratic reformers and Marxists loved to hate. White saw in the reformers the path to more democratic governments and respect for human rights. Washington, focused on Soviet threats and Fidel Castro's support for guerrillas, increasingly favored the dictators and caudillos. Secret agreements were struck between U.S. military and intelligence agencies and their Latin counterparts. This often put the Department of State, though the official representative of the United States, on the margins of both policy and practices. Jimmy Carter's victory in 1976 pressed U.S. policy once again into a human rights agenda; that ended with Ronald Reagan's election in 1980.

White had long found himself the middleman in many of the struggles between Latin American governments and reformers as well as with his own government. His job was to work with each country's political leaders, notwithstanding their anti-democratic policies. While they might tolerate his cajoling and plain speaking about land reform, fair elections, and human rights, they usually had a U.S. military representative or CIA agent to turn to for direct contact with Washington (often someone on the ambassador's own embassy staff). At the same time, White made it his business to seek out and get to know sympathetic academics, journalists, labor leaders, clergy, and reformers in the Christian Democratic tradition. He understood the central role the Catholic Church, especially its cardinals and bishops, played among the social and political elites. His friendship with some and parrying with others gave him behind-the-scenes influence; his attendance at Mass could be the occasion for a pointed homily on topics a prelate might otherwise avoid. If White was regarded with suspicion and contempt, especially by Salvadoran politicians and military, his reputation among Americans (and American Catholics) opposed to their endemic violence and abuse was hardly better. The U.S. ambassador was seen to be compromised by his position and not to be trusted.

After his resignation, White more than any U.S. official exposed the hidden ties between U.S. military and intelligence and their Latin American counterparts. He testified against Salvadoran military for their complicity in torture and murder, especially of the American churchwomen. He never ceased pressing for better political and economic conditions in Latin America, termination of sanctions against Cuba, and an end to human rights abuses not only by dictatorships but also by democracies. Bob's work as an ambassador—from the United States at its best—never really ended.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, for the second time in 2 days our friends across the aisle have killed important funding for the Department of Homeland Security, a bill worth about $40 billion that was passed by the House of Representatives and sent over for the Senate to consider.

I continue to be amazed, watching Member after Member across the aisle come down here and vote to block this important piece of legislation, and then, in the same breath, accuse the majority of threatening to shut down the government. It strikes me as surreal. They are the ones filibustering the funding for the Department of Homeland Security, and they are claiming we are trying to shut down the government.

I know it is sometimes hard to explain what happens in the Halls of Congress and Washington, DC, but my folks back home can't understand how they can block something and then claim they are for it—and then the people who are actually advocating for the passage of this funding, claiming somehow we are going to shut down the government. It just doesn't make any sense, and it is the kind of double talk I think people have come to despise and associate with Washington, DC, and Congress.

That is one reason voters so overwhelmingly repudiated the status quo on November 4 and said: We want new management, and we don't want business as usual in Washington, DC.

Speaking of saying one thing and doing another, on this side of the aisle we pointed out some of the tough talk from some of our friends on the other side of the aisle, Senate Democrats, last fall when the President made clear he intended to follow through on a series of unilateral immigration actions that he, himself, on 22 different occasions had said he did not have the authority to take.

Indeed, it is my view this is unconstitutional. He can't pass or make a new law without following the constitutional pathway, which requires Congress to consider it, vote on it—both Houses—and then send it to the President for signature. For the President just simply to make it up out of whole cloth is dangerous, to say the least.

I guess if the President doesn't like any other aspect of our laws, this President—or any future President—might claim the sole authority to change it without following the procedures laid out in the U.S. Constitution.

I know what the President did last fall in this Executive action on immigration makes a number of our colleagues across the aisle uncomfortable because they are quoted in the newspaper as saying so. But now somehow in this mind meld going on, on the minority side, they now are walking in lockstep, voting against proceeding to consider this Homeland Security appropriations bill, even though, by my count, at least seven Democrats expressed deep concern with the President's unconstitutional action.

Here is what the Senator from West Virginia said, talking about the President:

> I wish he wouldn't do it.

The junior Senator from Minnesota said:

> I have concerns about executive action.

The same kind of concerns I have just expressed.

The senior Senator from Missouri felt the same way, saying about the President's unilateral action:

> How this is coming about makes me uncomfortable, [and] I think it probably makes most Missourians uncomfortable.

It made the President of the United States uncomfortable, so uncomfortable on 22 occasions he said he couldn't do it—and then he did it.

It makes me extremely uncomfortable, too, and it certainly makes the vast majority of the people I represent back in Texas uncomfortable as well.

We are a nation of laws. I know we say that all the time, but it is one of the things that distinguishes us from so much of the rest of the world where, no matter who you are—whether you are the President of the United States or the most humble person in the country—the rules apply to you equally. That is what it says over the top of the Supreme Court Building. Look at the front of the building. It says, ''Equal Justice Under Law.''

The idea that the President can—after 22 times saying he didn't have the authority—become a law unto himself and try to get away with it is just unprecedented and it is dangerous.

Despite the fact that many of our colleagues on the Democratic side have said what the President did made them feel uncomfortable, they apparently lost their sense of discomfort when they voted in lockstep to block this funding bill.

In order to justify their filibuster, a number of Senate Democrats have said: I don't like the bill the House sent over because it has some things in it that I don't like. I like the funding, but I don't like the spending restrictions.

I know the Presiding Officer understands as well that we can't change a piece of legislation in the Senate unless we vote to get on the bill. It is the same thing as saying you can't finish a journey until you start it, and our friends across the aisle are unwilling to even start that journey.

To state the obvious, if our friends in the minority would like to change the Department of Homeland Security funding bill, they ought to stop blocking it from being debated and amend it. If they have ideas, let's bring them to the floor.

One of the things that has distinguished this 114th Congress from the way things ran last year is we have actually had an open amendment process. Indeed, we found out in the first month of this year and this new Congress that we had more votes than all of last year combined.

So there is going to be an opportunity for anybody with a better idea to come down and get a vote. But this whole idea of saying, I am not even going to participate in the process and—worse than that—I am going to block a funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security because I don't like what is in it is just—well, it is just impossible to explain.

We know some of our colleagues on the other side are using this to play games because they basically have admitted it.

Just yesterday in the Huffington Post, the senior Senator from New York, a member of the leadership of his own party, said that ''it is really fun to be in the minority.'' That strikes me as extraordinarily cynical because we were not sent to play games, particularly with matters as important as homeland security. That is not what the American people sent us to do, and that is certainly not what they ratified or what they voted for on November 4.

They rejected business as usual in Washington, DC, and they said: Let's do something different, and we may not necessarily endorse everything that Republicans stand for, but, boy, we are sure going to give them a chance to show that they can do better than the management in the 113th Congress.

I think we began to make some positive steps in the right direction, particularly with passing important legislation.

We passed three important pieces of legislation in the 114th Congress: the veterans suicide bill that we voted on earlier this week, we have passed the terrorism risk insurance bill, and we passed, as the Presiding Officer knows, a very important piece of legislation to our economy and job creation and energy security known as the Keystone XL Pipeline. That is not bad. That is not bad.

We would like to do what I think falls in the category of governance 101, something that is pretty basic. We have to pay to keep the government functioning and particularly the Department of Homeland Security.

I know our friends on the other side of the aisle say: We don't like the bill the way it is, and we don't like the tools that are being used by the majority party to rein in the President's Executive action. Well, I am not going to make any apology for that because what the President did was unconstitutional. It was illegal. He has no authority to do that on his own. Again, it is not just me saying that. It is not just my opinion. It is his opinion. How cynical. How cynical.

I guess he figures he is going to get away with it, and our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to be the enablers, to enable the President to get away with something he said he didn't have the authority to do on 22 times.

I sure wouldn't want the folks back home to see me in that same light. I would have a hard time explaining to my constituents back home, saying, yes, I am helping the President do something that he said was illegal and he didn't have the authority to do, and we are going to play games by blocking important funding for the Department of Homeland Security in order to facilitate him getting away with it.

That is a cynical game and it is dangerous, particularly in the threat environment we are living in.

So I come to the floor for the third time this week to ask our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—especially those who have boldly stood up to their own President, a member of their own party, the leader of their own party, a few short months ago—to ask them to stand up again and to tell the President and to tell their own leadership that we want to have a Senate that actually works, where the minority and the majority get to participate through an open amendment process. But we are going to respect the Constitution, we are going to respect this institution and, yes, we are going to respect the role of the Presidency under our Constitution enough to rein in this President's overreach, and we are not going to jeopardize funding for the Department of Homeland Security and allow that to be held hostage to the President's unconstitutional act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, earlier this week we learned about the young Jordanian pilot who was horrifically burned alive in a cage at the hands of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, ISIL. This is the same group that haunts us with images of beheadings and mass murders week after week and enslaves women into servitude. It is the same group that recently declared it is determined to ''reach America.''

My friends, we live in a world that is scary. And it is not just ISIL. It is the lone wolves who gather ammunition and equipment and carefully draft plans to attack us where we work, such as the attack we saw last year in Ottawa and last month in Paris, as well as the individual from Ohio who was planning to attack the Capitol right here in Washington, DC.

It is pandemics such as Ebola. It is the criminals trying to traffic illegal drugs and human beings across our borders and through our ports of entry. It is those individuals trying to sabotage our airplanes and our trains. It is those people trying to attack our computer networks and critical infrastructure.

But thanks in large part to the work of the Department of Homeland Security and its employees, Americans are safe—at least a lot safer than we otherwise would be. Our airplanes and our airports are protected 24/7. Our borders and our ports throughout our country are secure. Trafficking of illegal drugs and human beings is better controlled, and our critical infrastructure networks are better protected.

For anybody who thinks it makes sense to put the Department of Homeland Security out of business, to put it on the sidelines at this point in time in this world in which we live, I ask: Have we lost our minds? I hope not. I hope not. Yet today, here in the Congress, we are locked in a political debate about whether we fund that very agency that is charged with keeping Americans safe—those who live here with us—from the Islamic State and any other number of additional threats. That is irresponsible and shameful behavior. In order for the Department of Homeland Security to officially and effectively carry out its critical role in combating the multiple and ever-changing threats our country faces, the Department needs fiscal certainty and the full support of this Congress.

Throughout this week I joined nearly half of my Senate colleagues to reject the House funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security, H.R. 240, which contains riders that block the President's recent immigration actions. Many of our colleagues on both

sides of the aisle have significant concerns with these amendments, and the President has promised he would veto this bill if these amendments were not stripped from it.

My colleagues' insistence that we accept these House amendments is jeopardizing timely enactment of a vital and bipartisan Homeland Security funding bill and threatens to prolong the crippling budget uncertainty the Department of Homeland Security has been operating under since last year.

On top of that, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, this House bill with the amendments would increase deficits over the next 10 years by a total of $7.5 billion. Instead of helping our Nation move forward with our economic recovery and our deficit reduction, this bill would move us backwards.

I understand why some of our colleagues are upset about the President's immigration policies. We can and we should have a debate about those concerns. We started the process just yesterday in the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, where I serve as ranking member.

Let me remind my colleagues that we wouldn't even be here having this conversation today or at that hearing yesterday if Congress had finished the job we began some 2 years ago in the Senate, right here on this floor. As most of my colleagues in this Chamber will recall, two-thirds of the Senate came together in 2013. We passed by a wide margin a comprehensive immigration reform bill. Was it perfect? No, but we took significant steps to fix our badly broken and outdated immigration system and to enhance the security of our borders.

At the same time, the bill would have reduced our budget deficit by nearly $1 trillion—$1 trillion—over the next 20 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Let me repeat that. Comprehensive immigration reform adopted here by a two-thirds vote would reduce our deficit by nearly $1 trillion over the next 20 years. We demonstrated almost 2 years ago that we can debate our Nation's immigration policies in a thoughtful way in the Senate, and, I think, over in the House. There is no reason why we can't do it again. We need to have this debate on the Senate floor as we did last Congress.

We need to have this debate in committees as we did in the last Congress. We need to have this debate in our towns and States across America as we did in the last Congress. But we should not have this debate while we are deciding the fate of the budget of the Nation's most critical national security agency, the Department of Homeland Security.

I am not the only one who thinks so. All three former Department of Homeland Security Secretaries—Republicans Tom Ridge and Michael Chertoff and Democrat Janet Napolitano—wrote to the Republican leadership last week and this is what they said:

> We do not question your desire to have a larger debate about the Nation's immigration laws. However, we cannot emphasize enough that the DHS's responsibilities are much broader than its responsibility to oversee the federal immigration agencies and to protect our borders. . . . And funding for the entire agency should not be put in jeopardy by the debate about immigration.

The Washington Post's editorial board has also weighed in. Last week, here is what they wrote:

> If congressional Republicans want to attack those—
>
> Talking about immigration—
>
> actions responsibly, with discrete legislation, they are free to try. . . . However, it is another thing to wield their frustration over immigration as a cudgel, holding hostage an entire department of government that is critical to the nation's security. That is as irresponsible as it is politically ill-advised.

I could not agree more. We need to focus now on doing the job we were sent here to do—to provide the funding necessary to keep America safe in an ever more dangerous world. Once we have done that, we should engage in an urgent debate on how to amend America's immigration policies for the 21st century.

If we choose instead to continue down this irresponsible path toward a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security, we will actually put America at greater risk. Why would we do that? Why would we do that?

If we allow the Department of Homeland Security to shut down, here is what is going to happen—a few things that will happen. First of all, over 50,000 TSA security screeners keeping terrorists off of airplanes are going to go without pay. We want them to do their jobs, but we are just not going to pay them for it. Over 40,000 Customs and Border Protection officers needed to keep our borders secure are going to go without pay, too. We want them to do their jobs. We are not going to pay them, either.

In addition, over 13,000 Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, enforcing our immigration laws and combatting human and drug trafficking, are going to go without pay too. We want them to do their jobs. We are not going to pay them, either. Essentially, a large part of our Federal homeland security personnel would be working on an IOU. Now you say: How is that fair? How is that fair? Well, it is not. Even if we avoid a shutdown but continue to keep the Department on a continuing resolution, we prevent the men and women who work there from doing their jobs as effectively and as efficiently as they can.

For example, we will not be able to replace obsolete surveillance technology along the high-risk areas of our border with Mexico. Our Nation will have significantly fewer resources to respond to any future surges of unaccompanied minors along the Southwest border. Morale will continue to degrade at the Department, which already ranks dead last for morale among other major Federal agencies. This is not how we want to be treated. It is no way for us to treat the men and women who are working around the clock to keep us safe.

It is also an egregious waste of money. As we have learned over the years, crisis budgeting costs taxpayers millions of dollars. This latest situation is no exception. Employee hiring and research efforts at the Department would come to a halt. The contracts for a variety of security projects would be stalled and would need to be renegotiated, in all likelihood at a higher cost to taxpayers.

For example, a continuing resolution would delay a $600 million contract to build a national security cutter that the Coast Guard urgently needs—keep it from being awarded. This cutter is critical to stopping the illegal trafficking off of our shores and ports of entry, including illegal immigration and drug and human trafficking. That is just one example.

As any business owner would tell us, this is not the way to run a business. It is certainly no way to run a vital national security agency of the United States.

So how are we going to remedy this situation? Fortunately, we have a solution sitting right in front of us, the bill that Senators MIKULSKI and SHAHEEN have introduced. It is S. 272. It is a clean fiscal year 2015 appropriations bill, which both Democrats and Republicans agreed to just this past December, 2 months ago. This measure provides the stable full-year funding that the Department of Homeland Security and our national security need without demanding a ransom.

In closing, I want to urge, as strongly as I can, my colleagues in this Chamber, in this body, to join me in doing the right thing. Support passage of this clean full-year appropriations legislation for the Department of Homeland Security. Reject the amendments approved by the House. Once we have done that, let's begin a fulsome and badly needed debate that will enable us to hammer out a thoughtful, 21st century immigration policy for America, a policy that is fair, a policy that will significantly reduce our Nation's budget deficit, and a policy that will strengthen the economic recovery in this country that is now underway.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the Affordable Care Act is working. It is working better, frankly, than many of us who were there at its inception believed it would at this early stage in its implementation. The numbers are pretty hard to argue with. You have got now upwards of 10 million people who are on either private insurance with tax credits to help them get that coverage, or are on Medicaid through different State plans.

That is a big deal, because in just about 1 year, we have reduced the number of people without insurance by 25 percent in this country. In my State of Connecticut, which probably has the best-run exchange in the country, we have actually reduced the number of people without insurance by 50 percent.

Better news is the quality is getting better. Some of the measurements we most closely watch to decide whether people are getting better care—things such as hospital-acquired infections and readmission rates after surgery—are going down. That is really good news. Of course, maybe the best news of all is the taxpayers are saving money, an extraordinary leveling off of health care inflation.

Health care spending never goes down from year to year. We used to have 7-percent to 8-percent increases in spending on an annual basis. We are now seeing 2-percent or 3-percent increases. In fact, the lowest rate of increase since we started tracking health care spending happened in this last year. Federal taxpayers are saving, on average, $1,000 per Medicare beneficiary compared to what the Congressional Budget Office thought we would be spending when we passed the Affordable Care Act.

That does not mean we do not have a lot of work to do. But it does mean the conversation we should be having today is about perfecting the Affordable Care Act, making it work even better, not repealing the Affordable Care Act.

It is not just me. I have been down to the floor over and over again to make this case, that the numbers simply do not lie. The press, universally, perhaps, reporting on this overwhelming avalanche of data, tells us that the Affordable Care Act is working. I literally in the 5 minutes before I came to the floor did a quick search to see what people were saying. New York magazine: ''Four new studies. ObamaCare is working incredibly well.''

Forbes: ''More solid proof that ObamaCare is working.''

Washington Post: ''Despite the critics, ObamaCare works.''

Business Insider: ''Major new study says ObamaCare is working.''

Rolling Stone: ''ObamaCare: It's working.''

I could do a full 10 minutes just on the headlines that tell you the Affordable Care Act is working. But instead of talking about making it work better, today we are talking again about repealing it. The House took, I think, their 56th vote to repeal all or part of the bill. This morning several of our colleagues unveiled a proposal to replace the Affordable Care Act.

Now I give my colleagues credit. It has been 5 years. This is the first time we have seen even a memo on what would be this replacement we have been hearing a lot about. But it is still a memo, as far as I can tell. We do not have any legislative text or any CBO score. But I wanted to come to the floor and talk for a minute about what this replacement would mean.

The replacement memo we looked at this morning, offered by two of our Senate colleagues and one of our House colleagues, all really thoughtful legislators on this issue—I want to give them credit for putting this on the table. It would really mean the retraction of health care coverage for millions of Americans. People who have finally been able to afford health care because of the Affordable Care Act now would go back onto the rolls of the uninsured.

Why? Well, for two major reasons. Their plan reduces the number of people who would be eligible for the subsidies by millions, and then greatly reduces the amount of the subsidy. They admit that is the best way to get coverage, so we are not arguing any longer, at least, over whether providing tax credits in order for people to buy private insurance is the right way to go about expanding coverage. They want to lessen the amount of money we are providing in tax credits, meaning a lot less people are going to get insured. So you would have millions and millions of people who would go back onto the rolls of the uninsured, people who would once again be at the mercy of insurance companies, would lose everything, their house, their savings, their car, just because their kid got sick.

But the second thing it does is really puts insurance companies back in charge of our health care. It gets rid of the prohibition on gender rating, which is a complicated way of saying that in the old system, insurance companies charged women more just because they were women. The Affordable Care Act does not allow that any longer. But that is what we would go back to under this alternative. It used to be that insurance companies would say: You are only going to get a certain amount of insurance per year and then we cut you off. Well, for a family I know in Simsbury, CT, whose son has a fairly rare blood disorder, that meant they had to pull out of their savings every year in order to afford his expensive drugs. That discriminatory treatment would come back.

While the bill tries to address the issue of preexisting conditions, it seems to say that you would have a one-time chance to get on an affordable care policy if you had a preexisting condition. But if you did not sign up in that opening moment, in that special offer, then you would not be able to sign up later on. So if you got sick later on, it would be too late for you, or if you lost your coverage at any point, like, on average, 89 million Americans have over the last 3 years, you would not get the chance to have insurance with a preexisting condition at the same rate as people without preexisting conditions.

What this bill is about is people paying more and getting less. It is about going back to the day when people could not afford health care and they lost everything simply because they or a loved one, a spouse or a child, got sick. Never mind the fact that some of the pieces I thought we all agreed on are repealed in this proposal. The doughnut hole is an outrage, the idea that seniors who are trying to buy prescription drugs on Medicare get a little bit of coverage, then no coverage, then a lot of coverage. Middle-income seniors cannot afford that gap in coverage.

Well, the Affordable Care Act effectively eliminates the doughnut hole. That has saved seniors $11 billion since 2010. This memo we have seen from the Republican side would apparently get rid of those savings, putting the doughnut hole back, putting millions of seniors back on the hook for all of these costs when they lose coverage. This effort to replace the Affordable Care Act is a giant step backwards for millions of American families.

Here is the conversation we should be having: We should be talking about how to make this law work even better. It is a major concession, frankly, from the Republicans that tax credits are the appropriate way to get people more insurance. It is a concession that we should be at least addressing the issue of discrimination against sick people. But the protection they are offering is minimal, and the expense that would be passed on to seniors, families, hard-working Americans is immense.

So I am looking forward to seeing this introduced as a piece of legislation. I am looking forward to seeing the CBO score on it. Clearly the American people do not want us to have this debate over repeal any longer. They are sick and tired of it. They want us to be talking about creating jobs, protecting this country, making college more affordable, and making small, meaningful changes to the Affordable Care Act to make it work even better.

The data does not lie. The numbers do not lie. The increasing stories of people all across this country who are benefitting from the Affordable Care Act do not lie. The Affordable Care Act is working. We should stop having this tired debate over repealing it and replacing it with something that is much lesser coverage for much more cost and invest in a conversation about how to make sure the good news continues about the Affordable Care Act working for millions of Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am disappointed that earlier today once

again our Democratic colleagues have—like the palace guard protecting the White House—blocked and filibustered moving to the Homeland Security bill—a bill that the House has passed and that would fully fund every lawful program of Homeland Security.

The House has passed a bill that funds Homeland Security, they have sent it to the Senate, and the Democrats are refusing to let it come to the floor to even be debated. They are filibustering a motion to proceed to the bill, where amendments can be offered.

Senator MCCONNELL has said we will have amendments. Senator COLLINS has already reached out with amendments she thinks have bipartisan support. That is the way the process in the Senate is supposed to work. That is what we should do.

Amazingly and incredibly, our Democratic colleagues say that the Republicans want to shut down Homeland Security and that the Democrats are trying to keep that from happening. They claim Republicans have put riders on the bill. But I would say that I think, if there is any logic left in this body, that the riders were put on Homeland Security unilaterally and unlawfully by the President of the United States. He put those riders on Homeland Security when—after Congress refused to pass his amnesty bill that had in it the right to work for people who are illegally in the country—he gave legal status to people illegally in the country; he gave them a Social Security card with a photo ID—he wants to provide all of them with that and let them participate in Social Security and Medicare. That is what the President wants to do. All of those things fall outside the law governing Homeland Security and all of the items and programs that are involved in that homeland security process. This amnesty is outside of it. In fact, amnesty is not pro-homeland security, it is anti-homeland security. It is anti-law. It rewards people who have violated the law. It is going to create a mechanism where these people who get these photo IDs will have the ability to take any job in America, and nobody is going to check them in any effective way. In fact, it is quite clear that the Administration doesn't even intend to have personal interviews with them because the Administration doesn't have the time or the people. But they are spending money out of the lawful part of Homeland Security to create an office across the river in Crystal City, and they are hiring 1,000 people to process these individuals.

So Congress simply said: Mr. President, we oppose that. We won't approve that process. You said 20 times it is not lawful for you to grant amnesty, but you have changed your mind and you are going to do it anyway. So we are going to fund all the programs of Homeland Security just like last year—with some increase, I suppose—but we are not going to fund this office across the river to make people lawful who, under the law, are unlawful. That is what the bill is.

So my Democratic colleagues say that somehow this doesn't fund Homeland Security and that Congress has no right to decide what it funds and doesn't fund. But it is a fundamental power of the people's elected representatives to control the purse strings, to decide what gets funded and what does not get funded. Congress can fund programs that it doesn't like as a matter of policy or it could defund those programs, and it could defund programs it believes are illegal.

As a matter of fact, I would say Congress has an absolute duty to refuse to fund programs set up by the President of the United States that he would like to carry out if Congress believes those programs are unlawful. So that is where we are.

It is beyond my comprehension that our friends on the other side—at least seven have said in clear statements that they oppose the President's Executive amnesty, and they are now voting unanimously to not go to the bill and even allow it to be considered.

Now, one thing is not being considered enough. This amnesty is more than prosecutorial discretion. The President of the United States is giving work authorizations to more than 4 million people, and for the most part they are adults. Almost all of them are adults. Even the so-called DACA proportion—many of them are in their thirties. So this is an adult job legalization program. And we talked about why Congress didn't approve and it didn't pass, and why the President shouldn't carry out on his own that which Congress has rejected and for which he has no lawful basis.

But let's go further. Let's ask on behalf of the American people, the American working people, is this a good idea? Is it a good idea at this time of low wages—a time when the percentage of Americans in the working population who are actually working and have jobs is at the lowest it has been since the 1970s? Is this the right time to advance another 5 million people into the job market—a time when we admit 1 million lawful immigrants to the United States a year? I believe we have 700,000 guest workers from abroad working in America on top of that, and we're adding another 5 million who can take any job in the economy?

Frankly, the problem, colleagues, is not that we have a shortage of workers in America; the problem is we have a shortage of jobs and we have the lowest workforce participation that we have had in a long time.

Gallup recently noted that if someone works just a few hours a week, they are counted as an employee. People used to work 40 hours—overtime maybe—now they work 10 hours a week, and they are counted as an employee. If you are an engineer working at a fast food restaurant, you are counted as employed. So there are a whole bunch of factors that they know are out there that are causing the American people to be very concerned about their futures, even though politicians in Washington are saying things are so great.

Wages fell in December—I think the last full month for which we have the data—5 cents an hour. So it is not getting much better. That is not disputable data. We want wages to go up, not down.

So I think this is all important, and it is time for Congress to understand whom we represent and whom our focus should be on. We want to treat people who come to America well. We want to give them every lawful benefit when they immigrate to America properly. And people who enter unlawfully need to be treated humanely and processed properly, and the laws need to be enforced. We don't want to mistreat those people.

But what is it that is critical? What is critical is that we know whom we represent. We represent lawful immigrants and citizens of the United States of America. Our duty is to them. We should establish an immigration policy that serves their interests.

Years ago a witness before the Judiciary Committee told that committee—and I was a member—that, 'well, if your policy is to do what is best for poor people around the world, it is almost always the right thing to let them come to America. If they get in trouble health-wise, the hospitals will take care of them. Their children get a free education. If they get in trouble otherwise, this country helps them.'

But what we have to decide is what is a good policy for the United States of America and how to execute the national interests, not special interests.

Let me point this out. The numbers are stunning, colleagues, and we are going to have to learn these numbers. I am going to insist that we know what we are doing as we go forward with the ever-expanding programs to bring in more workers from abroad.

One of the more remarkable but least-reported trends in our economy is the disproportionate share of jobs being filled by foreign workers. Most people do not understand this. The following is new data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics—not my opinion; these numbers come straight from BLS tables. I challenge my colleagues, if these numbers are wrong, tell us they are wrong. It comes right off the BLS table. I don't think they are disputable. I don't think anybody is disputing them.

The total number of persons employed in the United States has increased by 1 million since 2007. Frankly, that is not many jobs at all over that number of years. It sounds like a lot, but it is not many. So we have had a total increase of 1 million jobs since 2007, but during this same time the number of jobs for U.S.-born workers—citizens—declined by 1 million.

How is that possible? During this same time the number of foreign workers with jobs increased by 2 million. So

that is where the net gain occurred. This means that all net employment gains since the recession have gone to workers brought in from abroad.

How many workers should we be bringing into America? Shouldn't we ask how the economy is doing? We are having the slowest recovery since the Great Depression 80 years ago. Shouldn't we ask questions about that? How many people are on food stamps and welfare and all kinds of aid programs? How many people have claimed disability?

During this same time—get this, colleagues—the population of Americans 16 and older increased by 11 million, but one-fifth of a million fewer Americans are employed.

Here is a chart that will reflect some of this data. This reflects that natives—people born in the country—accounted for two-thirds of the increase in the working-age population. It is a myth we are having declining birth rates to the extent we have fewer people coming into the working ages. That is not so. Since 2000 we have added increases of 16.8 million working age people, but all the employment gains went to immigrants from 2000 to 2014.

I was surprised at this. I knew we were having issues with this, and people have shared that with me, but I did not realize the numbers were this stark.

Let's look at this. This is the change in the working age on these two parts of the chart. We have an increase in immigrants from 2000 to 2014 by 8.8 million people, while the native population in their working ages increased by 16.8 million people—twice the number of working age immigrants, basically. But where did the jobs go, the few jobs we have been creating as we are recovering from the recession? We created 5.7 million jobs since 2000 that went to the immigrant population—this 8.8 million—and the native population showed a decline of 100,000 jobs. So even though we had a 16.8 million increase in that working-age group, we had a decline in native-born workers actually working.

I would say those are stunning numbers, and it calls on us to reevaluate our policies. We are not against immigration. I am not saying we should end immigration, I am saying it is time for us to review our immigration policies, as any sensible, sane nation would do. It is time to do that.

The President's policy goes in exactly the opposite direction. By overwhelming polling data, Americans—including Hispanics—agree that amnesty has created more of an illegal immigration flow, and yet this amnesty rewards 5 million people for what they did illegally.

Let's look at a little more of the reality of how this plays out in the world. Here is a dramatic article in Computerworld about the big power company in California—Southern California Edison. What have they done recently? Information technology workers at Southern California Edison are being laid off and replaced by workers from India. Some employees are training their H–1B visa-holding replacements, and many have already lost their jobs. The employees are upset and they say they can't understand how H–1B guest workers can be used to replace them since they are already doing the job now.

Apparently, Southern California Edison—a power company rooted in the United States of America—is converting, laying off, and terminating the employment of people who have been with them for a number of years. Southern California Edison is transitioning those positions to foreign employees who have come in under the H–1B visa program for the sole purpose of taking a job. They are not coming under the immigration policy where they would move from green card into permanent residence and into citizenship. They come solely for a limited period of time to take a job, and they work for less pay too often.

This is what one person said:

> ''They are bringing in people with a couple of years' experience to replace us and then we have to train them,'' said one long-time IT worker. ''It's demoralizing and in a way I kind of felt betrayed by the company.''

I bet he did. Continuing to quote from the article:

> SCE, Southern California's largest utility—

Which is a quasi-almost-government entity under the regulatory powers of the State—

> has confirmed the layoffs and the hiring of Infosys, based in Bangalore, and Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) in Mumbai. They are two of the largest users of H–1B visas.

Apparently what happens is these companies sign up workers in—in this case—India, and they call up the big power company and say: Look, we have all these young people who have an education, and your salaries are real generous to them, they like your salaries, and we will just send them over on H–1B visas. They can stay 3 years and then return to their country and you can get rid of all those American workers. Maybe you will not have to pay such high retirement or health care benefits.

The article goes on to say:

> Computerworld interviewed, separately, four affected SCE IT employees. They agreed to talk on the condition that their names not be used. The IT employees at SCE are ''beyond furious,'' said a second IT worker. The H–1B program ''was supposed to be for projects and jobs that American workers could not fill,'' this worker said, ''But we're doing our job. It's not like they are bringing in these guys for new positions that nobody can fill.''

It goes on to say:

> ''Not one of these jobs being filled by India was a job that an Edison employee wasn't already performing,'' he said.

It goes on to talk about this. Professor Ron Hira, who studied this in great depth and has written about this problem for some time, made some comments on it too:

> The SCE outsourcing ''is one more case, in a long line of them, of injustice where American workers are being replaced by H–1B's,'' said Ron Hira, a public policy professor at Howard University, and a researcher on offshore outsourcing. Adding to the injustice, American workers are being forced to do 'knowledge transfer,' an ugly euphemism for being forced to train their foreign replacements.''

He goes on to say:

> ''Americans should be outraged that most of our politicians have sat idly by while outsourcing firms have hijacked the guest worker programs.''

So the guest worker program is supposed to help businesses. If they can't get people to work, then they can apply to this program, which has some limits. Yet the President proposes doubling the number of people who can come in with H–1B visas to work. He wants to double that number. He has been demanding that. But Mr. Hira said:

> The majority of the H–1B program is now being used to replace Americans and to facilitate offshoring of high wage jobs.

So this is a pretty thorough article in Computerworld, and it is a growing problem in the high-tech industry.

Professor Hal Salzman, who is a sociologist and public policy professor at the Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers University, wrote about this last September. This is not something new. This has been understood for some time. This is what he says in U.S. News and World Report:

> All credible research finds the same evidence about the STEM workforce: ample supply, stagnant wages and, by industry accounts, thousands of applicants for any advertised job. The real concern should be about the dim employment prospects for our best STEM graduates.

Who are STEM graduates? Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. We have been telling our children they can have good jobs. Parents have borrowed money, invested in the college savings plans; students have borrowed money themselves to get degrees in STEM fields, and now we find STEM salaries are flat since 2000—that only 40 percent of STEM graduates are actually working in STEM jobs.

This is what Professor Salzman and five others said in an op-ed in USA Today, condemning what we are doing in America today:

> Average wages in the IT industry are the same as those that prevailed when Bill Clinton was President, despite industry cries of a shortage. Overall, U.S. colleges produced twice the number of STEM graduates than annually find jobs in those fields.

We have to think about how to get our people, our children, our constituents into good-paying jobs. I wish there were more of them. I wish there weren't enough jobs and we had to import workers, but it is not so.

The Salzman article goes on:

> . . . the growth of STEM shortage claims is driven by heavy industry funding for lobbyists and think tanks. Their goal is government intervention in the market under the guise of solving national economic problems. The highly profitable IT industry, for example, is devoting millions to convince Congress and the White House to provide it with

more low-cost, foreign guest workers instead of trying to attract and retain employees from an ample domestic labor pool of native and immigrant citizens and permanent residents. Guest workers currently make up two-thirds of all new IT hires, but employers are demanding further increases. If such lobbying efforts succeed, firms will have enough guest workers to last for at least 100 percent of their new hiring and can continue to legally substitute these younger workers for current employees holding down wages for both them and new hires. . . . the Census Bureau reports that only about one in four STEM bachelor's degree holders has a STEM job, and Microsoft plans to downsize by 18,000 workers over the next year.

Microsoft signed a letter to the President and Congress just a few months ago demanding more foreign workers in the same week they announced laying off 18,000 workers, and this is a pattern throughout the industry. They are lobbying for more and more while they are laying off workers.

Here is a statement our office obtained from a union representative at IBM:

On January 28, 2015, IBM embarked on another of its regular ''resource actions'' or job cuts at sites and divisions around the US. Although IBM won't say how many employees were notified that their employment was being terminated, the Alliance@IBM estimates the number at around 5,000.

I continue to read from their statement:

This has been almost a quarterly experience for IBM employees. One of the biggest drivers of the job cuts is off shoring and bringing in guest workers from other countries.

So they are laying off Americans and bringing in people from abroad.

The statement goes on to say:

The terminating of regular IBM U.S. employees while keeping H–1b visa or L1 visa workers on the payroll has been ongoing at IBM for years.

As one worker stated in an email to the Alliance just this past week:

''Received 'RA' notice (termination notice) yesterday. . . . I was told last October that I was being replaced by an IBM India Landed Resource. . . . ''

That is a guest worker.

Another employee e-mailed:

''I would estimate that of the 20 people in my IBM department, at least 80% were immigrants on Visa's working on a so called government contract.''

They were working on a government contract. They were bringing foreign workers.

And it goes on.

Here is an article in the Engineering Journal about IBM: ''Massive Worldwide Layoff Underway At IBM.''

Look, I am not saying a company can't lay off and be more efficient. The business market changes, and they are just not able to stay in business if they are paying people to do work that doesn't exist. I understand that.

What I am saying is that at the same time they are laying off people, they are demanding the right to bring in more foreign workers, further driving down wages.

Here is what this article says:

Project Chrome, a massive layoff that IBM is pretending is not a massive layoff, is under way. First reported by Robert X. Cringely in Forbes, about 26 percent of the company's global workforce is being shown the door. At more than 100,000 people, that makes it the largest mass layoff at any U.S. corporation in at least 20 years.

So these groups have all come together in a lobbying group, Compete America, the Alliance for a Competitive Workforce. IBM is one of them. I think Hewlett-Packard laid off 12,000 not too long ago; they are part of it. Microsoft, laying off 18,000, is part of it—demanding more guest workers.

Cringely wrote that notices have started going out, and most of the hundred thousand-plus will likely be gone by the end of February.

How does it impact us? Does it impact Americans?

Alliance@IBM, the IBM employees' union, says it has so far collected reports of 5,000 jobs eliminated, including 250 in Boulder, Colo., 150 in Columbia, Missouri, and 202 in Dubuque, Iowa. Layoffs in Littleton, Mass., are reportedly ''massive,'' but no specific numbers have been published.

Here is a story in timesunion.com about Governor Cuomo in New York. His program of IT work in New York is being outsourced by IBM.

. . . IBM has brought hundreds of workers from India to fill jobs in Albany for which—in theory—plenty of Americans are qualified.

Walt Disney World's information technology department laid off 500 workers, while Disney's profit margin has gone up and the stock price is rising.

We are going to be talking about this for some time. We need to ask ourselves: What is in the interest of American workers at a time when we are laying off large numbers of workers—skilled and unskilled? I have been talking about skilled.

Do we really need massive increases in foreign workers? Do we need to pass legislation that would double the number of guest workers that come into the country at this time? I think not.

I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts. I see my colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with Senator COLLINS not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SMALL BREW ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am very pleased that Senator COLLINS and I have introduced legislation known as the Small Brewer Reinvestment and Expanding Workforce Act, S. 375. The two of us have led the effort to try to help the craft brewing industry. The craft beer industry is composed of small businesses that have used their ingenuity to create beers that are becoming very, very popular.

It is interesting that when we developed the excise tax on beer, I don't think we thought of the craft beer industry at the time. The craft beer industry, as I said, generally consists of small businesses who are struggling to find capital in order to expand. The current law imposes an excise tax on the first 60,000 barrels at $7 per barrel for breweries that produce 2 million or fewer barrels annually. The Small BREW Act would modify that, by increasing the threshold to 6 million barrels. Under the bill, brewers producing 6 million or few barrels each year would pay $3.50 per barrel on the first 60,000 barrels, and $16 per barrel on their annual production between 60,001 and 2 million barrels. So the Small BREW Act would reduce the amount they pay in federal excise taxes.

I wish to take a moment and then yield to my colleague to explain the rationale as to why we have introduced this legislation.

As I said a moment ago, when we imposed the excise tax on beer, I believe we thought about the big companies and that we wanted to have taxes on distilled spirits, wine, and beer as an excise tax.

When we take a look at the craft breweries, they are really burdened by this tax. They are creating jobs, they are creating a different product, and they are creating new markets for beer in this country. I wish to share some of these numbers because I think they are pretty impressive.

In 1989 there were 247 breweries in the entire United States. Today there are over 3,200 small and independent breweries and brew pubs in the United States that employ over 110,000 Americans. So this has been a real growth industry. Here are jobs that can't be outsourced, and they have created a better product, a better way of doing business. But the challenge is that they are really strapped for capital. It is not easy for them to invest in the type of equipment necessary to expand their capacity.

Brewers Association CEO Bob Pease said last month in testimony submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee:

America's small brewers are quintessentially small Main Street manufacturers. They typically employ 10 to 100 workers, and many began as home brewers before devoting themselves full time to the brewing industry.

I think that the No. 1 problem for craft brewers trying to expand their capacity is access to sufficient capital. An article in yesterday's New York Times entitled ''Betting on the Growth of Microbreweries'' quotes Brewers Association economist Dr. Bart Watson:

Brewery after brewery is looking for ways to grow because when you talk to these companies, the biggest constraint is capacity. They're selling beer as fast as they can make it.

I recently visited Heavy Seas Brewery in Baltimore. Now, I know this brewery quite well because I helped Hugh Sisson, the owner and CEO, tap the very first keg he produced in a micropub when he was doing this basically as a hobby. Well, he has expanded

his operations a couple of times now, and it wasn't easy to do this. He has invested a lot of money, and he has hired additional people, creating more jobs in Baltimore. Hugh hired 8 people in 2013, another 10 last year, and he expects to hire at least 6 more people this year. These are good jobs. But he needs the capital, and the relief provided by this act would allow him to be able to do this.

So Senator COLLINS and I wanted to bring attention to this legislation which provides some very modest relief from the excise taxes I mentioned earlier. It would reduce the $7 per barrel on the first 60,000 barrels to $3.50 and establish a new rate of $16 per barrel after that up to 2 million barrels for breweries producing up to 6 million barrels annually.

It doesn't seem like much, but that would be the difference in making the investment to expand the microbrewery and hire another 6, 8 or 10 people or to start another brewery, to create the excitement in a community that comes with these brew pubs, which I think all of us would agree should not be subject to a special tax which prevents them from expanding.

This is an important business in my community. It is a growing business in Baltimore. It is a growing business around the country. I hope we all would want to help these small businesses.

In this Congress I have assumed a new role as the ranking Democrat on the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee. We are going to be looking for ways in which we can help small businesses in our country because we know that small businesses are the growth engine for innovation and change and good jobs.

So if we can help the microbreweries, if we can pass this legislation, we will help small businesses, and we will help economic growth in our communities.

I am pleased that Senator COLLINS and I are joined by 23 of our colleagues. Between all of use, 25 percent of the Senate has already cosponsored S. 375. We hope we will be able to find a way to move this legislation early this year so we can help economic growth.

In Maryland we are currently home to 43 craft breweries—up from 34 in 2013—and 24 more are in the planning stages. I have been to many of these craft breweries. I enjoy their product, but, more importantly, I enjoy their entrepreneurial spirit, which they have been able to show in a growth industry in our country and of which we all can be proud.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to Senator COLLINS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Maine and Maryland have in common not only delicious seafood but also fine craft beers.

I am delighted to join my friend and colleague Senator CARDIN in support of the legislation that we have introduced, S. 375, the Small Brewer Reinvestment and Expanding Workforce Act, or Small BREW Act.

The title is more than just a clever acronym. It is a statement of what our bipartisan bill really is all about. This is a jobs bill, and those covered by the bill are small businesses, entrepreneurs who are taking risks and creating jobs in communities around the country.

We often talk in this Chamber about what we can do to help create the environment that encourages job creation. Our bill is one such practical means where we can spur the creation of new jobs as well as great products.

In Maine, we are proud to boast that our State is now home to more than 60 breweries that produce more than 200 different brands. Maine beer is shipped around the country and has developed a real following among connoisseurs who have come to appreciate its quality and craftsmanship. This, in turn, has led to new tourism opportunities as visitors are drawn to our State to sample our delicious Maine craft beers. As the craft beer industry grows, so too does demand for American-grown barley and hops and American-made brewing, bottling, canning, and other equipment. Beyond creating delicious beer, these breweries are creating jobs. That is the whole rationale behind the bill we have introduced.

In Maine alone, our craft breweries employ more than 1,400 people. That is an extraordinary number of jobs. As the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, these are jobs that are going to stay right here in America. They are not going to be outsourced. These are small businesses in our communities that are hiring people and making a difference.

Nationally small and independent brewers employ more than 110,000 full- and part-time employees, generating more than $3 billion in wages and benefits, and pay more than $2.3 billion in business, personal, and consumption taxes, according to the Brewers Association.

What could we do to encourage even more employment in this area? The answer is to reduce the Federal excise tax on small craft brewers, and that is exactly what our bill would do. It would free up capital so these small business owners can reinvest in their companies and create more jobs.

Under the current law, as Senator CARDIN has pointed out, these small businesses pay $7 per barrel in Federal excise tax on the first 60,000 barrels they brew and $18 per barrel on every barrel thereafter. The Small BREW Act would reduce these rates to $3.50 on the first 60,000 barrels and $16 for production between 60,000 and 2 million barrels. Thereafter, the rate would remain at $18 per barrel.

We know from the economic analysis that has been done that such a change would have a significant positive economic impact. A June 2013 study prepared by a professor, then at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, estimated that our bill would increase economic activity by $1 billion over 5 years, create more than 5,000 new jobs in the first year to 18 months after passage, and create approximately 400 new jobs annually thereafter.

Again, I want to repeat, this is a jobs bill, and I am proud to sponsor it with my friend Senator CARDIN. I am also delighted that we have the support of such a large number of colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including my colleague from Maine, Senator KING.

I urge all of our colleagues to take a look at this bill. If you want to do something that is concrete and we know will create more jobs for a growing industry that is carving out a niche in so many States across this Nation, then work with us to achieve passage of the Small BREW Act.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator COLLINS not only for her leadership but for also pointing out something very important here: This is a jobs bill. The passage of this bill will create more jobs. We know that because we know that craft breweries are strapped for capital. Every dollar they save here will be reinvested and create more jobs because they don't have the capacity to meet the current demand for their beers. If they could produce more beer today, they would sell more beer, but they don't have the capital to make the investments.

Senator COLLINS is absolutely right when she says this is a jobs bill that will create more jobs.

It also creates a lot of indirect jobs. I was pleased Senator COLLINS pointed out that many of the ingredients the craft breweries use come from the community. They are helping local farmers and local industries grow, which are also generally small businesses. So as they grow, they help other small businesses grow.

One interesting fact is we are now starting to see an increase in craft beer exports. There is a real desire for our craft brews outside of the United States. It is a relatively new phenomenon, but exports grew by 49 percent in 2013. We exported 283,000 barrels in 2013, and I expect we will see those numbers greatly increase.

This chart shows some of the Maryland craft breweries. They are becoming well known outside of my State of Maryland. I already mentioned Heavy Seas, and Flying Dog is another brewery I had a chance to visit. There are many other breweries, including some with names that are synonymous with my State, such as Raven Beer, Ellicott Mills Brewing Company, Eastern Shore, and Antietam. These are companies and brand names that are now becoming better known because they are producing a great product and people really do like to encourage this type of industry.

I thank Senator COLLINS and our 23 cosponsors. I see Senator KING is on

the floor, and I thank the Senator for his help on this bill. I hope we will have an opportunity to show, in a bipartisan fashion, that we can pass legislation to help job growth here in the United States.

With that, I yield the floor to my colleague from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, first I wish to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Maryland and my senior colleague from Maine. I know this industry is growing in Maine. It is entrepreneurial, exciting, energetic, and they are adding jobs and only want to continue to grow.

I think this bill makes total sense. It is a way we can express support for the entrepreneurial and innovative growth of businesses in all of our States. I am delighted to be able to join and essentially add my encouragement and support to your work on this bill. Since it is a bipartisan bill, I hope we can move it through this body in a reasonably short period of time.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there are two items I want to touch on today. One is bad news and the other is good news. This week we learned there was a data breach of 80 million people's records—300,000 in Maine—at Anthem. Fortunately the data breach did not include credit card numbers, but it did include Social Security numbers. This news comes about a month after Sony.

What is it going to take for this body, for this Congress, for this city, to act to protect us against these threats? We keep getting warning shots, and we keep ignoring them.

I am going to have to go home this weekend, and 300,000 people in Maine are going to say: What have you done to keep this from happening? Am I really going to be able to say: Well, it is complicated; we have four committees of jurisdiction and it is very difficult for us to make these decisions and it takes some time? That is not good enough.

The intelligence committee reported out a bill last July. We had a bill on the floor here in the fall. It is time for us to act. We keep getting warned, and we keep not doing anything.

I can't justify it. There is no excuse for us not taking steps—concrete steps—to protect this country against cyber attacks. They keep happening.

My regional representatives in Maine have surveyed both small businesses and health care facilities, and all of them either have been attacked or are concerned about attacks. Whether it is from a foreign country or whether it is from garden-variety criminals, the point is this is a major threat facing this country, and it is one we have within our power—we can't control it, but we can at least work together to try to prevent it and to minimize the damage. It is beyond time—way beyond time—for us to take action on this subject.

I hope my colleagues on all the relevant committees can come together in the next several months—before the summer—to take action to deal with this problem. There is no excuse, particularly given the continuous warnings we are having, for not dealing with the issue of the cyber threat to this country.

This week it is Anthem. A few weeks ago it was Sony. What is going to happen when it is the gas pipeline system, when it is the financial system, when it is the New York Stock Exchange, when people's bank accounts disappear overnight? It is time for us to act, and it is time for us to act promptly.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I also come to the floor today with some good news. It comes as no surprise that our debates here in the Senate focus generally on challenges, such as the one I just outlined, that face the United States. After all, that is our task and it is our fundamental responsibility to identify our Nation's problems and work together to find solutions.

But too often—and I am sure everyone in this body realizes—the bad news gets more attention than the good news. The old saying is, bad news gets halfway around the world before good news gets its shoes tied. The problems we face should not, I believe, drown out the accomplishments of our citizens as we go about our work every day here in the United States.

I think we should take a little time every now and then to reflect on the great things that are happening all over America, and in my case in Maine. There are stories of perseverance, innovation, individual accomplishments, and community effort. It is in that spirit that I rise today with good news from my home State of Maine.

I will spend a few minutes talking about Dr. Ed Bilsky and the impressive work he and a dedicated team of scientists, physicians, and students have been doing at one of my favorite schools, the University of New England in Biddeford, ME, to better understand and treat chronic pain.

Dr. Bilsky was recently named a member of the Dana Alliance for Brain Initiatives, a group of neuroscientists who work together to advance public education about the progress and benefits of brain research and to provide information on the brain in a way that is understandable and accessible for those of us who don't have a Ph.D. in neuroscience.

His inclusion in this group is recognition of his terrific work to advance our understanding of chronic pain. It is also a reflection of the prominent role he and his colleagues are playing in a critical national effort to address this problem. Chronic pain—and that means pain that persists for days, weeks, and months at a time—can be absolutely debilitating for people in Maine and around the country and is responsible for more than $500 billion a year—$½ trillion a year—in direct and indirect medical costs.

Periodically in my life I have experienced back pain, and when it persists for a period of time, it changes everything. It changes your mood, it changes your attitude, it changes your ability to get anything done, to focus on the work at hand. There are people in this country who are suffering—the estimate is 100 million people suffer chronic pain at some point in their lives. That is why the work done at the University of New England Center for the Study of Pain and Sensory Function, where Dr. Bilsky is one of the leaders, is so important.

This center is built around a core group of scientists, educators, health care professionals, whose research at the University of New England is focused on understanding the neurobiology of pain. How does it happen? How is it caused? What can we do about it?

Faculty and students work together to study the causes of chronic pain and apply this knowledge to preventing and better treating this very challenging and very prevalent condition. Projects include working to develop new kinds of nonopioid painkillers. That is a big deal because of all of the side effects and dangers of opioid painkillers which we are experiencing in our society. To develop nonopioid painkillers would be a tremendous boon to this country, those which don't have the side effects of opioids. They are also studying the genes and proteins that can turn acute pain into chronic pain and trying to find out the genetic and chromosomal basis of this terrible problem.

As with any success story, certain key events, people, and investments have made this research community what it is today. The recruitment of key faculty scientists, such as Dr. Bilsky and his codirector Dr. Ian Meng, in the early 2000s was pivotal to this effort. The addition of complementary research-driven faculty and administrators as well as the launch at the university of the Center for Excellence in the Neurosciences continue to move this project forward.

I should mention here the leadership of Daniel Ripich, the president of the University of New England, who is a true visionary and a great leader in the advancement of science and medicine as well as the mission of this great university.

The NIH took notice, awarding the university a 5-year, $10 million grant in 2012 to create the Center for the Study of Pain and Sensory Function, focusing on the neurobiology of pain. As is often the case, that Federal investment in research, which I believe is one of the most important and valuable investments the Federal Government can make, has been critical to the growth of these research opportunities and projects and has helped to attract further Federal and private investment.

The importance of cooperation and collaboration in a project such as this cannot be overstated. Dr. Bilsky and his colleagues have developed in-State and national networks for collaborative research, training, and public advocacy. They have partnered with clinicians, other researchers, the private sector, community leaders, and schools throughout Maine and the country to not only further their research and advance the bodies of knowledge relating to chronic pain, but also to maximize the positive impact of that research by applying it in their communities. This improves the lives of our citizens by helping them understand the causes and potential treatments for their pain.

Any university's primary mission is to educate, and Dr. Bilsky and his colleagues have taken their important work into the surrounding community. They have developed a vibrant and award-winning K–12 outreach program led by Dr. Mike Burman that focuses on brain safety and brain awareness. This innovative approach to STEM education has been recognized by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. This program engages more than 3,000 local kids each year and inspires kids to enter STEM-related careers, which is one of the most important objectives we can encourage in this country.

The research has also helped to spur economic development in Maine. Faculty members work in partnership with local biotech and pharmaceutical companies, helping the private sector with local research and development they may otherwise be unable to afford. This cooperation has helped Maine companies grow and create jobs. It is a win-win for everyone involved. It has built the reputation of the University of New England, and it draws positive attention to the State of Maine and, most importantly, it helps change lives.

If my colleagues can't tell, I am very proud of this work done in my State. As we go about our work here in this body, it is important, I believe, every now and then to recognize the success stories at home. We might even learn a thing or two from them.

With that positive thought, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill 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.

REMEMBERING RICHARD ''DICK'' RICHARDS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am grateful for this opportunity to pay tribute to a respected political leader, a cherished friend, and an exceptional human being—Richard ''Dick'' Richards. A native of Ogden, UT, Dick touched the lives of many and was deeply respected for his wisdom, his nononsense approach, and his remarkable integrity.

When I first considered running for the Senate in 1976, Dick was serving as the Utah Republican Party chairman. At the time, I was a political novice, but Dick's early encouragement and counsel were instrumental in my candidacy and subsequent victory. I will always be grateful for his invaluable support during my first term as a Senator.

Dick and I shared a great admiration and respect for President Ronald Reagan. We were both early supporters who campaigned tirelessly to help get President Reagan elected in 1980. In President Reagan, we saw a leader who shared our conservative values and our willingness to take a stand on hard issues. Impressed with Reagan's integrity, Dick and I put our whole heart and energy into campaigning for this great man.

For many years, Dick and President Reagan shared a close friendship based on mutual love and respect. During the campaign, President Reagan noted Dick's political savvy and leadership skills and later tapped him to head the National Republican Committee from 1981–82. As chairman, Dick raised the Republican Party's profile and fought passionately for conservative principles across all levels of government. His leadership on the national stage set a course for many more years of campaign activity and advisory roles in Utah and across the Nation.

Capping Dick's successful career in politics was his tireless help in establishing the Richard Richards Institute for Ethics at his alma mater, Weber State University. The institute is carrying on Dick's legacy to inspire future leaders to enter politics and government and lead with integrity and strength. In his book, ''Climbing the Political Ladder, One Rung at a Time,'' Dick discusses the virtues of civic engagement and encourages youth to become actively involved in the political process.

Dick's public accomplishments were numerous, but his most significant achievements were personal. His greatest source of pride was his loving partnership with his wife Annette, their 5 children, 11 grandchildren, and 15 great-grandchildren. He deeply cared for each of them and always made family his top priority.

Dick also donated countless hours of service to his community and his faith. He served in many important leadership positions in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and was always generous with his time.

Dick Richards was a truly remarkable man who led by example, hard work, and a desire to do what is right. His impact on Utah will be felt for generations to come. Elaine and I send our deepest condolences to his beautiful wife Annette, whose loyal companionship and counsel sustained Dick throughout his career. May God's love embrace Annette and her family with peace and comfort during this difficult time.

RECOGNIZING THE BOYD GAMING CORPORATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the 40th anniversary of the Boyd Gaming Corporation, a leader in today's gaming industry that is respected in Nevada and across the Nation.

Boyd Gaming Corporation was founded in 1975, but the legacy of the company began in 1941, when Sam Boyd moved his family to Las Vegas, NV. Sam started his career as a table dealer and quickly gained experience by working his way across the Silver State through an array of jobs in the gaming industry. By 1952, he had saved enough money to purchase a small stake in the legendary Sahara Hotel and Casino. Sam's small stake in the Sahara eventually led to him becoming the general manager of the Mint, which was a hotel and casino in downtown Las Vegas.

Sam's son, Bill, has been a force in gaming in Nevada and throughout the United States. Bill is an accomplished lawyer, and now, an accomplished businessman. I am happy to call him a friend. Bill first partnered with Sam and others in acquiring a stake in the Eldorado Casino, but it was not until New Year's Day 1975 that the father and son partnership became the Boyd Gaming Corporation. The corporation's first major project was the California Hotel and Casino in downtown Las Vegas, which quickly became a success.

In 1979, Boyd Gaming opened ''Sam's Town'' on a 13 acre lot off Boulder Highway. The project carried the name of one of its founders, Sam Boyd, and for the first time, provided Las Vegas locals with a full-scale resort. While their California Hotel and Casino property was inspiring innovative marketing strategies, across town at the Sam's Town property, the corporation was providing an entirely new experience to local Nevadans.

Since then, Boyd Gaming has grown into a large corporation with 22 properties across the country, and enjoyed tremendous success. Throughout their history, Boyd Gaming has remained deeply rooted in its Nevadan history and has been guided by the principles of family and integrity first laid out by Sam Boyd. As an inductee in the Gaming Hall of Fame, Sam will always be remembered as one of the most influential businessmen and innovators in Las Vegas gaming history. I remember Sam not only for his entrepreneurship and business sense, but also as a friend who championed diversity among his employees, and would go out of his way to give back to the community.

I am honored to congratulate Boyd Gaming Corporation on reaching this

milestone and I wish the corporation, and the Boyd family the best on all future endeavors.

SAFE FOOD ACT OF 2015

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the issue that impacts the lives of every American—food safety.

In 1997, I introduced a bill to consolidate at one agency the Federal oversight of food safety, and I have introduced that bill seven times, including most recently just last week. So I found it heartening to see the President's proposal to consolidate most of those responsibilities into one agency as part of the fiscal year 2016 budget.

Today, 15 different Federal agencies have food safety responsibilities. This patchwork of oversight makes it harder to focus on the highest risks in our food system and makes foodborne illness outbreaks more difficult to manage. President Obama's budget puts in motion a plan to create the efficiencies we have been talking about since 1997.

The President's plan would create a single new agency within the Department of Health and Human Services. That agency would have primary responsibility for food safety inspections, as well as enforcement, applied research, and outbreak response and mitigation. And the proposed agency would be the Federal point for coordinating with State and local entities and food safety stakeholders. This is an important step toward creating a single food agency.

I first got involved in updating our food safety system in response to a letter from constituent. The letter shared the story of a mother purchasing, cooking, and serving her 6-year-old son a hamburger. Very few foods are more basic in American than hamburger, but on this day that hamburger was contaminated with E.coli. This simple hamburger ended up taking her son's life. This story, as sad as it is, is only one of many. Each year, 48 million Americans become sick as a result of foodborne illnesses. That is one in every six people. Mr. President, 128,000 of those will be so sick they will need hospitalization, and 3,000 of those will not survive their illnesses.

While we have made significant reforms to our food safety system with passage of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act—which will improve our food safety—we have still not solved this problem.

Recently, the New Yorker ran an article called ''A Bug in the System.'' The story details the experience of Rick Schiller, who had contracted a form of the salmonella bacterium, known as Salmonella Heidelberg. The condition led to multiple days in the hospital. After his release, he was contacted by the Centers for Disease Control, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture collected some chicken from his freezer as a potential source for the foodborne illness. More than a year later, he had not heard back from the investigator and he still wasn't sure that it was the chicken that almost killed him.

This New Yorker article highlights problems that have been identified by the Government Accountability Office, the National Research Council, and the Institute of Medicine for decades. Simply determining which of 15 Federal agencies is responsible for inspection of a particular food can leave the average citizen scratching their head.

In the current regulatory regime, a pepperoni pizza—because it contains meat—has ingredients that will be inspected three times before the product hits the grocery store freezer. A vegetarian pizza produced at the same facility, however, will probably not undergo any inspection.

For eggs, it is even more scrambled. If it is a fresh egg, it is inspected by U.S. Department of Agriculture. But if that egg is part of premade product like a breakfast biscuit, it is the Food and Drug Administration. It just does not make sense. The experts said it, the data reflects it, and we can be left with only one conclusion.

The fragmented nature of our food safety system has left us more vulnerable to risk of foodborne illness and too often forced consumers to go it alone in the case of outbreak. I agree with the President that it is time for a new governmentwide approach. I would like to take it a step further and establish a single food safety agency.

The Safe Food Act I introduced last week would transfer and consolidate food safety authorities for inspections, enforcement, labeling, and research into a single food safety agency. That will allow us to prioritize system-wide food safety goals and targets. With a single food safety agency, food producers and manufacturers will just have a single Federal regulatory structure.

An egg is an egg is an egg and will be regulated by the same agency regardless of how you cook, process, or serve it. This should make it easier for those in the food industry to comply with food safety laws, even if those laws are no less stringent. The bill also modernizes certain aspects of our federal food safety laws to protect and improve public health.

Specifically, the bill would authorize mandatory recall for all foods. Today, it is easier to recall toys than tainted meat. The bill requires facilities to use risk-based analysis to identify and protect against potential hazards at their facility. The bill will authorize performance standards for pathogens like salmonella and campylobacter and for the first time authorize the agency to prevent products that are not meeting those standards from entering the market. The bill will provide for full traceback of foods to better identify and stop the outbreak at its source. Finally, the bill provides a single point of contact for families harmed by foodborne illness to turn to for answers.

This new agency will help those families navigate the differing Federal, State, and local food safety agencies to get the answers they deserve. It is bad enough to suffer severe illness or lose a loved one to foodborne illness; you should not have to spend months going from agency to agency trying to get as simple an answer to a question like, Did this chicken make me sick?

This is not the only approach to creating an agency with the primary responsibilities for overseeing and directing food safety, but we think it will help close existing gaps in our food safety system, reduce the likelihood of foodborne illness, clarify our inspection regimes for industry, and provide more clear assistance to people made sick by foodborne illness.

In closing, I want to take a moment to thank some of my colleagues. I would like to thank Senators FEINSTEIN, BLUMENTHAL, and GILLIBRAND for joining me in introducing this bill, and I stand ready to work with any Member on either side of the aisle who wants to tackle this issue.

I commend the administration for embracing this idea of consolidating oversight of food safety. I hope it doesn't take another serious foodborne outbreak before we decide to act.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN COLLEGE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the 150th anniversary for Lincoln College in Lincoln, IL. One hundred fifty years ago tomorrow, the Illinois General Assembly granted a charter establishing the new college, originally known as Lincoln University. Just 6 days later, on President Abraham Lincoln's 56th birthday, ground was broken for University Hall, a building still in use today. Lincoln University was the first institution to be named for Abraham Lincoln and the only during his lifetime. The first commencement in 1868 included a total of three students—two men and one woman. Lincoln College has come a long way.

This year, Lincoln College enrolled about 640 students, and 90 percent of those who graduate will continue their education at a 4-year university. Lincoln College now has campuses in Lincoln and Normal, IL, with a tradition of personal education. By providing a low faculty to student ratio, Lincoln College offers individualized attention that makes the difference between failure and success for many students. The school provides a springboard for students who go on to continue their education and helps students find good paying jobs.

Lincoln College offers more than just great student services and academic programs that are second to none. Lincoln College fields a number of varsity sports teams that have won national championships, hosts a speaker series, and maintains Civil War era artifacts at the Lincoln Heritage Museum.

I thank President John Blackburn for his leadership at Lincoln College and congratulate the institution on 150 years of providing Illinois students with a quality affordable education.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CALIFORNIA CASUALTIES

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to 12 servicemembers from California or based in California who have died while serving our country in Operation Enduring Freedom and in Operation Inherent Resolve since I last entered names into the RECORD.

CW2 Edward Balli, 42, of Monterey, CA, died January 20, 2014, in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds from small arms fire when he was attacked by insurgents. Chief Warrant Officer Balli was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Troop, 2nd Cavalry Regiment, U.S. Army Europe, Vilseck, Germany.

SPC Daniela Rojas, 19, of Los Angeles, CA, died May 3, 2014, in Homburg, Germany, due to a noncombat related illness. Specialist Rojas was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO.

CW2 Deric M. Rasmussen, 33, of Oceanside, CA, died May 11, 2014, in Mazar-e Sharif, Afghanistan, as the result of a noncombat incident. Chief Warrant Officer Rasmussen was assigned to the Company C, 1st Battalion, 227th Aviation Regiment, 1st Air Cavalry Brigade, Fort Hood, TX.

SPC Adrian M. Perkins, 19, of Pine Valley, CA, died May 17, 2014, in Amman, Jordan, from a noncombat related injury. Specialist Perkins was assigned to 1st Battalion, 67th Armor Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO.

SPC Terry J. Hurne, 34, of Merced, CA, died June 9, 2014, in Logar Province, Afghanistan, from a noncombat related incident. Specialist Hurne was assigned to the 710th Brigade Support Battalion, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum, NY.

SSG Scott R. Studenmund, 24, of Pasadena, CA, died June 9, 2014, in Gaza Village, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered while engaged in a combat operation. Staff Sergeant Studenmund was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 5th Special Forces Group, Fort Campbell, KY.

Sgt Thomas Z. Spitzer, 23, of New Braunfels, TX, died June 25, 2014 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Spitzer was assigned to 1st Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Twentynine Palms, CA.

PFC Keith M. Williams, 19, of Visalia, CA, died July 24, 2014 in Mirugol Kalay, Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when the enemy attacked his vehicle with an improvised explosive device. Private First Class Williams was assigned to 1st Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO.

SGT Christopher W. Mulalley, 26, of Eureka, CA, died August 22, 2014 in Gardez, Afghanistan, as the result of a noncombat related incident. Sergeant Mulalley was assigned to 1st Battalion, 3rd Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, TX.

Cpl Jordan L. Spears, 21, of Memphis, IN, was lost at sea October 1, 2014 while conducting flight operations in the North Arabian Gulf. Corporal Spears was assigned to Marine Medium Tiltrotor Squadron-163, Marine Aircraft Group 16, 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

LCpl Sean P. Neal, 19, of Riverside, CA, died October 23, 2014, in Baghdad, Iraq, from a noncombat related incident. Lance Corporal Neal was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force, Crisis Response, Central Command, whose headquarters element deploys from Camp Pendleton, CA.

CDR Christopher E. Kalafut, 49, of Oceanside, CA, died October 24, 2014, in Doha, Qatar, of a noncombat related incident at Al Udeid Air Base. Commander Kalafut was assigned to Naval Amphibious Liaison Element, Combined Forces Air Component Center, U.S. Central Command.•

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING LORETTA'S AUTHENTIC PRALINES

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses across the country have the unique opportunity to put their special stamp on the traditions that mark their communities. In honor of Black History Month, I would like to recognize Loretta Harrison, owner and operator of a successful New Orleans-based praline company. Through the hardships of starting a business to persevering and even expanding through one of the most tragic natural disasters to hit the United States, this small business has gone above and beyond the past 35 years to carry the tradition of this special treat to the people of New Orleans. It is my pleasure to recognize Loretta's Authentic Pralines as this week's Small Business of the Week.

Before she felt the calling to bring her family's special praline recipe to her community, Loretta—who serves as president and CEO—worked as a medical librarian at Louisiana State University. Pralines are a common Louisiana dessert, with roots that go all the way back to the original French settlers. They are made of ingredients that are plentiful to the region, which include an intricate mix of sugar, butter, cream, and pecans. Through Loretta's hard work and determination, what started as a praline stand at the New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival has now grown into a storefront in both the Marigny and the French Market. Not only does Loretta's Pralines serve a wide variety of signature pralines, but it has expanded the menu to include other delicious desserts, such as king cakes, coconut macaroons, fudge, and oatmeal raisin cookies. The store in the Marigny also doubles as a café for breakfast and lunch, serving sweet and savory favorites like sweet potato pancakes and shrimp and grits.

Apart from the legacy of being some of the best pralines in New Orleans, which is no easy feat, Loretta's Pralines is known for its strength and support during the rebuilding of the city after Hurricane Katrina. With the blessing of minimal damage to her store, Loretta recognized that there was an important void in her community that she immediately stepped in to fill. By temporarily changing the business model from a sweet shop to a restaurant, Loretta was able to feed the volunteers, workers, and reporters who were helping to rebuild the city she knew and loved. Loretta's Pralines also became a sort of haven for those whose lives had changed dramatically, a familiar meeting place as part of a larger community during the recovery. This act of benevolence in the midst of the hardship cemented Loretta's Pralines as a New Orleans institution.

Small business owners like Loretta Harrison are what make our State truly unique—indeed, we would not be the same without their examples of courage and kindness. I am honored to recognize a small business that has shown compassion during the devastating times, as well as ingenuity and success in expanding their business across the city. Congratulations again to Loretta's Authentic Pralines. I wish you all the best and more in the future.•

RECOGNIZING ED HUNTER

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today, I rise to honor Ed Hunter, on the occasion of his retirement as the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Washington office.

Ed has had a long career in public service. He has served the Nation for over 40 years at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC. He began his career at the CDC's National Center for Health Statistics in 1975 while he was still a student at the University of Maryland.

In this role, Ed helped establish a national health information infrastructure that is critical to making evidence-based public health policy. He, along with two of his colleagues, conceived and edited ''Health Statistics: Shaping Policy and Practice to Improve the Population's Health,'' the first textbook to cover the development, use, and improvement of health statistics.

In his work on data policy, Ed created and led a cross agency committee to develop recommendations on the health data collection program of the entire Federal Government. His efforts have led to greater efficiency, increased emphasis on statistical rigor, and greater data usability. When you read a health statistic in a newspaper article, it is more trustworthy because of Ed Hunter.

Most recently, as the Director of the CDC's Washington office, Ed has been essential in keeping Members of Congress and their staffs informed about urgent public health crises and communicating critical public health information. From ricin in the halls of Congress to Ebola on the other side of the world, Ed helped us make policy decisions based on sound science.

Today, I want to recognize Ed for his 40 years at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, for his dedication to public service, and for a lifetime of work that has truly made a difference in the health of our Nation and around the world. On behalf of the U.S. Congress, your fellow statesmen in Maryland, and a grateful nation, I want to thank Ed for all of the important work he has done and wish him the very best in his next phase of life.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:31 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 50. An act to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 50. An act to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 596. An act to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 405. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2015'' (Rept. No. 114–2).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.

Jeanne E. Davidson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and modify the credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from the tax on early distributions for certain Bureau of Prisons correctional officers who retire before age 55, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 381. A bill to improve the response to missing children and victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 382. A bill to eliminate the automatic inflation increases for discretionary programs built into the baseline projections and require budget estimates to be compared with prior year's level; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 383. A bill to provide for Indian trust asset management reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 385. A bill to provide for a biennial appropriations process with the exception of defense spending and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 386. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 387. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to use the definitions in section 40125 of title 49, United States Code, in determining whether an unmanned aircraft conducting aeronautical research flights qualifies for public aircraft status under that section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 388. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require humane treatment of animals by Federal Government facilities; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 389. A bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 390. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to ensure that amounts in the land and water conservation fund are made available for projects to provide recreational public access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 391. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 392. A bill to combat heroin and methamphetamine trafficking across the Southern border of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID (for Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN)):

S. 393. A bill to designate the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Monument in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HELLER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 395. A bill to implement a demonstration project under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to examine the costs and benefits of providing payments for comprehensive coordinated health care services provided by purpose-built, continuing care retirement communities to Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 396. A bill to establish the Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Committee; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary dividends received deduction for dividends received from a controlled foreign corporation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KING, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. BROWN):

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; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 399. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide notice to charities and other nonprofit organizations before their tax-exempt status is automatically revoked; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 401. A bill to amend rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 402. A bill to establish a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Master Teacher Corps program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 403. A bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 404. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RISCH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 405. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 406. A bill to waive and repay certain debts relating to assistance provided to individuals and households; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 407. A bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 408. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules for tax-exempt enterprise zone facility bonds and to extend the tax incentives for empowerment zones; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 409. A bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 69. A resolution calling for the protection of religious minority rights and freedoms worldwide; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 70. A resolution designating February 2015 as ''National Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Awareness Month'' ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 71. A resolution designating the week of February 8 through February 14, 2015, as ''Internet Governance Awareness Week'' ; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Con. Res. 3. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 28

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 28, a bill to limit the use of cluster munitions.

S. 36

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 36, a bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 40

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 40, a bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations that prohibit certain preferential treatment or prioritization of Internet traffic.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.8 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 182

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 182, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal education mandates, and for other purposes.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 259

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 271

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 271, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 272

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 272, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 282

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 282, a bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes.

S. 295

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 295, a bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 308

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 308, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to prohibit earmarks.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 316, a bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 355

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 355, a bill to support the provision of safe relationship behavior education and training.

S. RES. 40

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 40, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States and others to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 396. A bill to establish the Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Committee; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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, 396

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 ''Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—The term ''executive officer'', with respect to a proprietary institution of higher education that is a publicly traded corporation, means—

(A) the president of such corporation;

(B) a vice president of such corporation who is in charge of a principal business unit, division, or function of such corporation, such as sales, administration, or finance; or

(C) any other officer or person who performs a policy making function for such corporation.

(2) FEDERAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE.—The term ''Federal education assistance'' means any Federal financial assistance provided under any Federal law through a grant, a contract, a subsidy, a loan, a guarantee, an insurance, or any other means to a proprietary institution of higher education, including Federal financial assistance that is disbursed or delivered to such institution, on behalf of a student, or to a student to be used to attend such institution, except that such term shall not include any monthly housing stipend provided under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—The term ''private education loan''—

(A) means a loan provided by a private educational lender (as defined in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a))) that—

(i) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

(ii) is issued expressly for postsecondary educational expenses to a borrower, regardless of whether the loan is provided through the educational institution that the subject student attends or directly to the borrower from the private educational lender (as so defined); and

(iii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and

(B) does not include an extension of credit under an open end consumer credit plan, a reverse mortgage transaction, a residential mortgage transaction, or any other loan that is secured by real property or a dwelling.

(4) PROPRIETARY INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''proprietary institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 102(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(b)).

(5) RECRUITING AND MARKETING ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''recruiting and marketing activities'' means activities that consist of the following:

(i) Advertising and promotion activities, including paid announcements in newspapers, magazines, radio, television, billboards, electronic media, naming rights, or any other public medium of communication, including paying for displays or promotions at job fairs, military installations, or college recruiting events.

(ii) Efforts to identify and attract prospective students, either directly or through a contractor or other third party, including contact concerning a prospective student's potential enrollment or application for a grant, a loan, or work assistance under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) or participation in preadmission or advising activities, including—

(I) paying employees responsible for overseeing enrollment and for contacting potential students in-person, by phone, by email, or by other internet communications regarding enrollment; and

(II) soliciting an individual to provide contact information to an institution of higher

education, including through websites established for such purpose and funds paid to third parties for such purpose.

(iii) Such other activities as the Secretary of Education may prescribe, including paying for promotion or sponsorship of education or military-related associations.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Any activity that is required as a condition of receipt of funds by an institution under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), is specifically authorized under such title, or is otherwise specified by the Secretary of Education, shall not be considered to be a recruiting and marketing activity under subparagraph (A).

(6) STATE APPROVAL AGENCY.—The term ''State approval agency'' means any State agency that determines whether an institution of higher education is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education.

(7) VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION.—The term ''veterans service organization'' means an organization recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a committee to be known as the ''Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Committee'' (referred to in this Act as the ''Committee'') and to be composed of the head (or the designee of such head) of each of the following Federal entities:

(1) The Department of Education.

(2) The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

(3) The Department of Justice.

(4) The Securities and Exchange Commission.

(5) The Department of Defense.

(6) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

(7) The Federal Trade Commission.

(8) The Department of Labor.

(9) The Internal Revenue Service.

(10) At the discretion of the President, any other relevant Federal agency or department.

(b) PURPOSES.—The Committee shall have the following purposes:

(1) Coordinate Federal oversight of proprietary institutions of higher education to—

(A) improve enforcement of applicable Federal laws and regulations;

(B) increase accountability of proprietary institutions of higher education to students and taxpayers; and

(C) ensure the promotion of quality education programs.

(2) Coordinate Federal activities to protect students from unfair, deceptive, abusive, unethical, fraudulent, or predatory practices, policies, or procedures of proprietary institutions of higher education.

(3) Encourage information sharing among agencies related to Federal investigations, audits, or inquiries of proprietary institutions of higher education.

(4) Increase coordination and cooperation between Federal and State agencies, including State Attorneys General and State approval agencies, with respect to improving oversight and accountability of proprietary institutions of higher education.

(5) Develop best practices and consistency among Federal and State agencies in the dissemination of consumer information regarding proprietary institutions of higher education to ensure that students, parents, and other stakeholders have easy access to such information.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) DESIGNEES.—For any designee described in subsection (a), the head of the member entity shall appoint a high-level official who exercises significant decision making authority for the oversight or investigatory activities and responsibilities related to proprietary institutions of higher education of the respective Federal entity of such head.

(2) CHAIRPERSON.—The Secretary of Education or the designee of such Secretary shall serve as the Chairperson of the Committee.

(3) COMMITTEE SUPPORT.—The head of each entity described in subsection (a) shall ensure appropriate staff and officials of such entity are available to support the Committee-related work of such entity.

SEC. 4. MEETINGS.

(a) COMMITTEE MEETINGS.—The members of the Committee shall meet regularly, but not less than once during each quarter of each fiscal year, to carry out the purposes described in section 3(b).

(b) MEETINGS WITH STATE AGENCIES AND STAKEHOLDERS.—The Committee shall meet not less than once each fiscal year, and shall otherwise interact regularly, with State Attorneys General, State approval agencies, veterans service organizations, and consumer advocates to carry out the purposes described in section 3(b).

SEC. 5. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall submit a report each year to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and any other committee of Congress that the Committee determines appropriate.

(b) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The report described in subsection (a) shall be made available to the public in a manner that is easily accessible to parents, students, and other stakeholders, in accordance with the best practices developed under section 3(b)(5).

(c) CONTENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The report shall include—

(A) an accounting of any action (as defined in paragraph (3)) taken by the Federal Government, any member entity of the Committee, or a State—

(i) to enforce Federal or State laws and regulations applicable to proprietary institutions of higher education;

(ii) to hold proprietary institutions of higher education accountable to students and taxpayers; and

(iii) to promote quality education programs;

(B) a summary of complaints against each proprietary institution of higher education received by any member entity of the Committee;

(C) the data described in paragraph (2) and any other data relevant to proprietary institutions of higher education that the Committee determines appropriate; and

(D) recommendations of the Committee for such legislative and administrative actions as the Committee determines are necessary to—

(i) improve enforcement of applicable Federal laws;

(ii) increase accountability of proprietary institutions of higher education to students and taxpayers; and

(iii) ensure the promotion of quality education programs.

(2) DATA.—

(A) INDUSTRY-WIDE DATA.—The report shall include data on all proprietary institutions of higher education that consists of information regarding—

(i) the total amount of Federal education assistance that proprietary institutions of higher education received for the previous academic year, and the percentage of the total amount of Federal education assistance provided to institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)) for such previous academic year that reflects such total amount of Federal education assistance provided to proprietary institutions of higher education for such previous academic year;

(ii) the total amount of Federal education assistance that proprietary institutions of higher education received for the previous academic year, disaggregated by—

(I) educational assistance in the form of a loan provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

(II) educational assistance in the form of a grant provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

(III) educational assistance provided under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code;

(IV) assistance for tuition and expenses under section 2007 of title 10, United States Code;

(V) assistance provided under section 1784a of title 10, United States Code; and

(VI) Federal education assistance not described in subclauses (I) through (V);

(iii) the percentage of the total amount of Federal education assistance provided to institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)) for such previous academic year for each of the programs described in subclauses (I) through (VI) of clause (ii) that reflects such total amount of Federal education assistance provided to proprietary institutions of higher education for such previous academic year for each of such programs;

(iv) the average retention and graduation rates for students pursuing a degree at proprietary institutions of higher education;

(v) the average cohort default rate (as defined in section 435(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(m)) for proprietary institutions of higher education, and an annual list of cohort default rates (as so defined) for all proprietary institutions of higher education;

(vi) for careers requiring the passage of a licensing examination—

(I) the passage rate of individuals who attended a proprietary institution of higher education taking such examination to pursue such a career; and

(II) the passage rate of all individuals taking such exam to pursue such a career; and

(vii) the use of private education loans at proprietary institutions of higher education that includes—

(I) an estimate of the total number of such loans; and

(II) information on the average debt, default rate, and interest rate of such loans.

(B) DATA ON PUBLICLY TRADED CORPORATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The report shall include data on proprietary institutions of higher education that are publicly traded corporations, consisting of information on—

(I) any pre-tax profit of such proprietary institutions of higher education—

(aa) reported as a total amount and an average percent of revenue for all such proprietary institutions of higher education; and

(bb) reported for each such proprietary institution of higher education;

(II) revenue for such proprietary institutions of higher education spent on recruiting and marketing activities, student instruction, and student support services, reported—

(aa) as a total amount and an average percent of revenue for all such proprietary institutions of higher education; and

(bb) for each such proprietary institution of higher education;

(III) total compensation packages of the executive officers of each such proprietary institution of higher education;

(IV) a list of institutional loan programs offered by each such proprietary institution of higher education that includes information on the default and interest rates of such programs; and

(V) the data described in clauses (ii) and (iii).

(ii) DISAGGREGATED BY OWNERSHIP.—The report shall include data on proprietary institutions of higher education that are publicly traded corporations, disaggregated by corporate or parent entity, brand name, and campus, consisting of—

(I) the total cost of attendance for each program at each such proprietary institution of higher education, and information comparing such total cost for each such program to—

(aa) the total cost of attendance for each program at each public institution of higher education; and

(bb) the average total cost of attendance for each program at all institutions of higher education, including such institutions that are public and such institutions that are private;

(II) total enrollment, disaggregated by—

(aa) individuals enrolled in programs taken online; and

(bb) individuals enrolled in programs that are not taken online;

(III) the average retention and graduation rates for students pursuing a degree at such proprietary institutions of higher education;

(IV) the percentage of students enrolled in such proprietary institutions of higher education who complete a program of such an institution within—

(aa) the standard period of completion for such program; and

(bb) a period that is 150 percent of such standard period of completion;

(V) the total cost of attendance for each program at such proprietary institutions of higher education;

(VI) the average cohort default rate, as defined in section 435(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(m)), for such proprietary institutions of higher education, and an annual list of cohort default rates (as so defined) for all proprietary institutions of higher education;

(VII) the median educational debt incurred by students who complete a program at such a proprietary institution of higher education;

(VIII) the median educational debt incurred by students who start but do not complete a program at such a proprietary institution of higher education;

(IX) the job placement rate for students who complete a program at such a proprietary institution of higher education and the type of employment obtained by such students;

(X) for careers requiring the passage of a licensing examination, the rate of individuals who attended such a proprietary institution of higher education and passed such an examination; and

(XI) the number of complaints from students enrolled in such proprietary institutions of higher education who have submitted a complaint to any member entity of the Committee.

(iii) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS ASSISTANCE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—To the extent practicable, the report shall provide information on the data described in clause (ii) for individuals using, to pay for the costs of attending such a proprietary institution of higher education, Federal education assistance provided under—

(aa) chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code;

(bb) section 2007 of title 10, United States Code; and

(cc) section 1784a of title 10, United States Code.

(II) REVENUE.—The report shall provide information on the revenue of proprietary institutions of higher education that are publicly traded corporations that is derived from the Federal education assistance described in subclause (I).

(C) COMPARISON DATA.—To the extent practicable, the report shall provide information comparing the data described in subparagraph (B) for proprietary institutions of higher education that are publicly traded corporations with such data for public institutions of higher education disaggregated by State.

(3) ACCOUNTING OF ANY ACTION.—For the purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the term ''any action'' shall include—

(A) a complaint filed by a Federal or State agency in a local, State, Federal, or tribal court;

(B) an administrative proceeding by a Federal or State agency involving noncompliance of any applicable law or regulation; or

(C) any other review, audit, or administrative process by any Federal or State agency that results in a penalty, suspension, or termination from any Federal or State program.

SEC. 6. FOR-PROFIT COLLEGE WARNING LIST FOR PARENTS AND STUDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each academic year, the Committee shall publish a list to be known as the ''For-Profit College Warning List for Parents and Students'' to be comprised of proprietary institutions of higher education—

(1) that have engaged in illegal activity during the previous academic year as determined by a Federal or State court;

(2) that have entered into a settlement resulting in a monetary payment;

(3) that have had any higher education program withdrawn or suspended; or

(4) for which the Committee has sufficient evidence of widespread or systemic unfair, deceptive, abusive, unethical, fraudulent, or predatory practices, policies, or procedures that pose a threat to the academic success, financial security, or general best interest of students.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—In making a determination pursuant to subsection (a)(4), the Committee may consider evidence that includes the following:

(1) Any consumer complaint collected by any member entity of the Committee.

(2) Any complaint filed by a Federal or State agency in a Federal, State, local, or tribal court.

(3) Any administrative proceeding by a Federal or State agency involving noncompliance of any applicable law or regulation.

(4) Any other review, audit, or administrative process by any Federal or State agency that results in a penalty, suspension, or termination from any Federal or State program.

(5) Data or information submitted by a proprietary institution of higher education to any accrediting agency or association recognized by the Secretary of Education pursuant to section 496 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1099b) or the findings or adverse actions of any such accrediting agency or association.

(6) Information submitted by a proprietary institution of higher education to any member entity of the Committee.

(7) Any other evidence that the Committee determines relevant in making a determination pursuant to subsection (a)(4).

(c) PUBLICATION.—Not later than July 1 of each fiscal year, the Committee shall publish the list under subsection (a) prominently and in a manner that is easily accessible to parents, students, and other stakeholders, in accordance with any best practices developed under section 3(b)(5).

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary dividends received deduction for dividends received from a controlled foreign corporation; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I introduce the Foreign Earnings Reinvestment Act that would generate the flow of an estimated $1.9 trillion back into the American economy by temporarily allowing companies to return profits earned overseas to the U.S. at a reduced tax rate. It is no secret that one of the primary reasons why this money is laying idle and doing nothing to spur job creation is due to the fact that our Nation has the highest corporate tax rate in the free world at 35 percent. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD, when you add in additional State and local taxes the combined corporate rate jumps to a staggering 39.1 percent. Whereas, the average combined corporate tax rate for the rest of the developed world, excluding the U.S. is around 25 percent.

Congress has long debated tax reform and has failed to act. It is my hope that, under a Republican controlled Congress, we will be able to move forward with tax reform, which includes lowering both the personal and corporate tax rate and eliminating tax loopholes. If we are not going to act on behalf of the American taxpayer than we need to make available temporary tax incentives to bring this money back home providing a much needed boost to our economy.

The Foreign Earnings Reinvestment Act would encourage American companies to bring overseas earnings back to the United States and creates strong incentives for those firms to invest these earnings in U.S. employees.

Specifically, the bill would temporarily reduce the current 35 percent corporate rate to an 8.75 percent effective rate on foreign earnings brought back to the United States. If companies are able to show that they are expanding their payroll by 10 percent through net job creation or higher payroll, the bill would allow these corporations to obtain up to a 5.25 percent effective repatriation rate In addition, the bill discourages U.S. companies from reducing employment by including in a company's gross income calculation of $75,000 per full-time position that is eliminated.

This common sense legislation will drive the roughly $1.9 trillion currently parked overseas back here to the United States, boosting our economy and spurring job creation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 401. A bill to amend rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There be no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 401

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. ATTORNEY ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) SANCTIONS UNDER RULE 11.—Rule 11(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Rule 5'' and all that follows through ''motion.'' and inserting ''rule 5.''; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking ''situated'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting ''situated, and to compensate the parties that were injured by such conduct. Subject to the limitations in paragraph (5), the sanction shall consist of an order to pay to the party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred as a direct result of the violation, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The court may also impose additional appropriate sanctions, such as striking the pleadings, dismissing the suit, or other directives of a nonmonetary nature, or, if warranted for effective deterrence, an order directing payment of a penalty into the court.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to bar or impede the assertion or development of new claims, defenses, or remedies under Federal, State, or local laws, including civil rights laws, or under the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RISCH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 405. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today with my friend and colleague from the State of Idaho to speak in support of legislation we have just dropped today; that is, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2015. I have introduced it today, along with the prime cosponsor, Senator HEINRICH from New Mexico.

I think it is important to recognize that this bipartisan bill is supported with original cosponsors, including the Senator from Idaho, Mr. RISCH, Senator MANCHIN, Senator FISCHER, and Senator HEITKAMP, as well as myself and Senator HEINRICH. I wish to acknowledge the role of Senator HEINRICH in this and his staff for working with us to revise and reintroduce this important bill. I would also like to acknowledge the great work the bipartisan leadership of the Senate's Sportsmen's Caucus has done on this issue, led ably by my friend from Idaho. I think it is important to recognize the groundwork, the leg work that went into the development of this bill and the work the caucus did in doing so. So I thank my colleagues for all of their good, hard work.

We are here today to not only announce this reintroduction—because this is now the third Congress we have tried to advance the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act—but also to really kind of re-up the conversation about its importance and really to urge the Senate to come together to pass legislation such as we are talking about today.

We have sportsmen all over the country. I come from a big State that is wide open, and people come to Alaska to hunt and to fish. They never want to leave, and that is fine. That is how my husband came to Alaska—it was the lure of sport fishing on the Kenai River. So many of our military are on assignment to Alaska, and they end up staying because of the hunting and fishing and other recreational opportunities Alaska offers. It is not just places such as Alaska and Idaho that offer great outdoors opportunities; it is all over the country, from big cities to small towns, North and South.

For so many of us, hunting is a tradition that is passed down from generation to generation. Certainly my family is evidence of that. I think it is important to recognize that while we talk about hunting and fishing as being the best known recreational opportunities, we also include with this legislation enthusiasts who go outside to go boating and so many of the other outdoor activities.

We speak often on this floor about jobs and economic opportunities and what they bring to our Nation, the important role they play. Sportsmen and sportswomen really are economic contributors when we think about their role. Back in 2013 there were approximately 37 million people who hunted or fished in America. That is roughly equal to the entire population of the State of California. Those numbers are always on the rise. Again, when we have strong numbers, we also have strong economic impacts. Sports men and women spent roughly $90 billion in 2013. Those numbers have probably risen since then. Those dollars go not only to the gear and equipment, which is what we would expect, but also to the travel industry, to the hospitality industry, and to so many other sectors of the economy.

Spending by sports men and women also aids our conservation efforts. Excise taxes on fishing and hunting and shooting equipment, motorboat fuel, as well as the fees for licenses and stamps are all dedicated to State fish and wildlife management and conservation. These folks care deeply about the environment and conservation, and that is why these excise taxes are in place to take care of our natural resources. Since their establishment, the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs have contributed over $14.5 billion to conservation.

I mentioned Alaska and its role as kind of a magnet for those who like to hunt and fish. In my State alone, we have over 125,000 individuals who engage in hunting every year. It has created more than $439 million in retail sales and $195 million in salaries and wages. In Alaska, we bring in over $53 million to the State and local governments each year. We had a big holiday a year or so ago when Cabela's opened its doors. It was as though we had finally arrived on the scene. All of our sportsmen—hunters and fishermen—were loving it.

On the fishing side, when we think about the economic impact in my State, it is even more impressive. Last year over 460,000 people bought fishing licenses to take part in some of the best fishing in the world. It brought about $1.4 billion to Alaska's economy. These are huge contributors to our tax base, to our economy, and they are key to who we are as a State.

Our Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2015 that we are introducing today builds on the efforts of last year. Last year's bill saw 46 Members of this Chamber coming together to support it. We have taken all of the provisions from the previous bill except for two that were enacted in other legislation and then we have added some additional bipartisan provisions. We have Senator HEINRICH's revised HUNT Act. We have a couple of others that are new to the bill. All told, these measures increase access to provide greater opportunities for sports men and women to enjoy our public lands.

There are a lot of different components in the bill. I know my colleague from Idaho will speak to several of them. I wish to highlight a couple that I think are important in this discussion.

First is a bill I have championed for several years now called the Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act. It protects recreational hunting and fishing on our BLM and our National Forest Service lands while reaffirming other prior congressional actions enacted to protect hunting and wildlife conservation. So the bill we have introduced—again, this is the same one we have had previously—requires BLM and Forest Service lands to be open to hunting, to recreational fishing, or recreational shooting as a matter of law unless the managing agency acts to close lands to such activity. So it is open unless otherwise closed. Leaving lands open unless closed means that agencies need not take action then to open them up to hunting and fishing. Agencies are still permitted to close or put restrictions on land for a number of purposes, such as resource conservation and public safety. But on the whole this is really an affirmation that sportsmen and sportswomen are welcome on our public lands. Isn't that what our public lands are supposed to be all about, which is being able to access them?

The Hunting, Fishing, and Recreational Shooting Protection Act has again been included in this bill. This

was introduced previously by Senators THUNE and KLOBUCHAR as a standalone bill, but its language is very important to many of us and to nearly all the sportsmen's groups we have heard from.

We also have provisions in the bill that deal with some of the efforts to limit ammunition and fishing tackle by some organizations. I think we know that if we can't access, if we can't afford traditional ammunition and fishing tackle, it makes it pretty tough to go out and enjoy these opportunities.

We have good pieces in here relating to conservation priorities, including the North American Wetlands Conservation Act and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

I again the Sportsmen's Caucus and Senator HEINRICH as the prime Democratic lead on this bill. My hope is that we will be able to build this coalition on the floor and get even beyond the number 46, which is what we had last go-around with this legislation.

I think we will have good discussion within the committee and here on the Senate floor. My hope is that the third time is going to be the charm for this sportsmen's legislation. It is important to us, it is important to our economy, and it is an issue which I am certainly willing to take aim at. Sorry for the pun.

With that, I yield to my friend from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today also in support of the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2015. I am honored to be here today with Senator MURKOWSKI. Idahoans and Alaskans have a lot in common when it comes to outdoor sporting activities, including hunting and fishing. Senator CRAPO and I were honored to host Senator MURKOWSKI in Idaho. Although we don't have the acres Alaska has, we certainly have that diverse environment for hunting and fishing in many different areas of the State that support and will continue to support both fishing and game.

This bill is cosponsored by a bipartisan team of Senators who are committed to advancing the agenda of sportsmen and sportswomen. Senators MURKOWSKI and HEINRICH, along with the leaders of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus—myself and Senator MANCHIN as the co-chairmen and Senator FISCHER and Senator HEITKAMP as the co-vice chairmen—make up the largest bipartisan caucus in Congress, and we have diligently labored to craft this bipartisan legislation that is supported by a broad coalition of sportsmen's groups. Indeed, we have worked on it substantially more since the first of the year. Last year we labored over it at great length and were not able to get it across the finish line, but we are cautiously optimistic this year that we have hit that right spot where we actually can get this across the finish line this year.

One provision of this package will encourage States to create and maintain public shooting ranges. This will promote gun safety by providing a venue to teach young adults about firearms. These public ranges can also serve as a place to hold hunter education classes and can be used as facilities to train police forces.

This bill will also allow any legal gun owner to carry a firearm on land administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This provision will require the Army Corps to conform their regulations to align with local laws related to firearms. I wish to thank my colleague from Idaho, Senator MIKE CRAPO, for his hard work and leadership on this particular issue. I know the sportsmen of Idaho and across the country are pleased to know that this legislation will allow firearms on Army Corps land and that it is included in this bipartisan sportsmen's package.

This bill will also reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, a program that enables the Bureau of Land Management to sell public land for community development and other projects. This land-for-land approach creates jobs and generates funding for the BLM to acquire critical inholdings from willing sellers.

I am also proud to include a provision supported by my colleague from Wyoming, Senator MIKE ENZI, to allow archery equipment to be transported and possessed in national parks. Archery is one of the fastest growing sports in America. It should not be illegal to carry a bow in a national park.

I am happy to work with my colleagues to include this important provision in this Sportsmen's Act. Whether you hunt or fish to put food on the table or for sport or to pass down a tradition to your family or for game-management purposes, there is something in this bill for you.

With more than half a million sportsmen and sportswomen in the State of Idaho, this legislation will ensure they can continue to access their favorite hunting or fishing sport. In fact, the number of people who hunt each year in Idaho would fill Boise State Broncos stadium more than 6½ times. Most of you are familiar with that stadium since it is the only stadium in America that has blue turf, and most everyone has seen that.

For those of us who hunt and fish, it is difficult to put into words why this legislation is so important. I ask everyone I talk to about these issues to encourage and teach youngsters about hunting and fishing. In Idaho this last year 14,000 kids purchased a junior fishing license, and approximately 14,000 purchased a junior hunting license. These numbers could be higher, and they should be higher. It is important to teach and mentor these future generations—those coming behind us—about hunting and fishing and to hand down this culture to them. Hunting and fishing give us a great reason to be in the great outdoors, a great reason to hand down traditions, and a great reason to support the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2015.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with this bipartisan coalition we put together, to cosponsor and to work with us to pass this legislation.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join my colleagues from Alaska and New Mexico in introducing the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act.

In North Dakota, hunting and fishing are a huge part of our lives. We have opening day circled on our calendars like we do birthdays and anniversaries. It was in North Dakota where America's conservationist President, Theodore Roosevelt, fell in love with our State and recognized the need to preserve our Nation's fish and game for future generations. As President Roosevelt once said:

> The nation behaves well if it treats the natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased and not impaired in value. Conservation means development as much as it does protection.

It is an honor to be able to help introduce this important legislation and continue to advance voluntary conservation measures that have kept our State a world-class destination for hunters and fishermen.

This bill would continue programs such as the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation which have successful track records of working with nonprofits, State and local governments and private landowners to promote voluntary conservation of fish and game habitat.

It also includes a number of provisions that will enable our hunters and fishers to access the lands their tax dollars pay to maintain. Additionally, it would set aside funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for improving recreational access to Federal lands. It would also direct agencies to identify high-priority Federal hunting and fishing lands where there is currently no access and work to provide access to sportsmen.

One section of the bill is particularly important to my State—enabling greater use of funds for public shooting ranges. We have a number of extremely popular target ranges in North Dakota and, with the great influx in population to the area, they have been under considerable stress. One such range in the city of Watford City has had to shut down as the city expanded around it. This bill would allow North Dakota Game and Fish to work with the city to move and reopen the range and provide a safe place for hunters to practice their skills.

I want to thank Senators MURKOWSKI and HEINRICH, as well as Senators RISCH, MANCHIN, and FISHER for being excellent partners through the Sportsmen's Caucus to introduce this bipartisan bill. I look forward to working with them to bring this bill to the floor and sending it to the President to become law.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act. I am pleased to join my colleague in introducing this legislation.

I am grateful for the opportunity to work with my colleagues on legislation that will promote our country's hunting, fishing, and conservation heritage.

This bill does a lot of good things. It prevents antihunting groups from restricting sportsmen's ammunition choices, which would unnecessarily drive up hunting costs, impede participation in shooting sports, and consequently decrease conservation funding.

The Sportsmen's Act provides States with more flexibility to build and maintain public shooting ranges in order to provide Americans with more opportunities to engage in recreational and competitive shooting activities. The legislation also expands and enhances hunting and fishing opportunities on Federal lands by establishing a more open policy for access to recreational activities on our public lands.

I am especially encouraged by the fact that this bill contains provisions I have championed that would increase transparency regarding the judgment fund. It has the potential to help our efforts to track taxpayer-funded litigation that impacts our public lands policies.

As my colleagues may or may not know, the judgment fund is administered by the Treasury Department and is used to pay certain court judgments and settlements against the Federal Government. Essentially, this fund acts as an unlimited amount of money that is set aside to pay for Federal Government liability. It is not subject to the annual appropriations process, and, even more remarkably, the Treasury Department has no reporting requirements, so these funds are paid out with very little oversight or scrutiny.

This is no small matter, as the judgment fund disburses billions of dollars in payments every year. Because the Treasury Department has no binding reporting requirements, few public details exist about where these funds are going and why.

The Public Lands Council has decried the lack of oversight of the judgment fund by stating:

> Certain groups continuously sue the federal government, and [the] Treasury simply writes a check to foot the bill without providing Members of Congress and the American taxpayers basic information about the payment.

This kind of litigation can have a big impact on sportsmen and others who enjoy multiple uses of Federal lands. This is because the government is permitted to blindly fund lawsuits by activist groups who use the court as a backdoor to policy making.

A recent report from the GAO found that cases filed against the EPA have shown a pattern of these groups working in unison with big law firms to sue under the same statutes in order to push their political agenda through the courts.

The legislation I introduced this week with Senator GARDNER, known as the Judgment Fund Transparency Act, will bring these cases to light. That bill has been included as a provision to the Sportsmen's Act and will provide even greater transparency and accountability.

I am proud to be a vice chair of the Sportsmen's Caucus, and I look forward to continuing our work to advance these important legislative measures.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss our truly bipartisan sportsmen's bill. This is a bipartisan bill which has been worked on for quite some time, and I think its time has come. They say Paul Masson's wine's time has come. It has. We have Senators LISA MURKOWSKI from Alaska, MARK HEINRICH from New Mexico, JIM RISCH from Idaho, myself from West Virginia, HEIDI HEITKAMP from North Dakota, and DEB FISCHER from Nebraska. It is balanced. I think we will find total support hopefully on both sides.

Let me talk about the bill and what it does. It is good for sportsmen, hunters, and lovers of the outdoors. This is a bill which shows that Democrats and Republicans can truly come together and work together. The bill should be a model for how we can make things work here in Washington, and we hope the country will be watching.

West Virginia has more than 1.6 million acres of public land open to hunting. In a State that is our size, if they flatten the State, it would be bigger than Texas. But with all the mountains and hills and everything, it is an absolutely wonderful and beautiful place to grow up and live and hunt and enjoy the outdoors.

We have a year-round fishing season with more than 20,000 miles of streams and more than 100 public fishing lakes. In 2011 West Virginia saw more than 400,000 hunters and sportsmen supporting more than 12,000 jobs—400,000 hunters supporting 12,000 West Virginia jobs. These sportsmen spent $870 million on hunting and fishing in West Virginia and generated $81 million in State and local taxes. That is an industry within itself. In a small State such as ours, we are very appreciative of every job and every dollar that helps us provide a better quality of life.

Let me tell you about growing up in West Virginia. It was funny. I had a conversation on the floor of the Senate with some of my colleagues, and we were talking about many issues. We started talking about how we grew up and this and that, and he said: You know, Joe, I grew up in a community in a part of the city where I never knew anybody who owned a gun.

I was thinking how much he missed. That means he had never been hunting. No one ever taught him how to shoot and be safe—the safety things we should learn. I kept thinking about that. I thought to myself and I told him: You know something, I grew up in a town where I didn't know anybody who didn't have a gun. It is just the cultures we have.

If this bill helps introduce people to the love of the outdoors, to the sporting, whether it is just shooting from the standpoint of targets or sports shooting or actually hunting and basically the game—it is very nutritional and very healthy. Venison is a big staple of the diet in West Virginia. It is very good quality meat and very low in fat, very high in protein and fiber. It is great.

You start learning about gun safety. My father was not a hunter. My father never got into it. My grandfather was not a hunter. My uncles were very much involved. But my dad made sure we had a sporting club in the little town, a little coal mining town, and the people who were very astute in this basically took all of us under their wing. They would teach us how to shoot. They would teach us the safety. They would teach us how to respect where we—if we are going to shoot something, we should be able to harvest the game or know somebody who would use it for nutritional values. Don't waste a thing. But also go out in the woods and enjoy the beauty God gave us. I look back on those days.

Then I took my grandson hunting the first time. First of all, I couldn't believe how good his eyesight was and how good he could shoot. It is something that now he is fixated on, and he does a great job, and I am so happy to see him. My son loves fishing, and I take him with me all the time. It is a family tradition. We do it once a year. We do a whole family trip where everybody goes.

This bill, the Sportsmen's Act of 2015, does so many things all over America. It really helps us promote and continue to promote the love of the outdoors, the love of hunting, the love of fishing, basically of sports shooting, competitive sports shooting, pleasurable sports shooting, learning the safety of a gun, what we should and should not do, learning to respect others around us, making sure safety is the first and foremost thing we do.

I hope this bill gets very quick action, very favorable action. We can start out this new year, if you will, on something that is truly overwhelmingly a bipartisan bill. I am sure there will be people who have something they might object to in any piece of legislation. They will have to work hard to find something in this bill they can object to because I think it is put together the right way, in a bipartisan way. It is good for America.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 69—CALLING FOR THE PROTECTION OF RELIGIOUS MINORITY RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS WORLDWIDE

Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr.

PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 69

Whereas it is a human right for all peoples to enjoy the fundamental freedom of religion, and the United States remains committed to promoting and protecting those that have been marginalized and persecuted because of their faith;

Whereas Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes that ''everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance'';

Whereas the freedom to worship by minority religious communities worldwide has come under repeated and deadly attack, and often religious minorities are regarded as enemies of the state;

Whereas the freedom to proselytize by minority religious communities has also come under repeated and deadly attack in recent years through so-called blasphemy laws and anti-conversion laws that are punishable by fines, imprisonment, and death;

Whereas, on November 1, 2010, the deadliest ever recorded attack on Iraqi Christians occurred at the Sayidat al-Nejat Catholic Cathedral located in central Baghdad, where militants stormed the church and detonated 2 suicide vests filled with ball bearings, killing 58, including 2 priests, and wounding 78 parishioners;

Whereas, in November 2010, Aasia Bibi, a Christian mother of five, was fined $1,100 and sentenced to death by hanging for blasphemy, becoming the first woman condemned to death on blasphemy charges in Pakistan, and remains jailed today appealing her sentence;

Whereas, on December 29, 2011, the Shia religious leader Tajul Muluk's Islamic boarding school in Madura Island, Indonesia was burned down in an arson attack by 300 anti-Shi'ite protestors, causing 500 Shia residents to flee from their homes, and on January 1, 2012, the Indonesian Ulema Council issued a fatwa against his teachings, leading to blasphemy charges and the arrest of Muluk on April 12, 2012, in Sampang, where he remains in prison;

Whereas, on July 28, 2012, Saeed Abedini, a Christian pastor with dual Iranian and United States citizenship, was arrested on charges solely based on his Christian faith, convicted, and sentenced to eight years in a brutal Iranian prison where he remains today;

Whereas, on October 17, 2013, 10 bombs exploded in the minority Shi'ite districts of Baghdad, killing 44 people, including 6 children, and on that same day a suicide bomber drove into a village in the northern province of Ninebeh, killing 15 Shabaks, who are mainly Shi'ites and are viewed as apostates by extreme Sunni Islamists;

Whereas, on November 16, 2013, Zhang Shaojie, a member of Three-Self church and pastor of the government-sanctioned Nanle County Christian Church, China, was arrested, fined $16,000, and given a 12 year prison sentence for ''gathering a crowd to disrupt the public order,'' in what is believed to be retaliation for his advocacy on behalf of his congregation and community;

Whereas, on May 15, 2014, a Sudanese Christian woman, Meriam Ibrahim, was imprisoned and sentenced to death by hanging for allegedly committing apostasy from Islam and faced constant pressure to renounce her faith of Christianity while in prison, and only after immediate and sustained pressure by the United States Senate and the Department of State was she released and allowed to leave the country, settling in New Hampshire with her husband and two children;

Whereas, on November 10, 2014, a young Christian Pakistani couple, Shama Bibi and Sajjad Maseeh, who was four months pregnant with her fifth child, were brutally beaten by a mob in Punjab Province, had their legs broken so they could not flee, and were locked in a brick kiln to burn to death while a crowd of 1,200 watched for alleged blasphemy of the desecration of a Koran;

Whereas, since 2010, the Nigerian terrorist organization Boko Haram, which translates to ''western education is a sin,'' has destroyed more than 1,000 churches across Nigeria, abducted hundreds of Christians to forcibly convert to Islam, and in increasingly violent attacks beginning in 2014, has killed more than 1,700 Christians;

Whereas, according to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, over 15,000 people in North Korea are presently incarcerated in prison labor camps for attempting to practice their religion and face constant abuse in attempts to force them to renounce their faith;

Whereas, since the beginning of its reign of terror, ISIL has sought to destroy any person of faith that does not embrace their own perverted interpretation of Islam, leading to the destruction of Jonah's tomb in Mosul, the destruction of Sunni shrines and mosques in Ninevah, the destruction of Christian churches in Syria, and the slaughter of anyone who resists their teachings; and

Whereas seven Indian states have so-called ''anti-conversion'' apostasy laws that require officials to assess the legality of conversions, and fine and/or imprison those responsible for the conversions if it is determined to be illegal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) remains committed to protecting the human right and the fundamental freedom of religion, especially those of religious minorities;

(2) recognizes that government policies prohibiting the freedom of thought and religion are designed to harass and intimidate religious groups; and

(3) urges in the strongest terms that the United States Government lead the international effort in calling for the repeal of all existing apostasy and blasphemy laws.

SENATE RESOLUTION 70—DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 2015 AS ''NATIONAL CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 70

Whereas carbon monoxide is an odorless, colorless gas that is produced whenever any fuel, such as natural gas, propane, gasoline, oil, kerosene, wood, or charcoal, is burned;

Whereas devices that produce carbon monoxide include cars, boats, gasoline engines, stoves, and heating systems, and carbon monoxide produced from these sources can build up in enclosed or semi-enclosed spaces;

Whereas carbon monoxide is often referred to as the ''silent killer'' because it is colorless, odorless, tasteless, and nonirritating, and ignoring early stages of carbon monoxide poisoning may cause unconsciousness and continual exposure to danger;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, each year in the United States, carbon monoxide poisoning kills more than 400 individuals and sends approximately 20,000 individuals to emergency rooms;

Whereas when people breathe in carbon monoxide, the poisonous gas enters the bloodstream and prevents adequate intake of oxygen, which can damage tissues and result in death;

Whereas given their common preexisting medical conditions, individuals older than age 65 are particularly vulnerable to carbon monoxide poisoning;

Whereas for most individuals who suffer from carbon monoxide poisoning, the early signs of exposure to low concentrations of carbon monoxide include mild headaches and breathlessness upon moderate exercise;

Whereas sustained or increased exposure to carbon monoxide can lead to flu-like symptoms, including severe headaches, dizziness, tiredness, nausea, confusion, irritability, and impaired judgment, memory, and coordination;

Whereas breathing in low concentrations of carbon monoxide can cause long-term health damage, even after exposure to the gas ends;

Whereas most cases of carbon monoxide exposure occur during the winter months of December, January, and February when oil and gas heaters are more heavily in use;

Whereas on January 17, 2009, Amanda J. Hansen, a junior and member of the swim team at West Seneca West High School, in West Seneca, New York, passed away from carbon monoxide poisoning while sleeping near a faulty basement boiler during a sleepover party;

Whereas Amanda J. Hansen loved Spanish, was a member of the Spanish Honor Society at West Seneca West High School, and wanted to eventually teach Spanish;

Whereas Amanda J. Hansen hoped to attend college at the University of North Carolina;

Whereas responding to tragedy, Ken and Kim Hansen established the Amanda Hansen Foundation to honor their daughter by raising money for a scholarship fund and spreading awareness about the dangers of carbon monoxide and the importance of taking safety measures, such as using carbon monoxide detectors in residences;

Whereas the Amanda Hansen Foundation works with lawmakers and local communities to educate the public on the dangers of carbon monoxide poisoning;

Whereas the Amanda Hansen Foundation raises money for purchasing carbon monoxide detectors for individuals who cannot afford them and has given away 17,000 carbon monoxide detectors;

Whereas the Amanda Hansen Foundation and Ken and Kim Hansen through their work with the Foundation collaborate with other national organizations to ensure that carbon monoxide detectors are as ubiquitous as possible;

Whereas the Hansen family fought in 2010 for the passage of ''Amanda's Law'', a law that mandates the installation of carbon monoxide detectors in new and existing residences with fuel burning appliances and the replacement of such detectors every 5 years;

Whereas the Amanda Hansen Foundation has paid to replace furnaces in the Buffalo, New York area with furnaces that are safer and more energy efficient; and

Whereas in memory of their daughter, the Hansen family has worked tirelessly to make New York and the rest of the United States a safer place: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates February 2015 as ''National Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Awareness Month''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 71—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 8 THROUGH FEBRUARY 14, 2015, AS ''INTERNET GOVERNANCE AWARENESS WEEK''

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 71

Whereas the United States remains committed to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance, in which the private sector works in collaboration with civil society, governments, and technical experts in a consensus fashion;

Whereas the United States has, through its stewardship of key Internet domain name functions, maintained an important role in the protection of the Internet as presently constituted;

Whereas on March 14, 2014, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (referred to in this preamble as the ''NTIA'') announced its intent to transition these key Internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community;

Whereas the transition process demonstrates that the United States supports and is committed to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance;

Whereas the NTIA has asked the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (referred to in this preamble as ''ICANN'') to convene global stakeholders to develop a proposal to transition the current role played by the NTIA in the coordination of the Internet's domain name system (referred to in this preamble as the ''DNS'');

Whereas the NTIA has stated that there is no deadline for the transition, and that the transition proposal must have broad community support and must—

(1) support and enhance the multistakeholder model;

(2) maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS;

(3) meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority; and

(4) maintain the openness of the Internet;

Whereas the NTIA has also stated that it will not accept a proposal that replaces the NTIA with a government-led or an inter-governmental organization, a position that is consistent with S. Con. Res. 50 (112th Congress), a concurrent resolution that was unanimously passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives in 2012 and supported ''the consistent and unequivocal policy of the United States to promote a global Internet free from government control and preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet today'';

Whereas ICANN will be holding its next global meeting, ICANN 52, in Singapore between February 8 and February 12, 2015; and

Whereas designating the week of February 8 through February 14, 2015, as ''Internet Governance Awareness Week'' will encourage the participants at ICANN 52 to focus on developing key ICANN accountability principles for the protection of the global Internet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Senate designates the week of February 8 through February 14, 2015, as ''Internet Governance Awareness Week'' to—

(1) increase public awareness regarding the March 14, 2014 announcement by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (referred to in this resolving clause as the ''NTIA'') declaring the intention of the NTIA to transition the stewardship of the functions of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority to the global multistakeholder community;

(2) encourage public education about the importance of this transition process; and

(3) call the attention of the participants at the next global meeting of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (referred to in this resolving clause as ''ICANN'') to the importance of designing accountability and governance reforms to best prepare ICANN for executing the responsibilities that it may receive under any transition of the stewardship of the functions of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority, including reforms that would—

(A) insist that the domain name system continues to function as part of a secure, stable, resilient, single, decentralized, open, and interoperable Internet;

(B) ensure a form of stewardship and accountability that is based on the separation of the functions of policy-making, policy implementation, and, as needed, independent adjudication or arbitration for dispute resolution;

(C) limit and maintain ICANN authority to matters that pertain to the coordination of Internet unique identifiers, and limit each function to those rights, responsibilities, and authorities that have been explicitly assigned;

(D) protect ICANN from undue influence or capture by one or more governments or multilateral or intergovernmental organizations, or a single set of other commercial or noncommercial stakeholders;

(E) maintain the commitment of ICANN for final action regarding key policy decisions to demonstrate broad support by the community of ICANN stakeholders;

(F) reinforce and expand transparency and accountability measures to ensure community access to ICANN documents and records; and

(G) ensure that, prior to the execution of the transition of the stewardship of the functions of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority, each of the foregoing elements of such proposal is adopted and made effective by ICANN through incorporation in its articles of incorporation and by-laws, as needed, and subject to independent adjudication or arbitration for dispute resolution, as appropriate.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as congressional approval of any proposal by ICANN to transition the stewardship of the functions of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority to the global multistakeholder community.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 3

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 7, 2015, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 5, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on February 5, 2015, at 10 a.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a subcommittee hearing entitled ''Getting it Right on Data Breach and Notification Legislation in the 114th Congress''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Who's the Boss? The 'Joint Employer' Standard and Business Ownership.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on February 5, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select

Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 5, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Laura Sherman, a fellow in my office, be given floor privileges for the remainder of this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Susan Corbin, Jill Mueller, Paul Babiarz, and Charles Carithers, detailees to the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, be granted the privileges of the floor for the remainder of the first session of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Monday, February 9, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 10, the nomination of Michael P. Botticelli to be Director of National Drug Control Policy. I further ask that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided on the nomination, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation, and that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNET GOVERNANCE AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 71, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 71) designating the week of February 8 through February 14, 2015, as ''Internet Governance Awareness Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 71) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 405

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 405) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 9–93, as amended by Public Law 99–151, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: the Honorable CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa, Chairman.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, February 9; 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 the Senate then be in a period of morning business, equally divided, until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each. I further ask that at 5 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 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 5:58 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 9, 2015, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

JESSIE HILL ROBERSON, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

CHRISTOPHER A. HART, OF COLORADO, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

MARIA CANCIAN, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FAMILY SUPPORT, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE CARMEN R. NAZARIO.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CASSANDRA Q. BUTTS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS.

STAFFORD FITZGERALD HANEY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA.

NANCY BIKOFF PETTIT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

BENIGNO T. RAZON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

DONNA L. SMOAK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

FABIO O. AUSTRIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MELISSA C. AUSTIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

SHAWN D. WILKERSON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

BUDD E. BERGLOFF

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SAINT TIMOTHY COMMUNITY CHURCH EXPANSION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and admiration that I congratulate Saint Timothy Community Church in Gary, Indiana, as its congregation and church leaders join together to celebrate the opening of a new addition to the church, the Reverend Dr. Robert E. Lowery Ministry Center. The congregation, along with Senior Pastor Reverend Dr. Alfred Johnson, Assistant Pastor Reverend R. E. Robinson, the church staff, and the board of trustees led by President Greg Jones, will be celebrating the opening of the center with a dedication service led by Reverend Johnson on Sunday, February 8, 2015.

Saint Timothy Community Church was organized in 1926 and has continued to prosper throughout the years. With the deterioration of the existing fellowship hall, church leaders, board members, and parishioners agreed that it was time for a new addition to the church. In order to meet the needs of the growing congregation, the new Reverend Dr. Robert E. Lowery Ministry Center offers church members a variety of amenities geared toward innovative spiritual programs. The new community center houses seven classrooms, a nursery, small meeting rooms, a study area, a full service kitchen, and a banquet hall that seats up to 300 people. The center will also be used for a variety of events and will be available for use by community organizations.

The new center is dedicated to the memory of Reverend Dr. Robert E. Lowery, who ministered to Saint Timothy Community Church for 49 years. Dr. Lowery was a very well-respected and loved pastor, who earned the admiration of many citizens and community organizations throughout Northwest Indiana. His ministry was not only within the church but extended to hospitals, nursing homes, and on the streets. Dr. Lowery's remarkable contributions to Saint Timothy Community Church and to the people of Northwest Indiana and beyond are worthy of our deepest appreciation. His legacy serves as an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring Saint Timothy's Community Church and its congregation as they celebrate the opening of the Reverend Dr. Robert E. Lowery Ministry Center. For their commitment to service, and for touching the lives of countless individuals, the church leaders, parishioners, and board members are worthy of the blessings that have been bestowed upon them.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN COLLEGE

HON. AARON SCHOCK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the 150th anniversary of Lincoln College in Lincoln, Illinois, which is celebrating the creation of its charter on February 8th, 2015. Lincoln College is a private liberal arts college established in 1865 to fill the need for an institution of higher learning in central Illinois.

Lincoln College now has campuses in both Lincoln and Normal, Illinois. Lincoln College's mission is to uniquely empower students to realize their full potential. The College's dedicated faculty and exceptional student services produces graduates who are prepared to meet the challenges of today's 21st century economy. The students and alumni of Lincoln College truly live the school motto of ''Experience Outstanding'' through their academic performance, professional achievements, and commitment to improving their communities.

Over the last 150 years, Lincoln College has become an integral part of the Central Illinois higher education community. I am honored to represent an institution with such an outstanding track record in academic, sporting, and leadership achievements, and I am proud to rise today to congratulate them on their sesquicentennial celebration.

NATIONAL FILTRATION WEEK 2015 (APRIL 26–MAY 2, 2015)

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

WHEREAS, pollution and contamination prevention are at the heart of national government policy and at all levels of government in communities, businesses and public awareness; and

WHEREAS, filtration, separation and coalescing processes have been developed to meet the changing needs of all concerned parties for a cleaner and healthier environment; and

WHEREAS, the need for a healthier environment is inherent to enrich and shape our way of life and address issues across a broad spectrum of issues in everyday life; and

WHEREAS, the filtration, separations and coalescing industry consists of highly trained and skilled tech-savvy practitioners and professionals who constantly provide solutions to the industry's most critical un-met needs; and

WHEREAS, the industry offers training programs for industry R&D, product development and engineering personnel, it equally seeks to inform and provide insight, access and in-depth training to end-users seeking an improved environment and quality control to satisfy their needs; and

WHEREAS, liquid, air and coalescing industry workers, companies and supporters across America are celebrating National Filtration Week,

Now, I encourage all suppliers and users of filtration, separation and coalescing technologies in the power generation industry to take advantage of opportunities these technologies offer.

REMEMBERING JOSEPHINE ''JOSIE'' BETRAS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of Josephine ''Josie'' Betras who passed away peacefully on Sunday, February 1, in the presence of her family at the Saint Elizabeth Health Center in Youngstown, Ohio. Josie was born on January 20, 1926 to her loving parents John and Ida Zidian. As a lifelong resident of the Mahoning Valley, Josie attended East High School, and shortly after her graduation she worked alongside her father at the family's business, the John Zidian Grocery Store.

In 1951, Josie married her husband, Joseph Betras. The two were married for 48 wonderful years and as a devoted wife she supported and encouraged him to pursue his political interest. With her help Joseph built a successful law practice, served as a Mahoning County Court Judge, and a Boardman Township Trustee. Aside from being a dedicated wife Josie believed in the importance of being civically engaged. As a result she became an active member of the Mahoning County Bar Auxiliary, the Lebanese Syrian Club, and the Mahoning County Democratic Party's Central Committee. She also volunteered for the Mahoning County Board of Elections, Saint Marons Church, and Saint Marks Ladies Society in Liberty, Ohio.

Josie and Joseph committed their lives to their family and were the proud parents of two sons, Daryl and David. Her children, grandchildren, and loved ones were her favorite topic of conversation and her greatest source of pride and joy. Josie was a matriarch in our community who delighted in entertaining guests with her glorious Lebanese feasts and I will forever cherish the times we have shared over the years.

Preceded in death by her husband Joseph; parents John and Ida; brothers John, Joseph, and Charles; and her sister Freda, Josie's warm and sweet spirit will continue to live on through the many hearts and families she has touched. Josie is survived by her sons: Daryl and David; her brother Ron; her three grandchildren Joseph, Rosie, and Alexander; and a

number of nieces and nephews. Our community is a much better place to call home because of Josie's timeless memory and she will be deeply missed.

HONORING ANDREW CUNNINGHAM

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew Cunningham. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 708, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew Cunningham for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Black History Month and to pay tribute to two important African Americans from Alabama's First Congressional District.

While researching the history of some of my predecessors, I discovered that two of the earliest African Americans to serve in Congress actually represented the First Congressional District. Mr. Benjamin S. Turner served in the House of Representatives from 1871 to 1873, and Mr. Jeremiah Haralson served in the House from 1875 to 1877. I believe it is very fitting that we take time to recognize the lasting impact these individuals had on our area, but more importantly the influence they had on our nation.

Both Mr. Turner and Mr. Haralson were born into slavery and not provided a quality education. These men did not let slavery stop them from becoming educated, as both men worked hard to self-educate. After being freed from slavery, Mr. Turner and Mr. Haralson followed different paths to Congress. Mr. Turner became a successful businessman in south Alabama and was elected tax collector and councilman in Dallas County, Alabama. Mr. Haralson worked as a farmer and a minister before being elected to the Alabama State House of Representatives and later the Alabama State Senate. Both men would go on to represent the First Congressional District in Congress as Republicans, the same seat I now hold.

Mr. Speaker, these men serve as a great example and an important reminder about our nation's history. These men remind us of the great American ideal that each and every person, regardless of the color of their skin, should have an opportunity to achieve their dreams. Thanks to the dedication and persistence of men like Mr. Turner and Mr. Haralson, today there are 46 black lawmakers serving in the 114th Congress, including the first-ever female, black Republican.

So during Black History Month, I encourage all Americans to take time to reflect on the past because looking to the past is the only true way to really understand common humanity. Let us remember the impact of Representatives Turner and Haralson and the countless other African Americans from Southwest Alabama who have made a lasting impact on our cities, states, and country.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 596, REPEAL OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 596 a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

This is the 56th attempt by House Republicans to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

After 55 attempts it was my hope that this new Congress would begin its work in a more productive manner. We should be addressing the need to eliminate sequestration, the importance of raising the minimum wage, provide universal access to child care, and the passage of a jobs bill that rebuilds our nation's infrastructure.

Instead we continue to waste precious legislative time on fighting this effort to hurting Americans who need affordable, assessable and available healthcare.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. Instead of attempting to repeal and undermine this law, we should use our time to work together to make improvements where necessary and ensure its smooth implementation.

Many of those most in need of the healthcare coverage provided by the Affordable Care Act live in the Districts of many members on both sides of this argument. Texas, my own state, leads the list of states with the highest percentages of uninsured residents.

Those states with the highest percentage of uninsured base on a report by the Bureau of the Census "Health Insurance Coverage in the United States:

Texas with 22.1 percent, Florida with 20.0 percent, Nevada with 20.7 percent, Georgia with 18.8 percent, Alaska with 18.5 percent, Oklahoma with 17.7 percent, and Arizona with 17.1 percent.

The highest concentration of the uninsured is the poor. The Affordable Care Act provides to states at no cost options for residents to enroll in healthcare programs through Medicaid. Unfortunately, some states like my state of Texas has rejected this important component of the Affordable Care Act for those in the state in most need of healthcare.

Other states that have not adopted the provisions of the law that expand Medicaid include Texas, Florida, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, Louisiana, Alaska, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Kansas, Montana, Idaho, Utah, Missouri, Virginia, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming and Maine.

Instead of focusing on protecting and caring for the health of our constituents, we are allowing partisan games to interfere with serving the best interest of our Districts.

There are 20 days before enrollment in the online Marketplaces will begin, the House majority is bringing this bill to deter the implementation of this key provision of the Affordable Care Act.

This latest attempt to prevent implementation of Obamacare would stop any premium tax credits from being provided until the HHS Inspector General Office certifies there is a program in place that "successfully and consistently verifies" household income and coverage requirements for those applying for these credits.

Conveniently, there is no way that this new requirement would be met in a timely fashion because the HHS IG office does not have the resources, staff or expertise to undertake such a certification. Therefore, since the new requirement will likely not be met, the Affordable Care Act will be drastically inhibited.

The impact of the enactment of this GOP bill would be to delay millions of qualified Americans from getting health coverage. The new requirement would deny millions of our hard-working constituents from getting the premium tax credits they are clearly eligible for beginning on January 1, 2014.

This is how the income verification program under the HHS regulations works to hinder the Affordable Care Act.

To get tax credits to make their health insurance affordable, individuals will have to submit their projected annual household income.

All income data submitted through the Marketplaces will be checked with IRS data, Social Security data, and current wage information.

If there is an inconsistency between income projection claims and proven past income, the Marketplaces will require additional documentation from applicants.

In addition, Marketplaces will check employer coverage information from the applicant and their employer against data from the: Office of Personnel Management and the SHOP Marketplaces (where available) as well as other data sources approved by HHS to verify eligibility for the tax credits.

If applicant information and other data do not match, the Marketplaces will ask for further supporting documentation.

Furthermore, all payments of premium tax credits are reconciled by IRS the following year. The income data submitted is reconciled against the actual wages and health coverage information on the individual's income tax return. If there is an inconsistency, the applicant pays back the excess, subject to statutory limit. There is l00% income verification and reconciliation on this back-end.

I cannot understand the continuous rejection by the Republicans against the Affordable Care act when the idea of everyone paying something towards their healthcare was a Republican idea put into practice in the State of Massachusetts by the former Republican presidential candidate, Mitt Romney.

Instead of focusing on the issues that the American people want addressed—we are having the same discussion to repeal the Affordable Care Act in efforts of my colleagues to repeal, obstruct and undermine this law. What is even more frustrating is that while there is so much energy in trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act, there has been no plan or suggestions posed on how to replace it.

I want to once again highlight the benefits of the Affordable Care Act so we can once in for all end the attempts to try and repeal this law that benefits so many Americans. Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans are already seeing lower costs, better coverage, and patient protections that Republicans want to repeal:

13 million Americans benefited from $1.1 billion in rebates sent to them from their health insurance companies last year.

105 million Americans have access to free preventive services, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors on Medicare.

Millions of women began receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive services in August 2012.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage.

Nearly 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 have health insurance through their parents' plan, half of whom would be uninsured without this coverage.

6.3 million Seniors in the 'donut hole' have already saved $6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 small employers have already taken advantage of the Small Business Health Care Tax Credit to provide health insurance to 2 million workers.

Because of the Affordable Care Act 3.8 million people in Texas—including 2.2 million seniors on Medicare now receive preventative care services. Over 7 million Texans no longer have to fear lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance. Texas parents of 300,731 young adults can sleep easier at night knowing that their children can remain on their health insurance until age 26.

The protection provided by this law is a guarantee to 5 million Texas residents that their insurance companies will spend 80 percent of their premium dollars on healthcare, or customers will get a rebate from their insurance company.

In my state, there are 4,029 people who had no insurance because of pre-existing conditions, but today the Affordable Care Act has provided them with access to coverage. The Affordable Care Act means that many Texans are free of worry about having access to healthcare insurance.

However, the list of benefits from the Affordable Care Act is not completed. In 2014, the Affordable Care Act's final provisions will become available to our citizens. Insurance companies will be banned from: discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition, charging higher rates based on gender or health status, enforcing lifetime dollar limits, enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

In 2014, access to affordable healthcare for the self employed or those who decide to purchase their own coverage will be easier because of Affordable Insurance Exchanges. There will be a one stop marketplace where consumers can do what Federal employees have done for decades—purchase insurance at reasonable rates from an insurer of their choice. This will assure that health care consumers can get the care that they need from the medical professionals they trust.

This Congress has work that needs to be done, and it has work that should be taken up to restore workers, their families and communities to sound economic health, not play partisan political games.

I urge my Colleagues to put partisan politics aside and join me in voting no on the passage of this bill.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Congressman DONALD PAYNE, Jr. and Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY for hosting this evening's Special Order. I appreciate your leadership in organizing this important discussion.

Today we ask: where we were, where we are, and where we are headed. This year, we celebrate 50 years from the March in Selma. 50 years from the signing of the pivotal Voting Rights Act. Over that last 50 years, much has changed. But the work remains unfinished.

Fifty years ago, civil rights leaders and concerned citizens marched in Selma for freedom. The freedom to vote, to assemble, to petition their government—the Constitutional protections enshrined in our nation's Constitution.

It was a fight to end legal, Jim Crow segregation in the South that actively and systemically suppressed African Americans. But it was also a fight to protect all Americans—as Dr. King wrote in his famous letter from the Birmingham Jail: ''injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.''

We are still fighting to end injustice in our nation—we are fighting for economic justice and justice under the law.

Nearly 50 years ago, Dr. King outlined the two Americas that still exist today.

In a speech on April 14th, 1967 at Stanford University, Dr. King explained: ''there are literally two Americas. One America is beautiful for situation. And, in a sense, this America is overflowing with the milk of prosperity and the honey of opportunity. . . . tragically and unfortunately, there is another America. This other America has a daily ugliness about it that constantly transforms the ebulliency of hope into the fatigue of despair.''

Ladies and gentlemen—tragically, there are still two Americas.

Systemic and institutional disparities and inequality are endemic at every level of our society—a legacy born in the suffering of the Middle Passage, nurtured through slavery and preserved with Jim Crow.

Today, we see this legacy in African American unemployment that is more than twice the unemployment rate of whites.

We see it in poverty rates for African Americans that are nearly three times the rate of white Americans.

We see it in the faces of the 1 in 3 black men who will have spent some time of their life in jail.

Mr. Speaker—In many ways, we are still living in two Americas. One of poverty, unemployment and injustice.

Mr. Speaker—too many are being left behind.

Sadly, Congressional leadership has decided to pursue partisan gridlock instead of acting for the millions of struggling Americans.

Tragically, many of the rights we fought for 50 years ago we are still fighting today. Congress has reauthorized the Voting Rights Act four times, with large bipartisan support. However, there has been no Congressional action since the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act. Not one hearing, not one vote and the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee has made clear, on this floor, that he has no intentions of taking up this matter.

Likewise, the deaths of Eric Garner, Michael Brown, Tamir Rice, Oscar Grant—one of my constituents—and many others illustrate that there are still two Americas.

Recent events forced us to ask ourselves do Black lives matter? Yes—black lives matter. Brown lives matter. White lives matter—all lives matter.

Our institutions must reflect this core value that all lives matters. We in Congress have a duty to get serious about reforming our broken criminal justice system. We need to repeal unfair sentencing laws, increase police force diversity, improve racial sensitivity training, end the school-to-prison pipeline and work to re-integrate ex-offenders back into society.

The Black Lives Matter movement parallels the Civil Rights Movement's call to action, a movement to that calls us to end economic despair, drives out hate and fear and embrace love, and unseats the unjust status quo.

While Americans from all walks of life continue to protest and demand for change, Congress must hear their call and work to enact real change.

Like Congress acted 50 years ago after Selma, we were sent to Washington to address the issues facing our nation—let's start working on the structural and racial biases that pervades and poisons our institutions.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the Grand Jury Reform Act, which authorizes an appointment of a special prosecutor to conduct an investigation and present the results to a judge in a probable cause hearing, open to the public, whenever a police officer kills an individual while acting in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker—We must pass this bill.

I have also introduced the Half in Ten Act to create a national strategy to cut the poverty rate in half over the next decade and lift 22 million Americans into the middle class.

Mr. Speaker—We must also pass this bill.

As a nation, we have made progress against racism and injustice. But we are backsliding.

We cannot lose the prize that our forefathers and mothers fought, bled and died to obtain and preserve. The soul of our nation is at stake.

Today, we carry the banner of Dr. King, Rosa Parks, and Medgar Evers. We have a duty to continue the fight for freedom, equality and justice.

This means Congress working together—Republican and Democrat—to pass important legislation to address unemployment and poverty and protect the voting rights of all.

The American dream of equality, freedom, liberty, justice and life must be more than just words. It must be a promise to all Americans, regardless of race, gender, place of birth, disability, sexual orientation or gender identity, nationality or religion.

Together, we can continue the unfinished work of creating a more perfect union.

HONORING LOGAN RODGERS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Logan Rodgers. Logan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 708, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Logan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Logan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Logan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Logan Rodgers for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 51, due to inclement weather, I was unable to vote on H.R. 361, Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

TRIBUTE TO MARJORIE ANN SHARP

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Marjorie Ann Sharp, a woman of great faith and an instrumental leader in Indiana's Wayne County Council.

Marjorie was a loving and devoted wife to her husband of 62 years, Karl. Together, they were the proud parents of three children, five grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. They were also my friends. As active members of the Central United Methodist Church, Marjorie and her family valued their faith and were diligent leaders within the Richmond community. She served for an impressive 16 years on the Wayne County Council and, furthermore, became the first female to serve as President of the County Council.

Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of Marjorie Ann Sharp. My thoughts and prayers go out to Marjorie's family during this difficult time. May God comfort those close to her with His peace and strength.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AWARE ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleague and co-chair of the Congressional Animal Protection Caucus, MIKE FITZPATRICK, I am pleased to introduce the Animal Welfare in Agricultural Research Endeavors, or AWARE Act. This bill would ensure that farm animals used in agricultural research at federal research facilities are included in the definition of ''animal'' under the Animal Welfare Act.

A January 20, 2015 front page article in the New York Times, ''U.S. Research Lab Lets Livestock Suffer in Quest for Profit: Animal Welfare at Risk in Experiments for Meat Industry,'' examined horrendous abuses at the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center in Clay Center, Nebraska. In the last 30 years, over half a million animals have been housed at the center. The center's experiments have included experiments to increase the number of twin births in cows and expand the litter size of pigs, without consideration of animal health impacts, and trying to breed ''easy care'' lambs that are born in open fields without human assistance—all with horrifying, and often unsuccessful results.

At least 6,500 animals are known to have starved to death at this facility alone. Unknown numbers have died from negligence such as easily treatable infections, exposure to bad weather, or attacks by predators. In just the last 10 years, this single center has cost nearly $200 million with taxpayers footing the bill for this shocking abuse of animals.

Appallingly, these animals are not currently protected under federal law. While the Animal Welfare Act ensures that certain minimum standards of humane care are required for federal and private research facilities, there is an exemption for farm animals ''used or intended for use for improving animal nutrition, breeding, management, or production efficiency, or for improving the quality of food or fiber''—from those basic protections. As a result, federal facilities like the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center don't have to obey the Animal Welfare Act.

This is why we are introducing the AWARE Act, which would close this loophole at federal research facilities. It is time that we step up to stop this horrible misuse of taxpayer funds. There is no reason that USDA agricultural research facilities experimenting on farm animals should not be held to the same standard as federal research facilities that conduct life-saving disease research with the same kinds of animals.

This is a small step that this Congress can take quickly to show that we respond to animal abuse and that the federal government will lead by example.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,098,502,229,899.75. We've added $7,471,625,180,986.67 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE 70TH BIRTHDAY OF JAMES GOODE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the seventieth birthday of one of my distinguished and active constituents, James Goode of Farmers Branch, Texas.

James has been a strong and hardworking member of this community for many decades. He has been an active role model and his eagerness to be involved has resonated throughout the area. He is Chairman of the Board of the Farmers Branch Chamber of Commerce, President of Carrollton-Farmers Branch Independent School District Board of Trustees, and is active in his church are just a few examples of his involvement among his peers. James is someone who sets out and makes a positive difference in everyone's life around him.

James also served our country in the Navy for four years and earned his B.S. in electrical engineering from the University of Texas-Arlington before settling down in Farmers Branch. His political involvement and strong engagement in the community provides a commendable example to others in the 24th district. As president of the school board, he exercises positive influence over the local education system and his reliable leadership style has helped many and will help the coming generations of children learn and excel to the best of their ability.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the seventieth birthday of one of my most engaged constituents, Mr. James Goode. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating this milestone in his remarkable life.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman DONALD PAYNE, Jr., and the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman ROBIN

KELLY, for organizing this important Special Order on the legacy of the events at Selma, Alabama.

As Ava DuVarney's Oscar-nominated film ''Selma'' continues to foster discussion about the history of the Civil Rights Movement and bring the horrific events of ''Bloody Sunday'' to life for a new generation, I believe there is no better time to reflect on our journey, both past and ahead.

The march from Selma to Montgomery stands out as one of the defining moments of the Civil Rights Movement in the 20th century. The images are seared into the minds of Americans, and serve as a constant reminder of the violence and injustice that our predecessors faced as they strove for equal representation.

Violence that claimed the life of Jimmy Lee Jackson, beaten by state troopers as he tried to protect his mother and grandmother. His death was a catalyst that ignited the community and inspired the march.

Violence that claimed the lives of Reverend James Reeb of Boston and Viola Liuzzo of Detroit, who had journeyed to Selma to join the protests after the events at Edmund Pettus Bridge on ''Bloody Sunday'' had been broadcast across America.

In spite of all the violence, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his fellow protestors held their heads high and remained committed to their cause, a cause which touched people across the nation, so that when they reached Montgomery the crowd had swelled to 25,000 strong.

The actions of those brave men and women were a shout to the world that injustice and oppression would no longer be tolerated. Their struggles ensured that the blood that was shed, the lives that were lost were not in vain.

The very next week, President Lyndon Johnson announced to the nation that he would put legislation before Congress to eliminate barriers to the right to vote.

We have made great strides towards equality and towards justice since those tumultuous events in Selma, Alabama.

We are honored today to serve alongside Rep. JOHN LEWIS, who experienced firsthand that fight for rights and representation.

This congress counts 44 black members among its number, and thanks to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, millions of African-Americans can proudly cast their votes and make their voices heard.

But our work is far from done. The dreams of Dr. King and of all those who gave their lives in the struggle for civil rights are not behind us. They are ahead.

In the wake of the Supreme Court's ruling which severely crippled the Voting Rights Act, states across our nation enacted legislation designed to limit the ability of women, the elderly, African-Americans to exercise their right to vote.

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

Such an act is a direct affront to all those who participated in the march to Montgomery, as well as anyone who values the principles of true democracy.

It was exactly these principles that motivated 13 students from Texas Southern University to stage a sit-in in Houston 55 years ago in pursuit of desegregation.

Their actions remind us of that guiding ideal that no action is too small, too local to affect change in our society.

The Voting Rights Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation in American history, and it represents not only the hope, but also the blood and tears of millions of Americans.

We must work, through legislation like the Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2014, to strengthen it and protect the achievements of Dr. King, Ralph Abernathy, Andrew Young, Hosea Williams, and all those who made securing the right to vote for African-Americans their life's work.

The freedom to vote is not the only freedom for which we must continue to fight. Across America, our communities struggle for their economic freedom, for the right to opportunity and to financial security.

In 2014, black unemployment was twice that of white Americans, and they are more than twice as likely to live in poverty.

Median income for a black household was $33,764, a mere 60% of median income for a white household.

For these reasons, I will continue to advocate for legislation to benefit the working class, to benefit those members of our community who continue to struggle with unemployment and underemployment.

We need legislation that creates new jobs, and legislation that provides our citizens with the training that they need to break the cycle of unemployment.

We must understand that the minimum wage is not a living wage, and that, without action, we are condemning those with minimum wage jobs to a lifetime of hardship.

Thank you again for this opportunity to speak, and for bringing these issues to the forefront of the conversation.

As we move forward with our work, let us remember the lessons of Selma, of the past. Let them serve as our inspiration and strengthen our resolve as we look to the future and continue our efforts to protect the freedoms and opportunities of the American people.

Tonight I call upon all people of good will, those who Dr. King called the Beloved Community, to join hands and march toward an agenda of healing, justice and equality in commemoration of those historic events.

We march to preserve equality at the voting booth. We march to bring an end to systemic poverty and disenfranchisement. We march because we believe that all lives matter, and that this truth makes our country great.

HONORING LOGAN GARTON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Logan Garton. Logan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 708, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Logan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Logan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Logan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Logan Garton for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 52 due to inclement weather, I was unable to vote on H.R. 615, Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

THE PEOPLE'S PRESIDENT TURNS 104

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Liberals loathed him. Conservatives idolized him. The middle overwhelmingly loved him. He charmed America. His knack to connect was unmistakable. And although many have tried to replicate his charisma and appeal, no one has ever come close to being Ronald Reagan.

He made us laugh when we didn't think we could, or should. He always had a way to comfort us in the midst of tragedy. He could disarm the press with a one-liner; and get a chuckle from even his fiercest opponents.

The first time I saw Ronald Reagan was at the 1968 Republican Convention in Miami Beach. Much to the dismay of my dyed-in-the-wool Democrat grandmother, I was there as a proud Texas College Republican delegate.

He lost the nomination to Nixon, but I was sold on Reagan from that moment on.

Of course, I instantly like him for his automobile of choice a jeep. I drove the same kind and still do. He appealed to me and other renegade conservatives my age, particularly those of us in the yellow-dog South, because we were a herd without a shepherd. Back then, it was taboo to be a Republican in Texas. But then, along came Reagan. We were Reagan Republicans.

Reagan cut the class warfare. He transformed the country-club GOP image, and brought conservatism out of the shadows. It was cool to be a conservative. He represented what Americans wanted Democrats and Republicans alike. He wasn't the Grand Old Party leader; he was the people's president.

Reagan's tenure in the White House saw some of the most historic events in our country and the world. His line, ''Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall,'' will probably resonate for time immemorial.

Although criticized by his foes for being a Hollywood actor, Reagan masterfully engineered a feat that so-called political experts

had little confidence could be accomplished the end of the Cold War.

Within minutes of his swearing in, news broke in one of the most widely followed situations of that time. President Reagan announced the Iran hostage crisis was over. The Americans were coming home. Make no mistake the significance of his election was an intimidating and influential factor in their release.

When the entire country was devastated by the *Challenger* tragedy, Reagan addressed a grieving nation by giving one of his most memorable and touching speeches. His ability to heal the brokenhearted was more than an admired political attribute. He never talked above the people, always to the people. It was what made him one of us. He just got it.

And of course, there is his most beloved legacy. He single handedly made the jelly bean a national treasure.

Reagan never took himself too seriously. Even when his own life was on the line, the leader of the free world was cracking jokes. On his way into emergency surgery after the 1981 assassination attempt, he looked up at the surgeons and said, ''I hope you are all Republicans.''

While he was a one-of-a kind politician the Everyman of our time. He was a pull yourself up by the boot straps kind of guy.

From union halls to country clubs, everyone felt like Reagan was one of them. Being an American meant something to him He was unabashedly unapologetic for our country's success.

He was the great defender of capitalism. Reaganomics was hailed ingenious by the supply-side, pro-growth economists and harshly criticized as voodoo by the big government crowd.

Reagan proved that lower taxes and leaner government stimulates growth, spurs private enterprise, inspires harder work and enables more savings and investment.

In the midst of another presidential election, Americans find themselves wondering where our next Ronald Reagan is. The American people got it then, and they want it back now.

As we celebrate the 104th birthday of President Reagan this Friday (or the 65th anniversary of his 39th birthday; he never missed a chance to poke fun at his own age), we should learn from The Great Communicator.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call votes 59–64 due to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted no on #59, no on #60, no on #56, yes on #61, yes on #62, yes on #63, and no on #64.

HONORING TIM WEBB AND JUSTIN WOOTEN

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I submit remarks in honor of Mr. Tim Webb and Mr. Justin Wooten, communications officers at the Galax Police Department's dispatch center, and also in recognition of the important work of all emergency dispatchers.

On December 29, 2014, Mr. Webb was working his routine shift when he took an incoming call from Cheri Grable and her daughter Melissa, who were caring for 17-month-old Aidan Paul Walker, Melissa's son. Aidan had been running a slight fever, but it took a sudden, dramatic spike, which caused him to convulse violently. Aidan stopped breathing, and his eyes rolled back into his head.

Mr. Webb's partner at the dispatch center, Mr. Justin Wooten, dispatched the call and fielded other duties so Mr. Webb could assist Cheri and Melissa with young Aidan.

However, the nearest ambulance was nearly 20 minutes from their home. When it was made clear that neither Cheri nor Melissa were trained in CPR, Mr. Webb—who is a certified CPR instructor and had worked for Laurel and Pipers Gap rescue squads for 20 years—walked Cheri through performing CPR and helping Aidan breathe again. As noted by WSLS' Bethany Teague, this is especially notable because the Galax Police Department does not have emergency medical dispatch certification, so dispatchers like Mr. Webb typically are not allowed to provide CPR instructions over the phone.

''I never have done CPR on anybody,'' Cheri told the Galax Gazette. ''[A]nd [Mr. Webb] told me what to do, and I did it, and the baby came back to life.''

Aidan began breathing about a minute into the CPR. But Mr. Webb stayed with them over the phone, checking the boy's pulse and keeping Cheri and Melissa calm. About 18 minutes after the dispatch call, the ambulance arrived and EMTs took Aidan on board. He was taken to Northern Hospital in Surry County, North Carolina for further treatment.

Galax Police Chief Rick Clark said of Mr. Webb, ''He did an exceptional job. He deserves to be recognized. In my mind he's a hero.''

However, Mr. Webb wishes to share his recognition with his partner that day, Mr. Wooten. Mr. Webb said, ''Without him, this couldn't have been a success. Without Justin taking care of other calls while this was going on . . . if one person had tried to handle this call, dispatch and handle radio traffic as well . . . I just don't know that it could have been done. Within the first 15 seconds, he had it dispatched. And he's only worked with me a year. For someone with that level of experience—he really deserves a pat on the back.''

This isn't the only recognition Mr. Webb has received for his work. Last spring, he and other 911 dispatchers received an award from the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials' Virginia Chapter for their efforts in regards to the tragic 2013 Easter Sunday car accident on Interstate 77, which involved more than 90 vehicles.

The efforts of communications officers such as Mr. Webb, Mr. Wooten, and other emergency workers may go largely unrecognized, but their actions and service to the community are to be commended. I am honored to pay tribute to Mr. Webb, Mr. Wooten, and others like them. Please join me in thanking Mr. Webb, Mr. Wooten, and others for all that they have done and continue to do for the people of this great nation.

175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTER FOR SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the charter for Southwestern University in Georgetown, TX. The Lone Star State's first institution of higher education and Texas' leading undergraduate liberal arts and sciences university, Southwestern has progressed from its early pioneering roots to become a vibrant and diverse center of growth and potential.

By fostering a liberal arts community whose values and actions encourage contributions toward the well-being of humanity, Southwestern reflects the best values of Central Texas. Southwestern offers small classes and numerous collaborative undergraduate research opportunities. Over 1,500 students enjoy the warm, small-town feel of historic Georgetown as well as the close proximity of Austin with its vibrant, innovative, and creative culture. Outside the classroom, students are civically engaged and volunteer in the community at more than twice the national average. Half of all students study abroad and most take advantage of leadership, service, and activism opportunities in Southwestern's 90+ student organizations.

Engaging minds remains at the forefront of the university's mission. Southwestern professors balance the highest level of scholarship with a serious dedication to teaching and collaboration with our students. The university has been recognized as a leading institution of higher learning. Both U.S. News & World Report and USA Today College rank Southwestern University the top national liberal arts colleges in Texas. Southwestern is consistently recognized as one of 40 colleges in the publication Colleges That Change Lives.

I'm proud that Southwestern University calls my congressional district home. For 175 years, this great college has been transforming lives and preparing our nation's next generation of leaders for success. I wish Southwestern University only the best as it continues its proud mission of scholarly excellence.

INTRODUCTION OF H. RES. 92, RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROJECT HEAD START

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and deep appreciation for the opportunities this great nation affords to its citizens that I rise to announce that joined by more than 65 co-sponsors, I have today introduced H. Res. 92, a resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of Project Head Start, one of the signal achievements of the Great Society and boldest initiatives launched by the nation in the War on Poverty.

Launched in the White House Rose Garden on May 18, 1965, by President Lyndon Baines

Johnson, the aim of Project Head Start was bold and audacious in its scope and design.

As President Johnson stated in announcing the opening of a new front in the War on Poverty with the launch of Project Head Start:

''We set out to make certain that poverty's children would not be forevermore poverty's captives. . . .

''This means that nearly half the preschool children of poverty will get a head start on their future. . . .

''These children will receive preschool training to prepare them for regular school in September. . . .

''They will get medical and dental attention that they badly need, and parents will receive counseling on improving the home environment.''

Conceived as an eight-week summer program designed to provide pre-school training not just to prepare 5 and 6 year-olds to enter regular school the following September, but also to give nearly half the preschool children living in poverty ''a head start on their future.''

At its launch, the Head Start Program, administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity and wonderfully and skillfully led by its Director, Sargent Shriver, consisted of 2,500 projects, covering 11,000 Child Development Centers, serving about 530,000 poor children in every state of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson recognized that the bleak future waiting for children trapped in poverty was not a phenomenon concentrated in the inner-cities of the large urban cities of the North but could be found in every region in every state in the nation.

That is why the Head Start Program was launched not as a mere demonstration project limited to a handful of counties, but as a program national in scope serving every city, suburb, and rural area in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to providing preschool training to prepare poor children to enter regular school and help put them on an even footing with their classmates as they enter school, the Head Start Program had an even higher aim and nobler purpose: to assist children prepare for the challenges they will face in life and to combat poverty's great weapons—hunger and malnutrition; illness and poor health; ignorance and cultural deprivation.

Project Head Start was from the start a national undertaking, utilizing the services of 41,000 professionals, including teachers, doctors, dentists, nurses, nutritionists, employing more than 47,000 persons, who were assisted by more than 500,000 volunteers.

Based on its initial success as a summer program, the following year, in 1966, Head Start was funded as a primarily part day, 9 month program, largely through existing community action programs.

In later years, the Head Start Program would be expanded to serve children with disabilities, Native Americans, homeless children, and to provide bilingual and bicultural migrant and seasonal programs serving 6,000 children in 21 states.

Today, the Head Start Program serves nearly a million poor children, including:

160,829 enrolled in Early Head Start for 3-year olds;

910,833 enrolled in Head Start;

20,627 American Indian/Alaska Native children enrolled in Head Start;

4,722 American Indian/Alaska Native children enrolled in Early Head Start;

32,082 children of migrant or seasonal workers enrolled in Head Start; and

40,853 homeless children enrolled in Head Start.

Additionally, Head Start Program serves 136,120 children with disabilities, 15,632 pregnant women, and provides services to 771,840 families.

In my home state of Texas, the Head Start Program serves 661,000 poor children under the age of 5, including 2,471 homeless children, 8,370 children with disabilities, and provides services to 53,333 families.

And in my home city of Houston, a remarkable organization called AVANCE has been serving the needs of low-income children and families since its founding in 1973.

AVANCE offers Head Start, Early Head Start, Parenting, Healthy Marriage, Fatherhood, and other programs designed to prepare and help low-income children, students, and families reach their potential.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the Head Start Program been a great benefit to its direct beneficiaries, it has provided substantial economic and social benefits to the nation as a whole.

Research studies have shown that for each dollar invested, the Head Start program yields a rate of return on investment (ROI) of 7–9 percent and the program is responsible for the direct creation of 236,591 jobs, with an average annual salary of about $31,000 for Head Start teachers with baccalaureate degrees.

Mr. Speaker, another societal benefit of the Head Start Program is the improved health of the children and families it serves.

Research has shown that the mortality rates for 5- to 9-year-old children who had attended Head Start are 33–50% lower than the rates for comparable children not enrolled in Head Start.

Moreover, Head Start children are less likely to fall victim to childhood obesity and are at least 8% more likely to have had their immunizations than children who did not attend preschool.

Mr. Speaker, the Head Start Program has been an unqualified success for the more than 31 million children and parents it has served since its inception in 1965.

And so it is that we can look back with pride on the 50 year record of this bold and innovative program.

But we cannot yet be satisfied because our work is not done and will not be done until every eligible child is afforded the opportunity to get a head start in life the program provides.

Today, only 42 percent of eligible low-income preschoolers are actually served by Head Start and less than 4 percent are in Early Head Start.

But we should not let the fact that we have more work to do to strengthen the Head Start Program detract from the joy and happiness we are justified in deriving from its half century of success and its vindication of our optimistic belief in the capacity of Americans to solve pressing national problems when people of goodwill work together in the spirit of cooperation rather than conflict.

The record of the Head Start Program shows that it can be done and that President Johnson was right—the Head Start Program was and is ''one of the most constructive, and one of the most sensible, and also one of the most exciting programs that this Nation has ever undertaken.''

And its reward for this bold act is the collective service and contributions to the betterment of society made by the 31 million children that have been served by the program over the past 50 years.

I invite all Members of the House to join me in sponsoring the resolution celebrating the 50 year record of success of the Head Start Program and urge the Speaker to schedule H. Res. 92 for floor debate and vote at the earliest possible time so that the House may have the opportunity to pass the resolution on or before the May 18, 2015 anniversary date.

I thank all of my colleagues who joined me as original cosponsors of H. Res. 92, and I also wish to express my thanks and appreciation to Chelsea Ukoha and Gregory Berry of my staff for their exceptional efforts and work on this wonderful tribute to a program that has contributed so much to the richness and vitality of our country.

REINTRODUCING THE LENA HORNE RECOGNITION ACT OF 2015

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Lena Horne Recognition Act of 2015, which would award the Congressional Gold Medal to the late, renowned singer, actress, and Civil Rights icon, Ms. Lena Mary Calhoun Horne.

As an African American woman born in 1917, Ms. Horne, who passed away in 2010, was truly a woman of firsts, having pioneered the way for many men and women of color through her work in Jazz, film, and the Civil Rights movement. She began her career in the chorus line at Harlem's famed Cotton Club before moving on to record dozens of musical tracks and playing roles in movies and musicals.

As a young woman, Lena drew much fame from her beauty and talent, yet found many roadblocks in her personal success due to the hyper-racialized nature of show business at the time. However, this adversity would not limit her, and presented a platform for her increasing support of and action in the Civil Rights movement.

The first to do so, Lena signed a long term contract with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM) and embarked on a career in Hollywood, as her celebrity had been noticed by many, despite the color of her skin. She was also the first African American woman to be nominated for a Tony Award. However, again, she found road blocks in her professional life, due to state-law restrictions in on-screen interracial relationships as well as the need to have her roles edited out for Jim Crow abiding viewers. Blacklisted during the period of McCarthyism in the 1950s, Ms. Horne still recorded what would become the best-selling album by a female singer in RCA Victor's history in 1957.

From music and film, Lena had built a substantial fan base, and by the 1960s, at the peak of the Civil Rights movement, she became a staple on Television. She had become so renowned in popular culture despite her race that she appeared on shows such as the Dean Martin Show and Ed Sullivan Show. In 1970, Horne co-starred with well known actor,

Harry Belafonte, on a show for ABC donning their names—''Harry and Lena.'' She would go on to play herself on The Muppet Show, Sesame Street, and Sanford and Son. In 1981, Lena then received two Grammy awards and a special Tony award for her cast recording of her Broadway show, Lena Horne: The Lady and Her Music. In 1989, she received a Grammy Lifetime Achievement Award.

Amongst her many awards, Ms. Horne was the recipient of the Kennedy Center honor for lifetime contribution to the arts in 1984. She received two stars on the Hollywood Walk of Fame—for her work in both motion pictures and recording—in addition to a footprint on the International Civil Rights Walk of Fame at the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site. Lena always fought back when opportunities presented themselves.

For example, during World War II, Lena had been slated to perform for segregated troops of U.S. servicemen. She was appalled to find that African American servicemen had been seated behind German prisoners of war, and refused to partake unless she could sing before an integrated group. As a compromise, Lena left the stage and sang directly in front of her African American counterparts, with the German prisoners of war to her rear.

Lena notably remained committed to bettering lives of the underserved and underrepresented for the entirety of her life. An active participant in the movement, Lena met President John F. Kennedy shortly before his assassination, marched in the March on Washington, and ultimately performed and spoke on behalf of the NAACP, SNCC, and National Council of Negro Women. Also notable is the work that she engaged in with Former First Lady, Eleanor Roosevelt to pass anti-lynching laws. Lena was awarded the Spingarn Medal from the NAACP in 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in support of honoring Lena Horne posthumously with a Congressional Gold Medal, for her outstanding contributions to American culture and the Civil Rights Movement. A beautiful person inside-out, Lena willed her talent, intelligence, and fame to fight against discrimination, traversing her career on a road filled with pot holes full of racial bias and degradation. Lena represents the very best of American ideals and signifies the true purpose of the American Dream.

HONORING CAPTAIN JEREMY W. POWELL, TECHNICAL SERGEANT MARK B. CORNETT, TECHNICAL SERGEANT BENJAMIN G. JACOBS, TECHNICAL SERGEANT JAMES J. JUNIPER, STAFF SERGEANT CHRISTOPHER D. RECTOR, HONOREES IN THE PORTRAITS IN COURAGE

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Captain Jeremy W. Powell, Technical Sergeant Mark B. Cornett, Technical Sergeant Benjamin G. Jacobs, Technical Sergeant James J. Juniper, and Staff Sergeant Christopher D. Rector who were included in the newest volume of the U.S. Air Force's Portraits in Courage.

Portraits in Courage highlight United States Air Force Airmen whose stories exemplify what it means to serve our country. These stories feature Airmen who ''remind us that our core values are more than slogans.''

On October 8, 2013, Captain Jeremy W. Powell, Staff Sergeant Christopher D. Rector, (then) Staff Sergeant Mark B. Cornett, (then) Staff Sergeant Benjamin G. Jacobs, and Technical Sergeant James J. Juniper were flying a routine mission when they responded to assist the evacuation of wounded coalition's troops. Under heavy fire, Captain Powell and his crew provided cover to the wounded unit. During the firefight, Technical Sergeant Juniper, who was manning the Mi–17 helicopter's M240 machinegun, was seriously wounded. (Then) Staff Sergeant Cornett and (then) Staff Sergeant Jacobs came to the aide of Technical Sergeant Juniper who was bleeding and unconscious on the aircraft's cabin floor.

Despite an extremely hostile environment and continual exposure to enemy fire, the advisors' aircraft remained overhead long enough to provide their wingmen the cover they needed to evacuate critically-wounded Afghans. The crew then retreated into safe airspace and made their way eighty miles to the nearest coalition base. Upon arrival, the crew learned that medical vehicles were unavailable. As such, (then) Staff Sergeant Jacobs and (then) Staff Sergeant Cornett were forced to commandeer a truck to rush Technical Sergeant Juniper to the nearest medical zone.

As a strong supporter of the United States Air Force, I am proud to represent the servicemen and women at Fairchild Air Force Base in Eastern Washington. Not only do these servicemen and women and their families make daily sacrifices to keep our nation safe, but they are integral members of our community.

So today, I rise to recognize Captain Jeremy W. Powell, Technical Sergeant Mark B. Cornett, Technical Sergeant Benjamin G. Jacobs, Technical Sergeant James J. Juniper, and Staff Sergeant Christopher D. Rector upon their inclusion in this year's Portraits in Courage. The outstanding heroism displayed deserves great recognition by the entire United States, the nation they have so selflessly served.

THE PASSING OF JAMES P. McINTYRE

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember a lifelong Rhode Islander who dedicated his life to his country and to his family. James McIntyre leaves behind eight children, 13 grandchildren and two great-grandchildren, and I have no doubt that his absence will be felt by them every day.

James served this nation in the Korean War, and after leaving the U.S. Army, he went on to become a longtime surveyor for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He never hesitated to lend a hand to family or friends. He was always eager to tackle a project, earning him a reputation as the resident handyman, and the first one to call when something needed fixing. His generosity of spirit was extended to his friends at the Knights of Columbus, and to all who asked.

I have had the honor of working with James's daughter, Nancy Beattie, for more than 20 years. Nancy is my director of constituent services and one of the kindest, most generous and genuine people that I have ever met. She works tirelessly on behalf of my constituents, and is a living representation of the values that James instilled in his family. My deepest condolences go out to Nancy and to James's loving wife of 61 years, Margaret McIntyre, and I know my colleagues will join me in extending our sympathy to the entire McIntyre family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 53 due to inclement weather, I was unable to vote on H.R. 623, Social Media Working Group Act. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT ANNIVERSARY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today on February 5, 2015, we celebrate the 22nd anniversary of the Family and Medical Leave Act, a family-friendly workplace policy that has benefited millions of American families. Since its passage in 1993, this landmark law has been used 200 million times by men and women across the nation. These individuals and their families have benefited from up to 12 weeks of unpaid job protected leave to care for a new child, sick family member, or a loved one recovering from a serious health condition.

While we celebrate this anniversary we must also recognize that after more than two decades our nation's family leave policies have not kept pace with changes to America's families and workforce. FMLA provides unpaid leave, which means families must choose between foregoing a paycheck and caring for a loved one. Most families today no longer have a stay-at-home parent to care for a new child, and even before the economic crisis, few could afford to go without pay for any length of time.

We need new policies that show that we truly value America's families. That is why I recently introduced the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act, legislation that provides federal employees with 6 weeks of paid leave following the birth, adoption, or fostering of a child. The Federal government is our nation's largest employer and as such should be leading the way on family-friendly workplace policy. By extending paid parental leave for new parents this bill helps diminish the risk of real economic hardship for the 2 million federal employees following the birth or adoption of a child.

I urge my colleagues to pass legislation that brings our country forward to the 21st Century

and reflects the realities of our nation's workforce.

A BILL TO STRENGTHEN ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS TO STOP IUU FISHING

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduce legislation to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing, which threatens the economic and social infrastructure of fishing communities and industry. Moreover, IUU fishing is a matter of national security for the United States and our allies across the globe, especially in the Asia-Pacific region.

The United States has become a world leader in sustainable management of marine fisheries, in great part due to the Magnuson-Stevens Act. In other parts of the world, however, poor fisheries management is more common, and stocks are overharvested—the direct result of IUU fishing.

IUU fishing is not only a matter of economic security and food sustainability. It is also a matter of national and regional security for the U.S. and our allies. IUU fishing is closely associated with various trafficking activities that are highly likely to operate from the same foreign vessels that engage in IUU fishing activities. IUU fishing has become a significant issue that has caused conflicts between countries and threatens regional stability such as that in the Asia-Pacific region.

Countries like Australia, Palau and now even Papua New Guinea have led the way in combating IUU fishing, and we must take immediate and forceful action as well. The bipartisan bill I am introducing today, the Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2015, along with my colleague from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG, would provide the Coast Guard and NOAA with much-needed tools to fight illegal fishing. It would also implement the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate IUU fishing, a treaty ratified by the Senate last year that would set international standards for denying port entry and services to vessels that have engaged in illegal fishing.

This bill is the product of extensive negotiations between Democratic and Republican staff in the last Congress, and is supported by a broad coalition that includes the U.S. State Department, fishing industry interests, and conservation groups. The bill I introduce today is identical to language that passed the House Committee on Natural Resources by unanimous consent on September 18, 2014. I thank Mr. YOUNG and his staff for working with us on this legislation, and I look forward to bill becoming law and enhancing our ability to address the harmful effects of IUU fishing.

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S803–S842

Measures Introduced: Thirty-one bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 379–409, S. Res. 69–71, and S. Con. Res. 3. **Pages S832–33**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2015". (S. Rept. No. 114–2) **Page S832**

Measures Passed:

Internet Governance Awareness Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 71, designating the week of February 8 through February 14, 2015, as "Internet Governance Awareness Week". **Page S842**

Measures Considered:

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act—Cloture: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 240, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015. **Pages S803–10**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 53), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S809**

Subsequently, Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S809**

Appointments:

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–93, as amended by Public Law 99–151, appointed the following individual to serve as a member of the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: Senator Grassley, Chairman. **Page S842**

Botticelli Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5:00 p.m., on Monday, February 9, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy; that there be 30 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the nomination, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination. **Page S842**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Jessie Hill Roberson, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2018.

Christopher A. Hart, of Colorado, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years.

Maria Cancian, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services.

Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

Stafford Fitzgerald Haney, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Costa Rica.

Nancy Bikoff Pettit, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia.

Routine lists in the Navy. **Page S842**

Messages from the House: **Page S832**

Measures Referred: **Page S832**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S803, S832**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S832, S842**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S832**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S833–34**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S834–41**

Additional Statements: **Pages S831–32**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S841–42**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S842**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—53) **Page S809**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:58 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, February 9, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S842.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

GUANTANAMO DETENTION FACILITY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Guantanamo detention facility and the future of United States detention policy, after receiving testimony from Brian P. McKeon, Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Policy, and Rear Admiral Ross A. Myers, Vice Deputy Director for Nuclear, Homeland Defense, and Current Operations, Joint Staff, both of the Department of Defense; and Nicholas J. Rasmussen, Director, National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

DATA BREACH AND NOTIFICATION LEGISLATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance concluded a hearing to examine data breach and notification legislation in the 114th Congress, after receiving testimony from Illinois Attorney General Lisa Madigan, Chicago; Cheri F. McGuire, Symantec Corporation, Mallory B. Duncan, National Retail Federation, Yael Weinman, Information Technology Industry Council, and Doug Johnson, American Bankers Association, all of Washington, D.C.; and Ravi Pendse, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016, after receiving testimony from Jacob J. Lew, Secretary of the Treasury.

JOINT EMPLOYER STANDARD AND BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the ''joint employer'' standard and business ownership, after receiving testimony from Marshall B. Babson, Seyfarth Shaw LLP, New York, New York; Gerald F. Moore, Little Gym Franchise, Knoxville, Tennessee; John Sims IV, Rainbow Station at the Boulders, Richmond, Virginia; and Paul M. Secunda, Marquette University Law School Labor and Employment Law Program, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 337, to improve the Freedom of Information Act;

S. 295, to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code; and

The nominations of Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy, and Jeanne E. Davidson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

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: 63 public bills, H.R. 9, 746–807; 2 private bills, H.R. 808–809; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 15; and H. Res. 91–96, were introduced. **Pages H852–56**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H858**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 527, to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, by a recorded vote of 260 ayes to 163 noes, Roll No. 68. **Pages H816–34**

Rejected the Deutch motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with

an amendment, by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 67. **Pages H831–33**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–3 shall be considered as read. **Page H822**

Agreed to:

Peters amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–14) that adds to the bill's Regulatory Flexibility Act exemption for veterans rights-and-benefits rules an exemption for rules pertaining to servicemembers and predatory lending, and effectuates limited technical amendments to the bill. **Pages H825–26**

Rejected:

Conyers amendment (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–14) that strikes section 5 of the bill; **Page H826**

Schrader amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–14) that strikes section 10 of the legislation, which creates a duplicative size standard office in the Office of Advocacy without a commensurate reduction in the existing SBA Office of Size Standards, by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 65; **Pages H826–27, H830–31**

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 5 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–14) that exempts from the bill any rule that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation; and **Pages H827–28**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 6 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–14) that exempts from the bill all regulations issued by the Food and Drug Administration relating to consumer safety, including those issued pursuant to the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 66. **Pages H828–30, H831**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Monday, February 9th. **Page H837**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H834.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H830–31, H831, H832–33, and H833–34. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

Committee Meetings

LEGISLATIVE HEARING; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing and markup on H.R. 212, the ''Drinking Water Protection Act''. Testimony was heard from Peter Grevatt, Director, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses. The bill was ordered forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA: A SQUANDERED OPPORTUNITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''Human Rights in Cuba: A Squandered Opportunity''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 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, February 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1 p.m., Monday, February 9

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 1 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E170
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E175
Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E168
Carter, John R., Tex., E172
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E170
Graves, Sam, Mo., E168, E170, E171
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E172
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E173
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E168, E170, E172
Jenkins, Evan H., W.Va., E170, E171, E174
Langevin, James R., R.I., E174
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E169, E172
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E174
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E170
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E174
Messer, Luke, Ind., E170
Pittenger, Robert, N.S., E167
Poe, Ted, Tex., E171
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E167
Schock, Aaron, Ill., E167
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E167

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.