United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2015 No. 49

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 24, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) at 10 a.m.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

AFGHANISTAN: THE GRAVEYARD OF EMPIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week in the House Armed Services Committee, we had a hearing on the budget for fiscal year 2016. Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, both testified before the committee, and I have great respect for both of them. I asked them if, after a decade in Afghanistan, keeping troops in Afghanistan for 9 more years would even make a difference.

Last year in his Politico article, ''Down the Opium Rathole,'' Roger Simon argues, ''If you spent 13 years pounding money down a rathole with little to show for it, you might wake up one morning and say: 'Hey, I'm going to stop pounding money down this rathole.' . . . Unfortunately, the U.S. Government does not think this way. Even though our combat troops are leaving Afghanistan, our money will continue to flow there, billion after billion.''

Mr. Speaker, I submit this Politico article for the RECORD.

[From Politico, Oct. 29, 2014]

DOWN THE OPIUM RATHOLE

(By Roger Simon)

If you spent 13 years pounding money down a rathole with little to show for it, you might wake up one morning and say: ''Hey, I'm going to stop pounding money down this rathole.''

Unfortunately, the U.S. government does not think this way.

The U.S. government wakes up every morning and says: ''The rathole is looking a little empty today. Let's pound a few more billion dollars down there.''

And when that rathole is Afghanistan, the billions are essentially without end.

Even though our combat troops are leaving Afghanistan, our money will continue to flow there, billion after billion.

The National Priorities Project says ''$753.3 billion has been allocated for the war in Afghanistan since 2001, including $89.1 billion in fiscal year 2014.''

President Obama hopes to reduce U.S. forces in Afghanistan to just 9,800 troops next year. But the money spigot will not be turned off.

Afghanistan is one of the poorest countries in the world. In Asia, only Bangladesh is poorer. According to the World Food Programme, half the population lives below the poverty line; Afghanistan has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world; and more than half the children under 5 years old are chronically malnourished.

Yet at one thing Afghanistan succeeds superbly: Afghanistan illegally produces and exports opium, morphine and heroin in such quantities that, according to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Afghanistan is ''practically the exclusive supplier of the world's deadliest drug [93% of the global opiates market]. Leaving aside 19th-century China, that had a population at that time 15 times larger than today's Afghanistan, no other country in the world has ever produced narcotics on such a deadly scale.''

The United States has spent billions trying to stop this trade, but it has failed utterly. In fact, under U.S. occupation, drug production has increased.

Opiates come from opium poppies, which are planted in profusion in Afghanistan. More than eight years ago, we decided to spray the poppy fields with herbicides, but this was unpopular with the Afghan government, which didn't want its illegal drug profits to stop. And even some counterinsurgency experts feared that killing the opium poppies would drive angry poppy farmers into the arms of the Taliban.

Lots of people get confused between counterinsurgency and counterterrorism, by the way. A military expert once explained it to me this way:

Counterinsurgency is when you try to win the hearts and minds of the people.

Counterterrorism is when you kill the people and then try to win their hearts and minds.

The United States has tried both policies in Afghanistan for years.

Printed on recycled paper.

And while the Taliban has become adept at fighting counterterrorism, the Afghan government has become adept at exploiting counterinsurgency.

Take narcotics. How does a country that has few and terrible roads, like Afghanistan, get 93 percent of the world's opiates out of its country?

One way is by air. And in January 2013, the U.S. government said it would no longer grant contracts to a private Afghanistan airline because the U.S. military's anti-corruption unit said the airline ''was involved in bulk opium smuggling.''

But the Afghan government howled, and the U.S. lifted its ban.

There are other examples, but only one conclusion. As Michael Lumpkin, assistant secretary of defense for special operations/low-intensity conflict, said in a letter on Oct. 7: ''In our opinion, the failure to reduce poppy cultivation and increase eradication is due to the lack of Afghan government support for the effort.''

But over 12 years, the U.S. government pounded $7.6 billion down the drug eradication rathole in Afghanistan.

In a report last week, John Sopko, the U.S. special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction, said: ''By every conceivable metric, we've failed. Production and cultivation are up, interdiction and eradication are down, financial support to the insurgency is up, and addiction and abuse are at unprecedented levels in Afghanistan.''

To our government, the solution was clear: Pound more money down the rathole.

As The Washington Post recently reported: ''The State Department requested $137.5 million in funding for counter-narcotics efforts in Afghanistan for fiscal year 2014, a $31 million increase over fiscal year 2012.''

Further, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently wrote a report saying we should give Afghanistan ''between $5 billion and $8 billion annually for at least a decade'' even though most U.S. troops will (supposedly) be long gone by then.

So we have spent $7.6 billion on a drug eradication program that increased drug production. And now we are planning to pour $50 billion to $80 billion into that same country over the next 10 years.

And you know what worries me? Pretty soon we are going to be talking about real money.

Mr. JONES. In recent days, the waste of billions of dollars in Afghanistan has been dominating the headlines:

March 20 of this year, ''Afghanistan Can't Manage Billions in Aid, U.S. Inspector Finds''; March 14, 2015, ''C.I.A. Cash Ended Up in Coffers of Al Qaeda''; May 4, 2013, ''Karzai Says He Was Assured C.I.A. Would Continue Delivering Bags of Cash.''

Mr. Speaker, the squandering of billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars by the Afghan Government is one small aspect of the rampant waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan.

The House is looking to vote on the budget produced by the Republican majority this week which continues billions of dollars the military deserves, but the billions of dollars going to Afghanistan are a waste. The Republican budget also provides billions of dollars for emergency war funding to get around sequestration. Why do we have sequestration in the first place? Because Congress has not passed an honest budget in years.

A couple of weeks ago, the House Armed Services Committee had a hearing on U.S. policy in Afghanistan, where I asked General John Campbell, U.S. Army, commander of the International Security Assistance Force and United States Forces in Afghanistan, if he will ever have a successor who will be honest with Congress and the American people about the fact that we have done as much as we can do in Afghanistan. He did not give me a direct answer, but his response was this: ''For very little continued investment, we can make this a shining light of central Asia.''

Mr. Speaker, if I had had more time, I would have asked General Campbell what his definition of ''very little continued investment'' is when we have already spent billions and billions of dollars and spilled blood in Afghanistan.

There are bridges, roads, educational needs, and veterans benefits to provide here in the United States. Let's focus on their needs rather than on chasing something that will never happen. History has proven Afghanistan will never change. It is a graveyard of empires.

Mr. Speaker, without a debate in Congress, President Obama signed a Bilateral Security Agreement with Afghanistan to keep our United States troops there for 9 more years. Let's cut the 9 years to 3 or 4 years and bring our troops home.

Finally, with an ever-climbing $18 trillion debt, the American people are frustrated. Congress needs to impose spending controls to save taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to bless our men and women in uniform, and may God continue to bless America.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the latest chapter in the drama of Republican control of Congress. This is their first opportunity with complete control of both Chambers to bring into focus what they would do governing, and the results aren't pretty.

We are discussing this week a budget that has been labeled by press accounts that actually give them the benefit of the doubt as being phony or a disaster. It has been condemned by many conservative commentators as a sham.

The purported $5.5 trillion in budget savings over the next 10 years provides no good explanation about how it can actually be achieved. There is a trillion dollars in unspecified reductions ''other mandatory programs.'' They would abolish the Affordable Care Act, but somehow keep all of the revenues that finance it.

There are a few areas of clarity which are hardly comforting. The ratcheting down support for our low-income college students through Pell grants is hardly a step forward and will be widely condemned the more clearly people understand it.

We are back to the Medicare voucher, which may have a different name but is still toxic. A measure of their understanding of its unpopularity is their refusal to put it into effect for seniors now. Instead they would have people approaching retirement age in their mid-fifties who will be able to enjoy the benefits and uncertainty of a vouchered Medicare program.

It is silent on the transportation crisis that is already upon us. The latest transportation extension expires May 31. Resources are not going to be available to get us through this fiscal year, let alone the next fiscal year that they would budget for. And if the budget that they have foreseen would somehow be enacted as written, the next fiscal year would see massive cuts for every single State across the country for transportation.

It continues to chip away at the ability of the Federal Government to hire and maintain the skilled workforce Americans depend upon. One of the most bizarre examples is their continued attack on the ability of the IRS, the Internal Revenue Service, to perform the functions necessary to finance our government.

What business cripples its accounts receivable department? And the proof of this approach is available to any American who tries to call the IRS to get information. It is almost impossible to get through now, let alone with the budget cuts that are anticipated. You can ask any CPA in your district about the devastating effects of crippling the IRS on not just the average citizen, but even on people who can hire the best legal and accounting services available.

While the IRS may be an attractive target for their assault on government, the attack is not limited to the Internal Revenue or the EPA. This budget will have crippling effects on the American way of life all across the country. This budgetary approach that is already baked in produces fewer people to be able to deal with the services for the exploding number of retired people seeking help from the Social Security Administration. It shortchanges the maintenance of our national parks. It underfunds medical research that can make a huge difference for American families.

Mr. Speaker, there are things that could be done. I introduced legislation this week, the REIN-IN Act, which would cut $100 billion of unnecessary spending on nuclear weapons over the next 10 years. These savings could be used to shore up the Department of Defense without resorting to the budget gimmicks that they are using.

That is the bitter reality of their budget approach. It is not their theatrics or the creative terminology. Republicans are avoiding the hard questions and reasonable solutions. It is simply an assault on providing Americans with the services they want, need,

and deserve. The more people understand this, the sooner we are likely to get the changes we need in the political process to get us back on course.

This budget may be a sham and a fraud, but it contains dangerous elements that will affect every family in America. We can and should do better.

CELEBRATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS HOWARD KEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished public service of the Honorable Thomas Howard Kean, 48th Governor of New Jersey, who will become 80 years old next month. Governor Kean is one of the most respected statesmen in the country due to his tremendous contributions to the civic life of New Jersey and of the Nation.

Governor Kean was born on April 21, 1935, in New York City, to Elizabeth Stuyvesant Howard and Robert Winthrop Kean. His father served for 20 years in the House of Representatives and became the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee. His grandfather, Hamilton Fish Kean, was United States Senator from New Jersey. Historians can trace his family's long and proud history of public service to William Livingston, signer of the United States Constitution and the first Governor of New Jersey. Governor Kean was graduated from Princeton University in 1957, and after military service returned to Livingston, New Jersey, named for his ancestor.

Governor Kean started his own career in public office with election to the New Jersey General Assembly in 1967. Known as a thoughtful and diligent legislator, he was elected to lead the chamber in 1972, when he became the youngest speaker of the general assembly in New Jersey history. Governor Kean's two successful campaigns for Governor of New Jersey were each of historical significance: in 1981, his election marked the closest margin of victory in State history, while his 1985 reelection was the largest margin of victory ever recorded in a gubernatorial race in our State.

Mr. Speaker, New Jersey saw significant improvements to public education, environmental protection, access to high-quality health care, and stable taxing and spending policies during the Kean governorship. His most defining legacy was his record of inclusive public engagement that facilitated progress, compromise, and the advancement of the best interests of New Jersey. Following his time in Trenton, Governor Kean served for 15 years as president of Drew University in Madison, New Jersey, where applications, the physical structure, and the endowment increased dramatically.

In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, President Bush turned to Governor Kean and former Indiana Congressman Lee Hamilton to chair the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. The two chairs led an exhaustive review of the intelligence, homeland security, and governmental response before and after the acts of terror perpetrated against this country. The 9/11 Commission's work and leadership drew bipartisan acclaim and resulted in major reforms to improve our Nation's security preparedness. The United States is safer today thanks to the tremendous work of Governor Kean and his colleagues.

I had the honor to serve as an assistant counsel to Governor Kean in Trenton and am honored now to call him a constituent in the congressional district I serve. I have learned continually from Governor Kean, whether through observation or instruction, and I am among the many New Jerseyans who consider him a mentor.

Governor Kean is a wonderful son and brother, husband, father and grandfather, educator, leader, colleague, and friend. He and his wife, the former Deborah Bye of Wilmington, Delaware, have raised three fine children, twin sons, Thomas and Reed, and daughter, Alexandra. His son, Thomas H. Kean, Jr., is my successor as minority leader in the New Jersey State Senate.

On his 80th birthday, I congratulate Governor Thomas H. Kean and wish him many years ahead of good health and happiness. The United States of America owes him a significant debt of gratitude for all that he has done in service to the Nation.

□ 1015

REPUBLICAN FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise against the Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution. This budget proposal would reduce critical economic investments, undermine growth in our jobs, as well as attempt to reduce the deficit on the backs of our students, seniors, low-income families, and the American middle class.

The Republican 2016 budget abandons our students. Our students, overall, are our country's future. It abandons our students by making cuts to college aid, research, job training, and innovation. It also abandons our most vulnerable. It would end Medicare as we know it and make harmful changes to Medicaid, threatening our seniors across this country.

The 2016 Republican proposal also threatens low-income families by reducing the food stamp program and by repealing the Affordable Care Act, leaving 16.4 million Americans who now have access to quality, affordable health care coverage without a viable option. In my State of Alabama alone, over 171,000 Alabamians have selected a plan and/or were automatically enrolled in the ACA—that is over 171,000 Alabamians. These citizens will be abandoned by the Republican budget proposal and would not have insurance for quality health care.

Furthermore, the Republican budget proposal does nothing to help incentivize job creation or put Americans back to work. We are currently on a path towards growth and prosperity.

Under President Obama's leadership, the economy has added more than 12 million private sector jobs in the last 60 months. The Republican 2016 budget proposal would reverse those valuable gains—12 million private sector jobs in the last 60 months.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that instead of putting forth a budget that would create jobs, balance our budget, and spur economic growth throughout our country, we are once again seeing divisive politics at work. Instead of attempting to balance the budget on the backs of American families, as this budget proposal does, we should be seeking to find a fair and balanced plan to responsibly reduce our deficit, to grow our economy, to strengthen our infrastructure, to spur innovation, and to create jobs.

As we move forward, it is my hope that we will pass a 2016 Federal budget that works for all Americans and leaves no one behind.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Republican 2016 budget resolution.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican budget proposal released last week will serve as a strong blueprint to put our country on a long-term path to fiscal responsibility and sustainability.

Unlike the President's proposed budget, which is the same tax-and-spend policies that have not worked for the President or the American people, the House Republican proposal aims to balance the budget within 10 years without ever raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, marked the fifth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act being signed into law. Let me be clear: ObamaCare is certainly not worth celebrating.

The House majority budget proposal would repeal ObamaCare in full, including the tax increases, erroneous regulations, and mandates, all while promoting freedom of choice, affordability, and true patient-centered health care solutions.

Furthermore, the budget proposal aims to further ensure a strong national security, economic competitiveness, and an atmosphere that will foster positive growth throughout Pennsylvania and all across the country.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support a clear path forward. The American people deserve as much.

BLACK LUNG BENEFITS

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to introduce my first bill, a resolution to protect black lung benefits.

Miners work hard to keep the lights on, to power our homes and businesses, and to provide for their own families.

In West Virginia alone, over 18,000 men and women work in the coal mines. It is good work, it is important work, work that puts food on the table and provides a better life for their families.

While great strides have been made in mine safety, some miners will still develop black lung disease.

The Federal Government made a promise decades ago to help coal miners and their families if miners develop black lung. Since 1973, miners have known that if they get black lung, the Federal Government will be there and stand up for them. More than 100,000 miners from West Virginia have filed for black lung benefits. And today, almost 5,000 miners and their families depend on these benefits for care for their families when they are no longer able to work.

Congress must uphold, protect, and secure these crucial benefits for our hardworking miners and their families. As we in Congress work on health care reform, we must remember the miners who toil above ground and underground to power our Nation. Any reforms must secure the black lung benefits program and ensure that these critical benefits will be available for our miners and their families. We made them a promise. We must keep that promise.

REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS WANT A STRONG U.S.-ISRAEL RELATIONSHIP

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, amid concerns of hostile treatment against Israel at the United Nations, I launched an initiative where I wrote letters to dozens of foreign ambassadors to the United Nations and explained why it was important that they stood against anti-Israel actions at the U.N.

I am saddened, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is apparently now in need of such a letter. Recent public reports indicate that President Obama warned Prime Minister Netanyahu, fresh off of his democratic election by the Israeli people, that the U.S. will reassess our options at the U.N.

Think about that for a second, Mr. Speaker. President Obama has left everyone with the impression that the United States could change its course and abandon Israel at the U.N. I can't think of a worse message to send to our friends in Israel and a better gift to the anti-Israel factions of the international community.

The delegitimization efforts of Israel are on the rise around the world and in the United Nations. Israel needs its friends in the United States now more than ever before.

These are bipartisan concerns, Mr. Speaker. Republicans and Democrats alike want a strong U.S.-Israel relationship, and the days of this administration challenging and undercutting Israel's Prime Minister, regardless of who that Prime Minister may be, must stop. The stakes are far too high. The challenges are amongst us.

We have to stand and speak with one united voice, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with our one true ally. This is not right versus left; this is right versus wrong.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 194th anniversary of Greek independence.

Citizens of Greece have always been a proud people, in body, mind, and spirit. From Pericles, the Greek statesman and general, dubbed ''the first citizen of Athens''; to Plato, who laid a groundwork in philosophy so vast that the entirety of European philosophical tradition is said to simply be a footnote to his work; to Count Ioannis Kapodistrias, the first head of state of an independent Greece, Greeks have been exceptional.

I am almost certain that Thomas Jefferson cast an eye across the Atlantic towards Greece when he uttered these words in 1821:

''The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism. On the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them.''

It is no coincidence that the Feast of Annunciation—Evangelismos—a commemoration of the conception of Jesus Christ, is also celebrated on March 25, just as Greek Independence Day is celebrated.

I am blessed to be of two cultures that have been beacons of freedom for all of civilization: the place of my birth, the land of the free and the home of the brave, the United States of America; and the land of my ancestors, the birthplace of democracy, the Hellenic Republic.

Many Greeks fought for years, holding on to their heritage, culture, and faith. Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the emblem of freedom for Hellenes, the flag bearing a white cross and nine blue and white stripes representing the nine letters in Eleftheria, meaning freedom.

Eight years of bloodshed and battle led to the Treaty of Adrianople, the formal declaration of a free and independent Greece.

Greece was the world's first advanced civilization, one that provided a cultural heritage that has influenced the world. Firsts in philosophy, mathematics, politics, sports, and art all stemmed from a free Greece.

Liberty and justice, freedom to determine the path of one's own life, these are human desires, and they were embodied by Greece throughout their fight for independence.

Those unyielding Hellenes paid life and limb for those desires, and generations of Greeks for decades to come owe their ancestors thanks.

As George Washington once said:

''Liberty, when it begins to take root, is a plant of rapid growth.''

This held true in Greece in 1821, as it did in America in 1776.

''Freedom or Death'' was the battle cry of the revolutionaries nearly 200 years ago. It rings true today. Freedom is a powerful and beautiful notion.

The Greek people achieved that for themselves 194 years ago, and I am proud to celebrate in memory of those who fought bravely to shed the shackles of the Ottoman Empire.

We celebrate Greek independence to reaffirm the common democratic heritage we share. And, as Americans, we must continue to pursue the spirit of freedom and liberty, which characterizes both of our great nations.

God bless America. Long live Greece—Zito i Ellas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks for the RECORD.

DENY AMNESTY CREDITS ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to speak on the recent introduction of my bill, H.R. 1332, the Deny Amnesty Credits Act of 2015, in order to put our country and our Americans first.

As a response to the President's unauthorized and illegal actions granting amnesty, my bill will prevent those who are granted deferred action under Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, and the Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents, or DAPA, from qualifying for the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit.

As it stands, the President's illegal executive amnesty would allow illegal aliens to obtain Social Security numbers and the ability to receive as much as $35,000 of hardworking taxpayer moneys on their tax returns from the United States Treasury. The money that is from our hardworking taxpayers, don't they deserve to be put first?

□ 1030

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this would cost American taxpayers $10.2 billion because of an illegal executive program never authorized by Congress.

America can no longer be the world's ATM. This President has trampled upon our Constitution and has circumvented Congress to ensure his political legacy far too many times, and it must stop. Instead of working with Congress to secure our borders and to uphold the law of the land, this administration is offering executive amnesty and tax credits to illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put America first. We must hold this administration accountable for actions that circumvent Congress' constitutional power of the purse, costing billions of taxpayer dollars—our taxpayers.

My bill, the Deny Amnesty Credits Act of 2015, will do just that. It will put America first. It will help put us on that path. It will help our hard-working Americans to be first and foremost in the hearts of us—of our Congress, the elected Representatives—who are, quite frankly, charged with putting Americans first.

Mr. Speaker, did I mention? It is time to put America first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dennis Fountain, Moses Lake Baptist Church, Moses Lake, Washington, offered the following prayer:

Dear God and Heavenly Father, we come before You today humbling ourselves and seeking Your help. I want to thank You, first of all, for who You are.

Thank You for Your goodness, mercy, and grace in each of our lives, and thank You for the blessings You give to us every day.

Lord, I want to thank You for each and every Representative and all they do to direct our great country. I pray today that You would have your hand of grace and guidance upon them. I pray, God, that You would give them the wisdom they need on a daily basis to fulfill the office You have appointed them to.

I also ask that You would guide, encourage, and protect them in their personal lives, as well as their families and loved ones.

I pray for Your blessings upon our Nation and upon our day. I love You, Lord. It is in the name of Jesus Christ I pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HILL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING PASTOR DENNIS FOUNTAIN

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with the honor to welcome today's guest chaplain, Pastor Dennis Fountain, the pastor of Moses Lake Baptist Church in Moses Lake, Washington.

Pastor Fountain has crossed the Cascade Mountain divide to serve common needs on both sides of Washington State. Pastor Fountain began his ministry in 2006 as a youth pastor in Lakewood, in western Washington. He headed east across the Cascades to plant Moses Lake Baptist Church, which first opened its doors 4 years ago this month. Pastor Fountain also currently serves as the chaplain for the Grant County Sheriff's Office. I would like to thank him for his faithfulness and commitment to serve the needs of the people of our State, particularly first responders and the law enforcement community.

It is my privilege to welcome Pastor Fountain and his wife, Hannah, to the House of Representatives as fellow Washingtonians. I extend the thanks of this body for his delivering the morning prayer, and I ask my colleagues to join me in making Pastor Fountain's time in our Nation's Capital warm and inviting.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AND COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2015.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to offer my official resignation as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and the House Committee on Homeland Security, effective today, March 23, 2015. Both committees are vital to ensuring our nation is secure at home and abroad, and it has been and honor and a privilege to serve on these two committees over the last four years.

Sincerely,

STEVEN M. PALAZZO,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 165

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Palazzo.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Russell.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

FLAT STANLEY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome a distinguished visitor to the House floor today.

Flat Stanley is visiting Washington, D.C., this week from Miss Martin's second-grade class at Clemmons Elementary in Clemmons, North Carolina. Through Flat Stanley's adventures, the students in Miss Martin's class are learning about geography and maps.

It has been more than 50 years since Stanley Lambchop was first flattened by a bulletin board in Jeff Brown's 1964 children's classic. Today, the Flat Stanley Project is a global literacy activity that engages hundreds of thousands of children and includes more than 6,000 schools registered in 88 countries around the world.

It has been my pleasure to show Flat Stanley around the U.S. Capitol. I hope he has a safe trip back to North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District and that Miss Martin's class enjoys learning about his visit to Congress.

INCREASE HARBOR MAINTENANCE FUNDING

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call on Congress to keep its promise to invest in our Nation's ports.

The harbor maintenance tax collected at our ports should be returned to our ports, not stockpiled or diverted to other spending.

For years, only about 50 percent of the tax was returned to our ports. The harbor maintenance trust fund now has a surplus of approximately $9 billion.

Last year, with bipartisan support, we passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which set targets for annual increases in usage of the trust fund, leading to 100 percent use by the year 2025.

I have offered an amendment to the budget resolution to meet that target funding level for 2016 established in WRRDA, and I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not rule it in order.

To keep our United States ports globally competitive, we should fully use the harbor maintenance trust fund to maintain and improve our harbors and navigation channels.

ARKANSAS RUN FOR THE FALLEN

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the fourth annual Arkansas Run for the Fallen. Congratulations too to run organizer Chief Master Sergeant Bubba Beason.

Several years ago, to honor Arkansas' fallen heroes, the Arkansas Run for the Fallen was created.

This year's run started in Ozark, Arkansas, last Friday and concluded at the State capitol in Little Rock on Sunday afternoon.

A team of Active Duty and Reserve airmen, soldiers, marines, and Arkansas State Police embarked on a 146-mile memorial run to honor every Arkansan who has died since the attacks on September 11, 2001.

I had the honor of attending the final ceremony on Sunday afternoon and was deeply moved to be in the presence of approximately 30 Gold Star families that were in attendance.

These men have served their country bravely, and their example and sacrifice are ones all Americans and Arkansans can admire.

JUST THE FACTS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as Congress debates how to best craft the 2016 budget proposal, I hope that heavier consideration will be given to reality over ideology.

Let's look at the facts of what has actually worked in the past and what has not. Because in real life, the facts show that Democratic administrations have outperformed the Republican administrations in creating jobs by a significant margin.

The most recent jobs report, for instance, showed that the economy added another 295,000 jobs in February. That is the 60th consecutive month of private sector job growth, and the longest streak in history that has been recorded.

Over the past 5 years, the American automobile industry added over 500,000 jobs due to the Democratic-led restructuring.

And during the past 4 years, while our friends on the other side of the aisle predicted hyperinflation, the collapse of the dollar, and worse, we put more people back to work than all other advanced economies combined.

Let's face the facts and consider what has worked in the real world in creating jobs.

CELEBRATION OF U.S.-TAIWAN RELATIONSHIP

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to celebrate the strong relationship between Taiwan and the United States. With the 70th anniversary of the ending of World War II this year and the 36th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act on April 10, we can reflect how this relationship has been beneficial for both countries.

Prior to World War II, America recognized the importance of protecting the Chinese people from invaders. In 1940, the U.S. operated a clandestine air support mission to protect the citizens of the Republic of China, carried out by a courageous volunteer group of pilots. Known as the Flying Tigers, this group became the 14th Air Force and included my father, the late First Lieutenant Hugh Wilson.

America is eternally grateful that the Chinese military in 1942 rescued most of the crews after 15 U.S. planes crashed in China following the Doolittle Raid, which had been formed at Columbia Army Air Base, South Carolina.

Today, I am encouraging everyone to recognize the critical importance of the U.S.-Taiwan relationship and its continuation.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

VETERANS EDUCATION TAX SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today, veterans who are disabled can get their Federal student loan debt discharged. But, unfortunately, the Department of Education reports discharged debt to the IRS, where it is considered as income for Federal and possible State tax purposes. In many instances, having Federal student loan debt discharged results in a substantial tax liability.

That is why I am introducing the Veterans Education Tax Security Act—the VETS Act. This bill will ensure that disabled veterans, deceased veterans, and deceased members of the Armed Forces are not financially penalized when their Federal student loan debts are lawfully discharged.

As veterans ourselves, Congressman ZINKE and I both understand the importance of putting politics aside to support our soldiers and veterans who have risked their whole lives and their families to defend our country. They, or their families, should not be penalized when Federal student loans are forgiven because of death or disability.

I thank Congressman ZINKE for his support on this issue and look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to champion fairness for our veterans.

FIGHTING FOR OUR FISHING INDUSTRY

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of one of New Hampshire's most vital industries—the fishing industry.

For nearly 400 years, our fishing industry has helped sustain and build our local economy in the seacoast region of

New Hampshire, providing thousands of steady jobs and millions of dollars in economic opportunity for the Granite State annually.

Unfortunately, increasing and constantly evolving government mandates are threatening to put an end to this very historic industry.

At a time when our Nation's job creators are already struggling to add jobs, increase revenue, and compete with cheaper international companies, the last thing that we should require of them is to spend their already limited time and resources on adhering to pages and pages of costly Federal regulations.

It is my charge to fight for regulatory relief and to strengthen New Hampshire's commercial fishing industry, which for so long has been an essential part of the New England tradition.

This remains one of my top priorities, and I will continue to work tirelessly in a bipartisan fashion with the New England region to preserve this industry, which is so essential to our Granite State.

□ 1215

SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Republicans released their budget, which is a roadmap of their priorities and their values. Just as has been the case for the past few years, it comes as no surprise that this budget will squeeze hard-working American families and make them, again, work harder and get less.

One of our priorities must be to end the across-the-board sequestration cuts that have strangled our investments in national priorities like education, research, and innovation. Unfortunately, this GOP budget goes further and jeopardizes national security by keeping sequester cuts on our military and our defense needs.

Sadly, the past few months of Congress have been nothing more than continued giveaways to special interests and the wealthy and pandering to the most extreme voices, the Tea Party voices in Congress.

Today, the Democrats released our budget. This is a budget that works for hard-working Americans. It protects national security. It gives Michiganders and families all across America the tools they need to buy a house, to send their kids to college, and to save for a decent retirement.

We have got to put away these fights.

WPSU-TV CELEBRATES ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(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, on March 1, Penn State University's public television station, WPSU-TV, celebrated its 50th anniversary.

On March 1, 1965, WPSU transmitted its first broadcast signal from atop Penfield Mountain, and viewers for the first time watched ''Saludos Amigos,'' an introductory Spanish class aimed at schoolchildren across central Pennsylvania. Since that initial broadcast, WPSU has dedicated itself to informing and engaging central Pennsylvania communities and beyond.

More recently, WPSU has looked to make a global impact by expanding its documentary production. WPSU-TV has produced several award-winning projects, such as ''Telling Amy's Story,'' which has reached more than 6 million people through on-air broadcasts, online, and at various community events.

Mr. Speaker, today, WPSU-TV reaches approximately 515,000 households in 29 counties through cable, satellite, and over-the-air delivery.

As a graduate of Penn State University, I am so proud of all that WPSU-TV has accomplished, and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing them for 50 terrific years.

VETERANS MEDICAL ACCESS ACT

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to serve our veterans as well as they have served us and our country. That means a lifelong commitment to their health and well-being.

Veterans who are severely disabled or blinded after they return home are eligible for medical care at VA specialty rehabilitation clinics, where we can improve their quality of life and independence; but, too often, veterans cannot afford the cost of the trip.

The Blinded Veterans Association of America estimates that, even though these VA clinics have long wait lists, one of four beds is empty because veterans who need care cannot afford to pay for transportation for their care.

That is why I have introduced the Veterans Medical Access Act, legislation to reimburse blinded and severely disabled veterans for travel expenses in Ventura County and across the country so they can access the lifesaving and life-changing care they need.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in support of this critical legislation.

TRAILBLAZER BETTY WALL

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Women's History Month, which we celebrate as a nation each March, and to pay respect to those women across the generations who have been trailblazers in so many ways, including in our military.

In 1944, one such remarkable woman was blazing trails in the skies over what is now Nellis Air Force Base, which is in my district. Betty Wall, whom I had the opportunity to speak to yesterday, was one of those Women Airforce Service Pilots during World War II.

When a skeptical male pilot would climb into her aircraft for training, she treated him to an introductory flight he would never forget. As she put the aircraft through its incredible combat maneuvers, the guy in the backseat had no choice but to marvel at her skill and expertise, on par with the men who were allowed to go into combat.

In 2010, Ms. Wall and her fellow WASPs received the well-deserved honor of the Congressional Gold Medal. Now, decades later, she has been followed by many other female pilots who continue to break barriers and lead the way.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I call on us as a nation to pay tribute to these amazing women during the month of March.

LIFTING DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE BUDGET CAPS

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as the House begins to prepare to discuss the next year's fiscal budget, we need a budget that supports hard-working Americans, not one that puts our families in jeopardy.

The GOP budget ends Medicare as we know it; it cuts Pell grants; it decimates Head Start, and it doubles down on policies that put working families further behind. One thing that we all need to fear in this budget is the harmful, arbitrary budget caps on both our nondefense and defense programs. These caps hurt all Americans and make our military vulnerable.

Our military leadership has made clear that the budget caps are harming our national security. Michigan is an important northern border State, and at too many places, like at the Selfridge Air National Guard Base in Michigan, our men and women in uniform face dramatic cuts to the critical training and equipment they need to defend our country.

We can't afford more unrealistic budget gimmicks or plans that just kick the can down the road. We need to take up a serious budget, which the Democrats will offer this week.

SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, according to the CBO, the House Republican budget's cuts to SNAP would drive the poorest working families deeper into poverty and would increase hunger in our communities.

The Republican budget would cut as many as 60 million people from SNAP, most of whom are working, and cuts of this magnitude would be tragic for millions of hard-working Americans and their families. Basically, the House Republican budget makes people work harder for less.

Today, the Democrats introduced an alternative budget, and this Democratic budget works for hard-working Americans. First, it makes it easier to own a home; second, easier to send kids to college; third, easier to have a secure and enjoyable retirement.

Once again, the difference between the two: House Republicans want Americans to work harder for less; Democrats, on the other hand, want to help hard-working Americans.

VETERAN SPOUSES EQUAL TREATMENT ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the LGBT veterans, who face discrimination by the very government they fought to defend, and I urge my colleagues to join me in ending this injustice.

Two years ago, DOMA was struck down, and most Federal benefits were effectively extended to legally married same-sex couples; yet an outdated law continues to bar access to VA benefits for LGBT veteran families in States that do not recognize marriage equality.

Our men and women in uniform do not serve in defense of a particular State, but of the United States. All veterans should have access to all Federal benefits, regardless of where they live, just as they do when they are in the military.

When President Lincoln laid out his vision for caring for veterans, he said we should support those ''who shall have borne the battle.'' He didn't say anything about discriminating against some because of who they love.

Please join me in ending this injustice, and support the bipartisan Veteran Spouses Equal Treatment Act, which I will introduce tomorrow.

SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against the majority resolution, which fails to repeal sequestration.

I am proud to represent not one, but two Army bases, Fort Meade and Aberdeen Proving Ground, as well as an Air National Guard base at Martin State Airport. I am a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and am co-chair of the Army Caucus. I am the former ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

I have sat through hearing after hearing in which the leaders of our Armed Forces have all testified that, if sequestration is not repealed, it will make our country weaker against the threats that exist today, from terrorism to cyber, including the Russia-China threat.

These outdated spending levels are putting our national security at risk and are damaging our credibility throughout the world. The across-the-board cuts of sequestration take away all ability to make strategic decisions on the things we keep and the things we cut. Budgeting is the science of priorities, not cutting across the board.

We must ensure our Armed Forces and intelligence community have the resources they need to do their jobs around the world and to protect our country and our families. The alternative Democratic budget released today does that by repealing sequestration.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 24, 2015 at 9:18 a.m.:

Appointments:

Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 27, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 163 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 163

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived. If more than one such amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I was looking around to see if folks were getting goosebumps as the Reading Clerk was reading the rule. I was. I think that if folks were honest with themselves, they would be getting some goosebumps, too, because we don't always have the most open of processes around here. It is hard. We have 435 of us. We all represent different districts, constituents that often have different hopes and dreams, different challenges that they face. It is not easy to craft a process that allows every Member of this institution to have a voice.

It is particularly not easy to allow every Member of this institution to have a voice on something as important as the budget of the United States of America. That is big, $3.8 trillion worth of big. And yet what you just heard from the Reading Clerk, Mr. Speaker, is that if we pass this rule, this rule that my colleagues and I on the Committee on Rules sorted out yesterday, if we pass this rule, we will begin the process that will allow a debate on every single budget submitted by every single Member of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have written those budgets in the past. That is not an easy job. There is a reason we are not going to consider 435 budgets. It is a big, big job. But more than being big in that it requires hundreds and hundreds of hours, it is big in that it requires you to put your money where your mouth is. That is not a task that folks often step up to the microphone to take on in this town, Mr. Speaker, but today we have budgets from the Progressive Caucus; we have budgets from the Democratic minority on the Committee on the Budget; we have budgets from the Republican Study Committee; we have budgets from the House Committee on the Budget and more. Every group that decided that they didn't run for this job to make campaign speeches but they ran for this job to make a difference has a chance to put their money where their mouth is.

My friends in the Progressive Caucus, Mr. Speaker, if we pass this rule, we will be allowed to vote on a Progressive Caucus budget. My back-of-the-envelope calculations suggest that their budget proposes increasing taxes by almost $7 trillion—$7 trillion. I don't support that kind of tax increase, but by golly, we ought to have a conversation about it. There are folks who are down here who are willing to recommend it. We should be willing to count the votes and see if it wins or whether it loses.

I sit on the House Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Rules, Mr. Speaker. Our budget doesn't raise taxes at all, at least not the tax rates. We believe if you implement a responsible budget, we are going to see the economic engine of America begin to churn once again. We believe revenues are going to rise because it turns out, if you don't make any money, you can't pay any taxes. If you get the economy going, tax revenues begin to take care of themselves. Reduce about $5.5 trillion in spending, that is what the House Committee on the Budget proposes.

I don't know where the votes are going to shake out, Mr. Speaker, and I am excited to find out. So often you come to the House floor, it has been pre-scripted: The votes have been counted; the process has been closed; it is just more of a show up and vote to give it some finality. But not so today.

If we can come together as a Committee on Rules and pass this rule, if we can come together as a body and begin this debate, I don't know which budget is going to pass at the end of the day, but I know this: I know America will be the better for us having a process that includes absolutely every voice in this Chamber, and I know that our chances of turning this budget process, this collection of hopes and dreams that are in a document into the law of the land to make a difference in the lives of families in each of our districts back home, the chances of that happening will be much, much greater.

Mr. Speaker, I have got lots to say about the budgets we have introduced, I have lots to say about the numbers that are behind those budgets, but I don't want to slow down what I know is going to be a bipartisan day and a bipartisan budget week.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have some good economic news: the private sector has added 12 million new jobs over the last 60 months, 5 years; our national unemployment rate is down to 5.5 percent; we have reduced the deficit from 9.8 percent of our economy to nearly 3 percent; 16.4 million people now have affordable health care who didn't have it before. These are good economic indicators, and we are moving in the right direction, but there is more to do to ensure that our economy gets and stays stronger.

What we can't afford to do at this critical juncture is endanger all of the progress we have made by pursuing this drastic austerity agenda, and that is what the Republican budget is. They have an almost religious commitment to slashing government to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. So they propose severe cuts to everything except the military, even though it means destroying Medicare coverage that was promised to seniors, cutting education funding that we need to help our children compete in the global economy, literally taking food out of the mouths of the poor, and snatching health insurance away from millions who now have access to affordable care coverage for the first time.

Not only would the House majority raise taxes on the poor and give a $50,000 tax break to millionaires—a play that some like to call the reverse Robin Hood—but the House majority would slash funding for bridges and roads and gut funding for law enforcement and schools, double down on trickle-down economics and dynamic scoring, a failed and discredited set of policies that we know don't work.

That is how the House majority wants to govern the greatest democracy on Earth, by cutting our way to prosperity. Not only is it dangerous, it is mathematically impossible. It just doesn't add up. But don't take my word for it. Here are some of the reactions to the Republican budget from the majority's allies and its own members.

The American Enterprise Institute said about this budget: ''The House GOP leadership took the easy way out.''

A Republican Member and Army veteran said that this budget ''makes our country weaker.''

Another member of the House majority said: ''I am tired of seeing gimmicks in the budget process; I am tired of seeing gimmicks in the legislative process.''

Finally, summing it up nicely, one Republican Member said, ''It's all hooey.''

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD several news reports documenting the criticisms of the GOP budget.

[From CNN, March 18, 2015]

HOUSE GOP MEMBERS THREATENING TO TAKE BUDGET DOWN OVER DEFENSE

(By Deirdre Walsh)

WASHINGTON.—A sizeable bloc of House Republicans are vowing to defeat the GOP budget that was unveiled on Tuesday, arguing it shortchanges defense programs at a time that multiple national security threats around the world means Pentagon spending should be boosted.

''As a Republican I do not want our budget to go down. But as a veteran and somebody who has served in the Army I am not going to be part of something that I believe that makes our country weaker,'' Florida GOP Rep. Tom Rooney told reporters Tuesday.

Failure to pass a budget won't trigger any crisis—budget resolutions are nonbinding and essentially symbolic documents. They do set spending levels for various government agencies and outline the party's priorities for reforming entitlement programs and the tax code, but they lack the force of law.

But if House Speaker John Boehner can't cobble together enough votes from his own members for a budget, he will add another embarrassing setback to a pile of failed efforts this year. Boehner and Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell pledged that total GOP control of Congress meant they would prove their party can govern and showcasing a unified budget is key to that pledge.

Last month, Ohio Republican Rep. Mike Turner, a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, got 70 House Republicans to sign a letter insisting that defense programs receive a minimum of $561 billion that was included in President Barack Obama's budget plan.

Republican budget writers, however, were put in a box because of the automatic across the board spending cuts, known as sequestration, put into place by a previous budget law. Those cuts cap defense spending at $523 billion.

To address concerns from defense hawks, the House Budget Committee used an accounting trick and added more than $30 billion in defense money to the ''Overseas Contingency Operations,'' an emergency fund that doesn't count toward their total spending number. On top of that money the committee created a separate $20 billion reserve fund to add more savings from other programs and promised to set both pots of money aside for defense.

But multiple House Republicans told CNN the move is merely a gimmick.

''I don't think that it's fair game—I think it's fairy dust stuff,'' Rooney said.

The top Democrat on the House Budget Committee, Rep. Chris Van Hollen, also

seized on the way Republicans structured Pentagon money, saying on Wednesday the GOP budget ''plays a shameless shell game with our defense spending. It would make Enron accountants blush.''

Boehner and his lieutenants also know some conservatives won't back the measure because they want bolder reforms, but threat from Republicans who want to see bolstered defense spending is real.

GOP Rep. Adam Kinzinger ticked off a list of flashpoints across the globe—ISIS in the Middle East, Ukraine, Boko Haram—that weren't major threats in 2011, arguing the trend shows the need to respond to growing threats, not cut back.

''It's a totally different world we live in and I think we have to recognize that,'' he told CNN, adding he's not sure how he will vote on the current measure and hopes it will be changed.

House Republican leaders also can't afford to lose more an a couple dozen of their own members on this vote, because Democrats will surely oppose the measure which repeals Obamacare and cuts food stamp and education programs.

There remains hope by some in the GOP, though, that they can strike a balance that works for the majority of the caucus.

But even if House Republicans figure out a way to pass this budget, the constraints on future proposals will persist until Democrats and Republicans broker a compromise to do away with the automatic cuts that they agree are unworkable for both domestic and defense programs.

''Both sides need to come together and put their grown up pants on and figure out how do we overcome this issue,'' Kinzinger said.

A budget resolution brokered between the two chambers is supposed to be negotiated by April 15th so spending panels can move forward with their work.

[From AEI, March 17, 2015]

HOUSE GOP 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION IS DOA

(By Mackenzie Eaglen)

Even though House Republicans just unveiled their draft budget for the next ten years, it is already painfully clear how this is going to end for defense.

1. The House budget resolution will not have enough votes to pass as written. There will be no conference with the Senate as a result.

2. The defense appropriations bill that passes the House will match the legal spending caps for the core defense budget at $499 billion for 2016.

3. Congress will seek to add additional emergency supplemental funds—or overseas contingency operations (OCO) money—for defense above President Obama's levels, but much of it will ultimately be stripped out during floor debate.

4. The defense spending bills that pass in both chambers will not become law. Most likely, the federal government will start the fiscal year operating under another continuing resolution (CR).

5. All eyes will turn to the Budget Committee chairmen to craft a follow on to the Ryan-Murray Bipartisan Budget Act to stanch the bleeding and triage the patient (defense) while providing some fiscal certainty and relief for the military later this summer or early fall.

Only after this long, torturous path to the end will leadership finally understand why the House Republican budget blueprint for 2016 is wholly insufficient to provide for America's military. First, the budget limits base defense spending to about $499 billion in 2016, in line with caps mandated under current law. This is a budget $35 billion below what President Obama has requested, and about $112 billion below what former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates thought would be necessary for the Pentagon when he crafted his final budget in 2012.

As an attempt to appease both budget and fiscal hawks, the House budget seeks to offset a lower base defense budget by increasing Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) ''wartime'' spending. That is because these emergency funds are exempt from budget caps and essentially ''off the books.''

While the House GOP budget would ostensibly increase Pentagon OCO funding to about $90 billion compared to the Obama administration's 2016 request of roughly $51 billion, much of this increase is an illusion. First, the plan uses a budgetary procedure known as a deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase OCO spending by more than $20 billion. Reserve funds call for increased spending in certain areas but only upon the condition that offsetting cuts or revenues are generated elsewhere.

Without corresponding deficit reduction, reserve funds do not lead to increased spending. This means that while the House plan promises about $39 billion in OCO spending over the president's request, about half of this increase will not materialize.

Realistically, the Pentagon should expect no more than about $569 billion from the House budget between base and wartime spending—well under the $585 billion the president requested.

Even if taken at face value, the OCO increase contained in the House budget will not make up for years of neglected Pentagon modernization and readiness. The reality is that the base budget and war spending accounts buy different outcomes and effects. Emergency funds buy mostly perishable items like readiness, maintenance, training, and war-related consumables like fuel. This makes OCO spending the equivalent of a sugar high. It contains empty calories that are rapidly consumed by ongoing operations, but does not provide for the long-term health of the military. Only robust and predictable base budgets—as the bipartisan National Defense Panel recommended—can provide long-term funding for readiness, force structure and modernization.

Moreover, by relying on debt-financed supplemental money to put a Band-Aid on the military's growing wounds, the House budget provides a false sense of accomplishment of having ''fixed'' defense. The unfortunate reality is that it does not. While the budget does propose increased defense spending in the future, the only year that matters is 2016. And, in 2016, the House GOP plan keeps current spending caps locked in. Not only is that insufficient, but the president is sure to veto the defense spending bill when it ultimately hits his desk at these levels.

For three and a half years, the military has languished under the Budget Control Act's irresponsible defense cuts as threats around the world have increased. While both political parties share in the responsibility for passage of the Budget Control Act, the GOP now controls Congress. The House budget resolution is clear that defense is only one priority of many, and one far down the line at that.

The House GOP leadership took the easy way out—politically and budgetary. This resolution will do little to draw support from policymakers with a deep understanding of the crisis in defense and will likely end up failing for not pleasing any bloc in the party, including defense hawks, fiscal hawks and appropriators.

For the Pentagon, this means another long year of budget uncertainty with no foresight into how or when the budgetary process will end and at what spending levels. That hurts not only the military, but taxpayers as well since it creates inefficiency and drives up program and planning costs across the largest federal agency.

[From The Examiner, March 17, 2015]

CONSERVATIVES QUESTION 'GIMMICKS' IN HOUSE GOP'S DEFENSE BUDGET

(By Tara Copp)

Republican budget leaders announced a fiscal 2016 plan Tuesday that appeases the defense hawks in their party by nearly doubling wartime spending, but the move has prompted pushback from their most conservative flanks, highlighting the challenges ahead.

Nine conservative House Republicans who hosted a discussion with reporters shortly after the budget's release said they want ''to get to yes'' on the GOP's plan, but they raised concerns about the plan's direction.

They questioned whether additional military spending has been properly vetted, noted that the sequester-immune account boosting military spending is not in line with the promises they made to their constituents to deliver a balanced budget, and pointed out that the added defense needs will require concessions to Democrats that will further distance the party from its political goals.

''Republicans are in the majority, but conservatives are not,'' said Rep. Thomas Massie, R-Ky. But he added that the final bill will need to address conservatives' concerns. ''There are a lot more conservatives than are at this table today.''

Lawmakers said they specifically invited four officers and agents to testify.

The members were also doubtful that they could garner enough intra-party support for the blueprint to move the bill through on a process known as reconciliation, due to differences on spending within their party.

Reconciliation, if enough Republicans agree to it, would allow the budget to be passed on a simple majority, effectively cutting out Senate Democrats' ability to block it.

''We need to make sure we are the party of fiscal conservatism,'' said Rep. Justin Amash, R–Mich. ''I understand some of the concerns from defense hawks who want to blow through the [spending] caps. But I'm tired of seeing gimmicks in the budget process. I'm tired of seeing gimmicks in the legislative process.

''At the end of the day, if you want to increase spending on programs Republicans like, you are going to have to accept some compromise for Democrats. So for those who are pushing for higher spending, they'd better be prepared to go to higher spending on Democratic programs and possibly tax increases.''

In the 2016 plan, which House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price, R–Ga., announced Tuesday, keeps the Defense Department's baseline budget to the $523 billion sequester cap—but then adds another $94 billion in the wartime fund known as the overseas contingency operations account, which is not subject to sequester caps.

''That's one of the issues I am having with the budget,'' said Rep. Raúl Labrador, R–Idaho. ''I think if you are going to plus up military spending you should have to do it within the budget—not in a separate [wartime] account. I think we have to ask the fundamental question, 'what is all that money being spent on in the military? It's not a question that Republicans are willing to ask.''

Price's assurance that defense could be beefed up under a balanced budget also was questioned.

''I don't know anybody who honestly believes we are going to balance the budget in

10 years. It's all hooey,'' said Rep. Ken Buck, R–Colo. Buck said with winding down operations in Afghanistan and the end of the 2008 financial crisis, it is now time to make push difficult spending cuts to balance the budget.

''We continue to put off the pain,'' Buck said.

Labrador said it's not a question of defense as a priority, but the willingness to scrutinize defense spending.

''I want to protect the military as much as anybody. But it seems we have an unquestioning disregard for what its actually being spent in the military sometimes as Republicans, and I have a concern about that.

''So now what we are going to do is . . . put it in the [overseas contingency] account and we are going to forget about the promises that we made to our constituents that we are going to balance the budget,'' Labrador said.

Rep. Jim Jordan, R–Ohio, said he was ''leaning toward yes'' in supporting the additional Pentagon spending, but that he wanted to see the final bill. ''Obviously we want to do everything we can for national defense, but we understand the dynamic we are in,'' Jordan said.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The Republican budget would force hardworking families to work harder for less. The proposal turns Medicaid into a State block grant, makes students pay more for tuition, decimates the Pell grants for college tuition, slashes food stamps, and turns Medicare into a voucher program for the future recipients, all the while keeping billions of dollars in tax breaks for Big Oil.

Today, Medicare guarantees insurance coverage for seniors, but imagine with me, if you will, a world in which Medicare is just a fixed amount voucher. Instead of insurance, your grandparent is given a set amount of money and is sent out on his or her own to negotiate with multinational companies; and if they need a medical plan that is more expensive than that voucher, the balance comes straight out of their pocket, or, if they can't afford it, they have no insurance. Not only does the budget show a clear disdain for working families, middle class families, students, and the elderly, but it was so haphazardly drafted last week that the media exposed a drafting error in the bill that revealed an additional $900 million in cuts. Imagine that, nearly a billion dollars that had been overlooked.

What is more, the House majority is playing fast and loose, using budget gimmicks to violate agreed-upon spending caps in the sequestration and to fund critical long-term Department of Defense needs out of a temporary war slush fund, the overseas contingency operations account, a slush fund the use of which Republicans decried just last year for undermining the budgetary process.

The Secretary of Defense, Dr. Ashton Carter, has highlighted the need for predictability in the Department's budget. He would like to know from one year to the next what is a gimmick and what is real, something that the House majority refuses to ensure. Ashton Carter, Secretary of Defense, says the only way that he can provide funding for the military is through stability, not through slush funds, spending caps, and budget games.

This is how the majority chooses to run our government: with tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires, with financial incentives for Big Oil, tax breaks for corporations that ship their jobs overseas, and tax policies that burden the people whose heads are barely above water. But, most importantly, it hurts the SNAP program, when thousands, millions of Americans go to bed hungry every night. How dare we threaten the very thing that gives them some peace of mind and some food to eat. That is also, by the way, an agriculture program that our farmers depend on to help them make a living.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a different course. Let's grow the economy from the middle class out, not try to hope something will trickle down on it. Let's fix our crumbling roads and bridges, and let's invest in our kids and make it easier to go to college, not harder. Let's respect the contribution of our Nation's seniors and make certain that they have the stability that they need in their health care to make financial decisions with some degree of certainty. We could do that by adopting the Democratic alternative. And while my colleagues in the minority might be getting fatigued saying this over and over that what we have isn't just a list of numbers, it is a statement of our ideals, instead of a slash-and-burn budget that puts at risk the economic growth of the last 5 years, we propose investments in our infrastructure, in our children, in our economy, and in our future.

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

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

I am not sure if I was clear when I got started, and I apologize if I was not. We are going to vote on every idea that folks have. We are going to vote on every budget that was introduced. If you have a plan about how to better run this Nation, you don't need to complain about somebody else's vision; you are allowed to bring your own vision to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we all care about men and women back home in our districts. What you can see on this chart is the interest spending alone under current law in year 2025. That is the 10th year of the budget window, almost a trillion dollars in interest alone. When we hear about what the spending priorities are that each Member of this Chamber has, we have to ask ourselves, so what are you doing to balance the budget so that interest doesn't consume it all?

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, under current law, if we don't make necessary changes, we are going to be spending more on interest alone on the national debt than we are on all defense issues combined. We are going to be spending more on interest on the national debt than we spend on Medicaid, our largest health care program, to help those constituents in need in our district. If you care about folks who are in need in your district, you care about balancing the budget, because we all know that in a debt crisis, the folks who get hurt the most are the folks who are most dependent on government services.

Mr. Speaker, in this great festival of democracy that is the budget process, we have a budget before us today that purports to balance in 6 years. The Republican Study Committee has introduced that budget. We are going to have a vote on it today. We have the budget that came out of the House Committee on the Budget. It purports to balance in 10 years. We are going to have votes on budgets in this process, Mr. Speaker, that anticipate balancing never—never.

The President's budget, for example, Mr. Speaker, the President's budget projects $2 trillion in new taxes—$2 trillion in new taxes—and never balances. It doesn't balance next year; it doesn't balance 10 years from now; it doesn't balance 20 years from now. It balances never. Every time we borrow a dollar from our children or our grandchildren, we are promising, we are committing either an additional dollar in taxes on those same children and grandchildren plus interest in the future or an additional dollar in benefit cuts.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to have this robust debate about our spending priorities, but it ought to start from the position that we have an obligation to pay for the bills that we are running up today. I say to my friends, these are not small things that we are arguing about. I want to talk to you about how do we invest more in transportation. I want to talk to you about how do we invest more lifting people up from that bottom rung of the ladder to the next rung of the ladder, to the next rung of the ladder.

□ 1245

I want to talk about how to invest in America, but every time we vote for a budget that doesn't balance, we threaten that future. We have more in interest payments on the national debt than on all national security combined.

I don't know that we are going to find that agreement today, Mr. Speaker, but if we pass this rule, again, we will be able to begin that process where all of the ideas will be debated.

I just encourage my friends, when each budget comes to the floor, ask this question: Do we plan for balance ever? Do we anticipate ending the added burden on our children ever? Do we anticipate mortgaging our children's future for as far as the eye can see, or do we anticipate taking responsibility?

We have got a lot of budgets to choose from, a lot of opportunities to take responsibility for. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my friends to support this rule so that we will be able to bring those bills to the floor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time of year where we begin to debate our Nation's budget, ostensibly, our plans for the fiscal future of our Nation.

There was a time, far ago in the past, before the invention of the Ryan budget and the Price budgets, when this time of year represented an honest, informed discussion of our different views of the future of our Nation and how to restore fiscal stability.

Since the Ryan budget, though, which says it balances, but doesn't; which includes tax revenue for laws that it says it repeals; which creates fiscal growth out of thin air; this discussion, unfortunately, has devolved into nothing more than political theater.

Somehow, this year, as we consider this rule today on the first ever Price budgets, the process has fallen even further. Gimmicks are being stacked on gimmicks. The Budget Control Act and its caps are law, and everyone on my side of the aisle stands ready to work together to come to a compromise solution that allows for both our domestic spending needs to be met as well as our national security needs.

But that is not the discussion we are having. Instead, we have a budget—or budgets—which completely circumvent common sense and budgetary convention by adding billions of ''base budget'' money to the overseas contingency account, essentially giving President Obama a record slush fund to engage in wars of his choice without consulting the United States Congress.

Those are the Republican plans before you. What we have is a fictional budget. But then, that fictional budget wasn't enough for everyone. So here we are, being asked to pass a rule which looks a lot like the rules you might see at an auction at the county fair. The most votes wins the blue ribbon.

This isn't the county fair. This is the United States Congress. This is our official budget plan of a major American political party for fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

I reject this rule today. We can do better. We can have an honest discussion about our budget priorities and about restoring fiscal stability for the next generation. We deserve a serious proposal rather than this fun and games and gimmicks that we have before us under this rule.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my friend, that is what is so wonderful about this process. The days for pointing out who is so wrong and their ideas are so bad are left for a campaign season. This is the day where you bring your ideas to the floor of the House, and every single idea that was offered is going to be considered. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't happen by accident.

At this time it is my great pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee and an outspoken advocate for trying to bring these ideas to the floor, without whom we would not be able to be here today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, who represents not only the Rules Committee but conservatives from across our Conference on the Budget Committee. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we had an opportunity to have Chairman TOM PRICE come and speak with us about the budget and what costs what and what decisions we wanted to make and what direction we were going to go.

It was really pretty simple. He said he is presenting a budget that is going to balance. He is presenting a budget that is going to fund our military properly. And he has got a budget which is one we cannot only understand but believe in.

One of the questions I asked him yesterday was: Mr. PRICE, how much does the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare, cost the taxpayer and the budget? He said: You know, I don't know, but I'll get back to you. Well, by the end of the hearing, he said—what he could figure—it is $108 billion.

Now, I have not checked this out. In fairness to TOM PRICE, he is allowed to go and doublecheck everything. That was a cursory view.

Mr. Speaker, if that is true, and if I accept the figures that the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the committee, said of the number of people who are on ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act—about 12 million—if you just do simple multiplication, 12 million into $108 billion, we are talking literally every single recipient would be costing this government more than $5 million per person for their insurance.

It is staggering. It is staggering that our friends, the Democrats, passed—it took us all day—a bill that they told us at least 24 million people who were uninsured would be on it, and a whole bunch of other people, and now here we are some 4 years later, a whopping total of 12.5 million at a cost of $100 billion or more. And yet they come to the floor and look at us like we are some self-righteous group of people because we want to balance the budget and change the direction.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is not about doing away with the Affordable Care Act. It is about properly looking at the money that comes in to the Federal Government and us properly allocating it back out. And $108 billion for 12 million people is immoral. It is unconscionable. And yet that was the testimony yesterday. Once again, I am going to have to look at it again, and I know Chairman PRICE is going to as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we do budgets. We do budgets so that we do ask the tough questions, so that we can put a pencil to the millions, billions, and trillions that the American taxpayer sent us here to do.

For us to be on the defensive by our friends, the Democrats, about wanting to balance the budget, about us wanting to do the things that will balance out and not only netting them out to where we don't spend more than what we take in, but being on the defensive because we are doing the right thing to sustain America's greatest days ahead of us, I think is a real mistake for the people who make the argument against us, when they are the people that passed—without one Republican vote—what we were told is $108 billion for 12.5 million people.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to get away from this yelling and screaming and go to the numbers. And that is what TOM PRICE did. That is what Mr. WOODALL is doing. They are looking at how we are spending our money and what we are getting as a result of it. And if it really is true that for everybody who is on this Affordable Care Act, the true cost to the taxpayers is over $5 million for each person, then shame on us for not knowing, asking, and understanding. And that is what we are doing today, Mr. Speaker.

TOM PRICE, our young chairman from Georgia, actually has taken time to go and look at the budget. He is also doing a lot of other things that the gentleman from Texas, MIKE BURGESS, gave him credit for yesterday, where he is looking at some $800 billion—almost a trillion dollars—that is sitting in agencies, not spent yet, that has previously been given to them. The taxpayer paid for it, and they are just sitting there waiting to spend the money.

Mr. Speaker, it is Republicans, it is TOM PRICE, it is ROB WOODALL, it is the members of the committee who have taken the tough votes and have done their homework. And that is what we are presenting here today. We are presenting the hard work from a committee called the Budget Committee to come and look at, once a year, how much are we spending, what are we getting, and how can we do it better?

So I will reject the arguments from those who say that the Republicans aren't doing the right thing. We are doing the heavy lifting. It is Republicans who are trying to look at the billions that are being spent. Not just the thousands, but the hundreds of millions and the thousand billions. Because a thousand billion is a trillion. And this is a big budget, and we need people to do what we are doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand up for not just my party, the Republican Party, but I stand up for the honest and legitimate work that TOM PRICE and the Budget Committee have done. And I intend to follow up with this committee

and to make sure we know more about the real cost of government because it is the real cost of government that turns the direction of our country, where we pass by that effort of where we create good behavior and we help people to, one, where we create people who are leaning on the government for their life, for their lifestyle, and for their future. And that is a mistake. That is a mistake—and one that the Republican Party will try and stand up to.

I understand the difference between a person who is able-bodied and not. I have a son with Down Syndrome, and I understand that we do need to do the right things for people who can't take care of themselves—those with an intellectual or physical disability. I get it that we should be there for poor people.

But it is unconscionable if we are paying $5 million for an insurance plan, per person, under the Affordable Care Act. That is beyond the wild ideas of boondoggle. It is immoral.

So, the Republican Party is going to ask the tough questions. And when we go to the voter or taxpayer and we say: Here is what we want you to understand about your money, we can do it with the authority and the responsibility that we have done the homework. We sharpened our pencils and we made a real difference by understanding not just dollars and cents, but the future of this great Nation.

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

Now I think I understand it all. I believe I understand how you could lose $900 million when you are doing your budget.

By what possible means do you think that we are paying $5 million for each person's health care who is on the Affordable Care Act?

The rising cost of health care for the first time in 50 years is going down. But nobody ever paid $5 million for anybody's health care in a single year. It is the most atrocious thing I think I have heard on this floor.

Mr. and Mrs. America, these are the people you have entrusted your Congress to. They are the people who are writing your budget. They are the people who are going to voucherize your Medicare, who are going to turn Medicaid into a block grant and help some people, maybe not. These are the people making sure that the roads and bridges are crumbling and that are going to take food out of the mouths of the poor.

This is the kind of math that you are practicing over there? For heaven's sake.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who I hope is as angry as I am, a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for making it very plain in terms of what their budget does and does not do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. Yes, I am a member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and I know that our national budget is a statement of our national priorities and our values. And I know very well that the Republican budget is full of misplaced priorities and it is not a moral document.

This budget should not be rigged in favor of special interests and the wealthy few, but the Republican budget is. Our Nation's budget should prioritize working families, too many of whom are making low wages and living below the poverty line. It should assist those working hard to find a job and invest in workforce training, job training, and job creation. Instead, this Republican budget keeps tax breaks for corporations and the superwealthy.

Our budget should open educational opportunities for all, but the Republican budget slashes Pell grants that Congress has already paid for by $89 billion.

□ 1300

A budget—a moral document—a budget that invests in the American people should invest in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, but the Republican budget cuts funding for our roads, our bridges, and our rail.

It should contain a serious and effective strategy to end poverty if we really believe that our budget is a reflection of our values and is a moral document. The House Republican budget offers none of these.

In fact, it slashes programs that support low-wage workers and people working hard to find a job. These families shouldn't have to go hungry; yet, because their wages are so low, they need food stamps. By cutting $150 billion from SNAP, this budget creates more hunger and more poverty for people who are working.

Many of the programs in this budget are a legacy of the War on Poverty, which cut the poverty rate in our country by one-third in 50 years. Let me just read the list of programs that you are cutting and what the War on Poverty listed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. The Civil Rights Act, the Criminal Justice Act, Food Stamp Act, Older Americans Act, Social Security amendments, Voting Rights Act, HUD, all of these programs, Higher Education Act, these are initiatives that you are cutting that provide pathways out of poverty.

This Republican budget balances on the backs of the most vulnerable to preserve tax loopholes for the superwealthy and slush funds for Pentagon contractors.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and on this budget.

List of War on Poverty Programs: the Civil Rights Act (1964); the Urban Mass Transportation Act (1964); the Criminal Justice Act (1964); the Food Stamp Act (1964); the Older Americans Act (1965); Social Security Amendments (1965); the Voting Rights Act (1965); the Housing and Urban Development Act (1965); the Public Works and Economic Development Act (1965); the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (1965); the Amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act (1965); the Higher Education Act (1965); the Child Nutrition Act (1966); the Child Protection Act (1966); and the National School Lunch Act (1968).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds just to ask the gentlewoman from California, I understand why she objects to the Republican budget. What I don't understand is why she objects to the rule.

We have made every single budget that any Member of Congress asked to be made in order, we made that in order. Could the gentlewoman tell me why she opposes the rule?

I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Why do I oppose the rule?

I oppose the rule, first, because this rule, if it moves forward, would allow for the Republican budget, which we know could pass this body, with these huge cuts. I think we need to go back to the drawing board and minimally put back and restore cuts to the SNAP program.

Any budget that has SNAP cuts, cuts to Pell grants, does not invest in infrastructure, any budget that does that, regardless of the budgets that have been put forward, I don't want to see this debate put forward with those cuts in place.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentlewoman.

Candidly, I am certainly on the other side of that issue. I understand that somebody is going to win and somebody is going to lose, but I think the process is always better when we allow everyone's ideas to come to the floor, and that is one of the things this rule does, and I am very grateful that we have been able to do that. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Rules Committee, a member of the Budget Committee, and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I want to pick up and thank my friend and thank our chairman of the Rules Committee for doing exactly what he just suggested, bringing us a rule that lets everybody bring their choices to the floor. That is what we all like to do around here.

Interestingly enough, we essentially have three Democratic choices and three Republican choices, and we are going to have an opportunity for people to express a variety of opinions and arrive at a consensus in this body.

Now, obviously, as a Republican, I like all three Republican alternatives pretty well. I think my friend Mr.

WOODALL has always worked on the Republican Study Committee budget; it gets us to balance faster than anything else on this floor.

The reality is, if you look at the three Republican budgets, they have several things in common. The first is they make tough choices because we have got an $18 trillion debt; and, just left on autopilot, that will increase by another $7.2 trillion. It aims to bring these things into balance, and each one of those Republican budgets does that—the Republican Study Committee budget a little bit faster—but all within the 10-year budget window.

Second, they all repeal ObamaCare—not a big surprise. No Republican voted for it. We have never liked it, and it would be remiss of us not to continue to argue our position.

Third, they all call for major tax reforms. We all know that lowering rates, eliminating exemptions, and rationalizing the Tax Code contributes to economic growth.

They all, frankly, defend the country pretty well. We do it in different ways, and we have debates, but they all manage to do that, and none of them raise taxes in the process of achieving those objectives.

I am pretty content with the Republican choices in front of us and look forward to that. I think it behooves us all to remember—and it gets lost in this debate—a budget is not the law of the land.

The budget is, essentially, a negotiating position. The President submitted a budget earlier. That is his initial negotiating position. Whatever emerges from this debate today is likely to be the Republican initial negotiating position.

My friends on their side will present a budget today which I presume represents their initial negotiating position. They have also got other budgets within the context of that—perfectly appropriate. We do, too, but they will have a general position. Our friends in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, are wrestling with this very issue as we talk.

Now, we seem to forget, as we draw our differences and distinctions here, we do live in an era of divided government; and despite what many people think, we do occasionally come to compromises around here.

Now, I am pretty pleased we have lowered the budget deficit every year that we have been in the majority, but that has entailed some compromises. We compromised in the Ryan-Murray agreement. That was actually a pretty good agreement that both sides were happy with.

Frankly, this week, we will probably compromise on the so-called doc fix, the SGR. We compromised last December on the CR/Omnibus bill which, again, gave us some fiscal stability.

I suspect, as we all define our initial negotiating positions, at some point down the road, we will indeed compromise. The President of the United States has got a signature that is going to have to happen to any appropriations bill. Our friends have a filibuster control in the upper House.

My hope is we state our positions. I am very content with where we are opening this debate; and then, frankly, over the course of the months ahead, we work together and see if we can find that common ground.

That common ground ought to do what the Republicans are trying to do in terms of lowering the deficit, reforming entitlements, not raising taxes, and moving us in a fiscally responsible direction while we modernize our Tax Code. That is our opening position. I look forward to defending it.

I thank my friend Mr. WOODALL for bringing this excellent rule to the floor, which allows everybody to put forward their position.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules and an extraordinary colleague.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the last 8 years have been very difficult. We are recovering from the single greatest economic crisis since the Great Depression. This recovery hasn't been easy, and it has forced us to make difficult decisions. Working on budget priorities and wrestling with spending cuts have been difficult, to say the least.

Our economy is beginning to turn around, thanks in large part to an increase in hiring and the success of the Affordable Care Act; yet we still must wrestle with the Nation's budget. It is true, as my Republican friends say, that tough choices have to be made.

Why is it that every time House Republicans try to put our fiscal house in order, they ask those among us who can least afford it to make the most sacrifices?

Mr. Speaker, we should not balance the budget on the backs of the poor and working families. They didn't cause the financial crisis, and they shouldn't be the ones forced to get us out of this mess.

There is a lot to dislike in the Republican budget, from repealing the Affordable Care Act to ending Medicare as we know it, to slashing Pell grants. Quite frankly, it is awful.

I want to focus on what the Republican budget does to SNAP, the Nation's premier antihunger program. Once again, the Republican budget would turn SNAP into a block grant, resulting in sharp cuts of $125 billion. On top of that, the Republican budget requires a cut of at least another $1 billion—maybe more—from SNAP.

Mr. Speaker, SNAP is one of the only remaining basic protections for the poor. For many of the poorest Americans, SNAP is the only form of income assistance that they receive. The numbers don't lie, but the stories are far more powerful.

Just listen to the people who rely on SNAP to make ends meet. Thousands of people sent messages to Congress written on paper plates, pleading with us not to cut SNAP.

One woman wrote:

> SNAP means that, as a single mother, I was able to finish college, feed my family, and find a career where I am able to advocate for a program that I know works.

Another person wrote:

> SNAP means dignity. SNAP matters to me because no senior should have to choose between buying food or paying for their medication. When I was a child, my father left, and the only reason we could afford food was because of food stamps. I never got a chance to say thank you, so thank you.

For the life of me, I can't figure out why House Republicans are hell-bent on arbitrarily cutting a program that feeds hungry kids, seniors, and working families. These SNAP cuts are deep and hurtful. We have already seen how the farm bill cuts $8.6 billion, how those cuts are wreaking havoc among the hungry. Imagine what a cut of $125 billion-plus would do.

Republicans claim that SNAP spending is out of control; yet the Congressional Budget Office shows that SNAP spending is going down as the economy recovers and people go back to work.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to strike these SNAP cuts from the Republican budget. The Republicans blocked my amendment while, at the same time, increasing spending for the Pentagon by over $90 billion, without even paying for it.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are moral documents; and what the Republicans are doing, in my opinion, is immoral. Penalizing working families—and, yes, the majority of people on SNAP who can work do work—penalizing these families by taking away food in the guise of fiscal prudence is just wrong. Cutting SNAP, while increasing unchecked spending for the Pentagon, is hypocritical.

Let's be clear. There is a cost to hunger in America. Hungry kids don't learn in school. Senior citizens who take their medication on an empty stomach end up in the emergency room. Workers who miss meals are less productive at work.

Cutting SNAP, a program that puts food on the table for hungry families, is just a rotten thing to do. Shame on anybody in this House who votes for a budget that increases hunger in America.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to my friend from Massachusetts I know he cares deeply about these issues; and, candidly, this House is a better House because of his leadership on these issues.

Just this year, we are going to spend four times more on interest on our national debt than feeding families through the Food Stamp program. An unbalanced budget is eroding those opportunities to invest in people.

I am certain that we would come together to invest in Americans. I am

certain that we care. I will concede the gentleman cares. I won't concede he cares more than I do about lifting folks up and taking them to the next rung of that ladder.

Our debt and our deficit are eroding those opportunities to come together.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would argue that the problem of hunger in America is actually increasing our deficit and our debt; but I would also argue, if you want to find ways to balance the budget, maybe go after some of those corporate tax breaks, instead of going after poor people.

Mr. WOODALL. As the gentleman knows—and, again, I thank the gentleman—I have introduced the only bill in Congress that abolishes every single corporate tax break in the Tax Code. I would welcome support and enthusiastic cosponsorship from any of my colleagues on the other side the aisle.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation that would help families afford college tuition by letting undergraduate borrowers refinance their student loans at a low interest rate of 3.86 percent. That is what the families we represent need, not the education cuts in the Republican budget.

To discuss our proposal, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the previous question, as she just stated, would allow consideration of H.R. 1434, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is an emergency out there for young Americans who are trapped in high interest rate students loans. The Federal Reserve bank has tallied that. It is $1.3 trillion of overhang in the U.S. economy.

None other than the former Republican Governor of the State of Indiana and the former Budget Director under George Bush testified before the Education Committee the other day, and this is what he said:

> Research from the Pew Research Center and Rutgers shows that today's 20- and 30-year olds are delaying marriage, delaying childbearing, both unhelpful trends from an economic and social standpoint.
>
> Between 25 percent and 40 percent of borrowers report postponing homes, cars, and other major purchases. Half say that their student loans increase their risk of defaulting on other bills.

□ 1315

There are 7.5 million young Americans who are behind on their student loans. Again, they are trapped in no collateral, high interest rate documents that our bill allows them to write down.

Anyone watching this debate knows that when there is a period of low interest rates—and that is exactly what is the situation today—middle class families refinance their houses, refinance their car loans, and refinance their credit cards; but students and people carrying student loan debt because of the fact that they were no-collateral loans are trapped.

Our bill allows them to go to the Department of Education, write down those interest rates to 3.6 percent. The Congressional Budget Office has told us that half of the trillion-dollar overhang would be refinanced down if this bill took place. That puts money in people's pockets, as the Pew Research Center shows. That means that they are going to go out and buy cars, buy homes, and start families.

Our failure to deal with this issue is strangling this economic recovery. And incredibly, we are going to take up a Republican budget which cuts Pell Grants and also raises interest rate costs for Stafford loan programs.

Let's be very clear: this budget allows the government to charge interest while people are in school, which has been a pillar of the Stafford student loan program, that interest is not charged while kids are going through college. Yet the Republican budget adds to that $1.3 trillion in overhang by adding interest costs in their budget plan.

The hard-working American people who want to buy homes, who want to send their kids to college, have an opportunity with this legislation, H.R. 1434, to allow them to refinance down their interest rates to a lower out-of-pocket cost that will provide an automatic, instant stimulus to the U.S. economy. That is what the American people are looking for, not a Republican budget plan that compounds the largest area of consumer debt in the U.S. economy. It adds costs to folks whose Pell grants won't rise and whose interest rates are going to go up on their Stafford loans.

The choice is very clear with this vote that we are about to take. One vote is going to add to the student loan problem, which the Federal Reserve has identified as the largest consumer debt challenge of our Nation, and the other vote will allow us to move forward to solving that problem.

Vote ''no'' on the rule. Vote ''no'' on the previous question. Let's help those 7.5 million kids and young people who are behind on their student loans. Allow them to refinance down their interest rates, which is what happens all throughout the U.S. economy during a time of low interest rates.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in opposition to the rule, and I rise in opposition to the previous question so that H.R. 1434 can be offered. Let me tell you why.

Every few weeks, I spend time calling constituents who have sent me letters and emails. In many of these conversations, I hear about the burden of student loan debt. Just recently, I spoke with a couple with more than $100,000 in student debt, and their monthly loan payments exceed the rent that they pay on their apartment.

There is absolutely no question, student loan debt is an enormous problem in this country. We all know the facts. As the gentleman from Connecticut stated, at $1.3 trillion, student loan debt has surpassed credit card debt. Nearly three-quarters of college seniors graduate with some debt; bachelor's degree recipients graduate with an average of almost $30,000 in debt.

The Federal Government, the States, colleges and universities and other relevant actors in higher education must come together to address this issue. We must take steps to reduce the underlying costs of degree completion, strengthen Federal and State investment in colleges and universities, provide additional aid to students, and diminish existing student loan debt.

The gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY's legislation, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, would help bring down existing student loan debt by allowing eligible borrowers with existing debt to refinance their student loans and receive the same lower interest rates passed by Congress in 2013 that new borrowers currently receive.

Lowering interest rates for existing loan debt will benefit tens of millions of Americans. I oppose the rule. I oppose the previous question.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

If I could engage my friend from California, I understand why he doesn't like one of the Republican budgets that is here. But this rule also makes in order every single Democratic substitute budget that was offered.

I would ask my friend why it is that he opposes this rule since it allows everyone's ideas to be considered.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. TAKANO. Well, I am not so much in opposition to the rule because of not allowing other budgets to be considered, but because of the way the rule is structured, I would rather see us be able to consider H.R. 1434. If we would oppose the rule and oppose the previous question, we could solve the student debt question here.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can amend the rule

to bring up the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act.

The magnitude of the problem cannot be overlooked. In 2013, there were 37 million American student loan borrowers with outstanding student loans. Those 37 million American students hold an enormous $1.3 trillion in student loan debt, as my friend from Connecticut mentioned. Student loan debt is growing by $3,000 per second. The Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act would be a good first step in allowing students to refinance their loans and put some much-needed money back in their pockets and back in the American economy.

In 2012, Congress passed a bill to allow new student loan borrowers to receive a low interest rate. Unfortunately, students with existing student loan debt were left out of this fix. This bill would provide those students who borrowed before 2012 the same opportunities that new borrowers have.

If student loan borrowers could get lower interest rates, they would be able to more fully participate in the economy. They could buy houses, eat out in restaurants, move out of their parents' homes, or even just have enough money to save for a better future.

This bill is simple, and it fixes a fundamental inequity. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, in parliamentary parlance, what we have before us is termed a ''structured rule.'' However, I would venture to say that this is an unstructured rule. It is a rule put forward by a majority with no clear structure to its strategy of how to govern this country.

This rule will allow them to bring two versions of their budget to the floor, as their deficit hawks and defense hawks continue to fight over what budget they should pursue. It is demonstrative of the deep divisions that we have seen displayed on a regular basis in the majority party.

We have now seen one example after another of this Republican majority being unable to assemble the votes from within its own ranks to pass important measures on its own. We saw it with funding to keep the Department of Homeland Security open. We also saw it last Congress, when Republicans were forced to withdraw an appropriations bill for Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development when they didn't have the votes to support their sequestration strategy.

The gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said at that time that the bill's removal meant that ''with this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just 3 months ago. Thus, I believe,'' Chairman ROGERS went on, ''that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.''

That was the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee speaking—not STENY HOYER, not a Democrat, but a Republican leader.

So, Mr. Speaker, today is not the first time that we are seeing the majority plagued by dysfunction as it budgets in a partisan way, but today it has gone a step further with a rule that essentially acknowledges that there is no consensus among Republicans as to how they ought to proceed. That is why Republicans are putting forward this convoluted amendment strategy.

However, I tell my friends on the other side, the votes exist to pass a budget in this House but only if it is one that replaces both the defense and nondefense components of the sequester with a commonsense and fiscally responsible alternative.

And I predict today that this budget will not be followed, as previous budgets passed by the Republican majority have never been followed and were not followed by them.

Democrats would partner, I would tell my Republican friends, to pass a budget that invests in the future and does not stifle the growth of jobs and opportunity.

I urge my colleagues we can do better. Reject this rule. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's get it right.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to my friend, whose leadership in this House I value, that he had an opportunity in that joint select committee, that supercommittee, an opportunity that I know he wishes that we had been able to come together on and we were not able to come together on.

What we have now is not a division amongst ourselves; it is a reflection of the fact that we actually have different opinions. Allowing different budgets to come to the floor is going to allow us to flush out those opinions.

I wish, thinking about bipartisan cooperation as we have had in years past, there would have been a Republican-Democratic substitute that would have gotten to balance as well, making those tough decisions. But instead, what we are left with are Democratic budgets that never balance and Republican budgets that achieve balance, all while ignoring the challenge that we have to deal with sequester long term.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on trying to deal with the sequester. I, too, wish we had had it.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

The fact of the matter is, I oppose this rule. I think my Republican friends' budget will pass. I understand that.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I wish he would go back to the drawing board. And I will tell my friend, I will participate with you.

Nobody believes, I think, that sequester is going to ultimately rule the day in our appropriation bills because it is, as your chairman said, ill-conceived and unrealistic. I would think it better policy for us to decide that now, and then implement appropriation bills consistent with something that is reasonable and not ill-conceived.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today as a member of the Higher Education Subcommittee and as a retired professor of 40 years at Bennett College in North Carolina. I am steadfastly committed to making sure that every student has access to a quality, affordable college education because education is key to achieving the American Dream.

However, too many of our graduates are burdened with insurmountable debt, which hinders their prospect of achieving the great American Dream. Even worse, the rising cost of education and the threat of educational debt has become a barrier for many students considering college. That is not acceptable.

National student loan debt is more than $1.3 trillion. It is time to invest in our constituents and help our graduates better manage their debt. Homeowners and car owners can refinance their loans. Why can't our hardworking graduates do the same?

The Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act will allow them to do just that. It will allow graduates to refinance their old debt so that they are better equipped to pay it off.

One in seven student borrowers defaults on their loans within the first 3 years. If we don't act now, our graduates will continue to be forced to choose between paying school debt, purchasing homes, creating a savings account, and starting families. The threat is too grave to our economy.

I know firsthand what higher education can do for a person's life because of what it did for me. That is why I am fighting for every student to have access to a quality, affordable education.

We can no longer sit back and watch students spend their entire adult lives paying off their student debt. I urge my colleagues to put our graduates before partisan politics, and let's pass this legislation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from New York that I have no further requests for time, and I would ask my friend if she has further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not, and I am prepared to close.

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

□ 1330

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the House majority has once again chosen to favor billionaires over the middle class, debunk economics over real investments, and politics over people. Democrats have a clear alternative that would keep our economy growing and ensure a strong fiscal future. Our alternative ensures that college is achievable, that jobs are available, and that health care is affordable. That is what will keep our economy on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, vote ''no'' on the draconian Republican budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

I understand why folks want to vote ''no'' sometimes in this Chamber. You want to vote ''no'' because you don't like the ideas the other side has, and it turns out that if they have more votes than you have on any particular idea, they win and you lose. I lose in this Chamber from time to time myself, as I know all my friends do, but this rule offers an opportunity at least for every idea to be heard, and the best ideas ought to rise to the top. That is the America that I believe in. That is the Congress that I believe in, that if we allow this festival of democracy, if we allow all of these provisions to be considered, we will have the best ideas rise to the top.

When I hear my colleagues complaining about what isn't available today, it is an indictment of our collective work ethic because this rule makes every idea that was presented available.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side decided to talk about student loan debt today. It is a troubling issue. Member after Member has come to the House floor, and they have said that these students have taken out all of these loans, economic circumstances have changed, and now their opportunities are truncated. I feel for those students. America is in exactly that same circumstance. We have taken out loan after loan after loan, economic circumstances are changing, and if we continue on this path, America's opportunities will be truncated.

I hear my friends advocating for an opportunity to refinance student loans. Where is the opportunity to refinance America's $18 trillion in debt? Mr. Speaker, over the next 10 years, if we do nothing—if we do nothing—as my colleagues propose, if we defeat this rule and do nothing, America will pay $4.7 trillion in interest alone—not a penny of the $18 trillion in principal, $4.7 trillion in interest alone. That is an entire year, in fact, that is an entire year and one quarter of Federal spending wasted on interest.

These are not academic conversations we are having today, Mr. Speaker. These are decisions about whether we are going to be paying our creditors or investing in America. These are decisions about whether we are going to be paying our creditors or focusing on our collective priorities. These are decisions about whether the budget will balance or whether it never ever, ever will.

I choose balance, Mr. Speaker. I choose balance, and I choose the tough bipartisan decisions that we will have to make together. I choose the tough bicameral decisions we will have to make together. I choose the tough negotiations with the President that we will have to do together. But I will not be a party to mortgaging the future of America one more time. I am grateful that we will consider all of the ideas that are presented here today, and I am confident that balance and fiscal responsibility will rise to the top.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and get on to this great debate that we will have.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 163 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1434) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1434.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee

on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; suspending the rules and passing H.R. 216; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 180, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—238

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
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 (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—180

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
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

NOT VOTING—14

Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Costa
Duncan (SC)
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Labrador
Norcross
Payne
Roskam
Ruiz
Smith (WA)

□ 1402

Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. GARAMENDI changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 180, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—237

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)
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed

Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
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
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—180

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Griffith

NOT VOTING—14

Adams
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Deutch
Duncan (SC)
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Norcross
Payne
Ruiz
Smith (WA)
Turner

□ 1410

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET PLANNING REFORM ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 216) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—420

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—12

Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Coffman
Duncan (SC)
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Norcross
Payne
Perry
Ruiz
Smith (WA)

□ 1417

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 156, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—254

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palmer
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Tiberi
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vela
Wagner
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—156

Aguilar
Amash
Barr
Bass
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Dold
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (LA)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Lee
Lewis
LoBiondo
Love
Lowenthal
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert
Tonko

NOT VOTING—20

Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Cárdenas
Duncan (SC)
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Miller (MI)
Norcross
Payne
Pelosi
Quigley
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Smith (WA)
Thornberry
Walorski

□ 1424

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 27.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 163 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 concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 27.

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

□ 1425

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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), or their designees.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman, and I want to thank my ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), for his work on our budget that we bring forward and the spirited debate that we had in committee.

I want to thank all of our committee members for the productive activity

that they brought forward over the last 10 or 11 weeks to work on our budget and produce this product.

I want to thank our staff. They have done incredible work to get us to this point.

I want to take a special moment to thank Congressional Budget Office Director Doug Elmendorf, who will be leaving at the end of the month. I know the ranking member and I are going to have some words later on about his service, but I want to thank him and his staff for the work that they have done.

Mr. Chairman, I am so proud and pleased to join my Committee on the Budget colleagues and Conference member colleagues on this side of the aisle to present A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

When I talk with folks back home in the district, the Sixth District of Georgia, and across the State of Georgia, truly across this country, individuals are concerned. They are very concerned. Many of them are angry. Most are frustrated about the direction of America. They feel we are adrift, that Washington seems incapable of addressing their concerns, that the Federal Government is getting in the way or impeding the very spirit of the people. The President's response in his budget? More taxes, more spending, more borrowing, more debt, more stagnant growth, and a budget that never, ever, ever balances.

Remember, Mr. Chairman—the American people know this—every dollar that is taken for taxes and every dollar that is borrowed, stealing from the next generation, is a dollar that can't be used to pay the rent, to buy a car, to buy a home, to send a kid to college, to open a business or to expand a business and create jobs. We think there is a better way.

Framing that issue, as folks read our report, is our introduction, in which we say this: It is often said that a budget is more than a dry collection of numbers and budgeting more than a mechanical act. With respect to the congressional budget, no one has put it better than the renowned political scientist, Aaron Wildavsky, when he said:

> Taxing and spending, resource mobilization, and resource allocation now take up as much or more time on the floors of Congress than all other matters put together. How large government will be, the part it will play in our lives, whether more or less will be done for defense or welfare, how much, and what sort of people will pay for the services, what kind of society, in sum, we Americans want to have, all these are routinely discussed in budget debates.

This resolution proceeds from that conviction. It seeks to restore fundamental principles of budgeting and governing, to reverse the drift toward higher spending and larger government, to reinforce the innovative and creative spirit stirring among the myriad institutions and communities across this country, and to revitalize the prosperity that creates ever-expanding opportunities for all Americans to pursue their destinies. Put differently, this budget resolution expresses a vision, a vision of governing, and of America itself.

So what is that vision? Mr. Chairman, we believe in promoting the greatest amount of opportunity and the greatest amount of success for the greatest number of Americans so the greatest number of American dreams may be realized, and doing so in a way that demonstrates real hope and real compassion and real fairness without Washington picking winners and losers.

Now, Americans just have a common sense about them, and they understand that something just isn't right, especially with our debt—very troubling, over $18 trillion. They know that we can't spend more money than we take in forever. They can't do it in their personal lives, they can't do it in their families or their businesses or their communities, and we can't do it right here in Congress.

In fact, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said just a few years ago, Admiral Mike Mullen, the highest ranking military officer in our country, he was asked: What is the greatest threat to national security? The highest ranking military officer in our country asked what the greatest threat was, and he said the national debt because he knows what Americans know, that unless we have economic security, we will never have national security.

□ 1430

So instead of the insecurity and the uncertainty of the President's plan, we think there is a better way.

What are our highlights? We balance the budget in less than 10 years, and we do so without raising taxes. Our budget reduces spending by $5.5 trillion. It stays in balance and sets us on a path to pay off that debt—all of it.

We provide for a vote on the balanced budget amendment in the House of Representatives—this Congress—something that folks back home just think makes sense.

We support a strong national defense—providing resources above the President's number—when taking into account the base defense budget and the global war on terror funding.

We repeal ObamaCare in its entirety. As a physician, I can tell you it is not just harming the health of America; it is harming the economy of America.

We stop the raid on Medicare. We eliminate the Independent Payment Advisory Board, where a board of individuals can not pay seniors' doctors for caring for them.

We promote patient-centered health care where patients, families, and doctors are making medical decisions, not Washington, D.C.

We secure economic opportunity. We call for fair and simple and comprehensive tax reform to get this economy rolling again and get millions of Americans back to work.

We repeal Dodd-Frank and end the too-big-to-fail bank bailouts. We reform Fannie and Freddie. We cut corporate welfare.

We promote federalism. In fact, a letter sent from Governors across this State recently said:

> Over the last several decades, the Federal Government has passed laws and promulgated regulations that restrict the ability of States to innovate while requiring States to implement and run programs dictated by Federal dollars and Federal rules.
>
> For a long time, States were willing to trade off power and responsibility for Federal taxpayer funds, but we have reached a tipping point where States serve to carry out the wishes of the Federal Government instead of serving as laboratories of democracy.

So, we give States flexibility—flexibility in programs like Medicaid and nutritional assistance. The States are the ones that know how best to respond to their population. We return control of education to State and local governments.

We hold Washington accountable, reducing the size of the Federal workforce through attrition, and we support selling Federal assets and unneeded Federal lands. We call for regulatory reform to free up small business and job creation across this land. We require fee-collecting programs in the Federal Government to account for that revenue in our own appropriations process so the people's Representatives can have a say about how that money is spent.

We cut waste, fraud, and abuse. We would end the double-dipping in disability insurance and unemployment insurance. We require able-bodied adults of working age to work in order to receive Federal welfare benefits.

We support the rights of conscience for doctors and health care providers and employers, and we push back on the executive overreach of this administration. We stop the President's war on coal. We prevent the carbon tax. We encourage construction of the Keystone pipeline, and we hold the IRS accountable for targeting American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this is a positive vision for our country. It will deliver real results for the American people. We responsibly lay out a path for a healthy economy, an opportunity economy—one that opens doors for people, not subjects them to the dictates of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, we believe in America, and we believe in Americans. We understand our problems are significant, and we hear the people of this Nation crying out for leadership here in Washington, D.C.

The Balanced Budget for a Stronger America will result in a government that is more efficient, more effective, and more accountable—one that frees up the American spirit and optimism and enthusiasm to do great things and meet great challenges.

We encourage our colleagues and fellow citizens across this country to join us in this exciting opportunity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by thanking the chairman of the committee, Chairman PRICE, for conducting the business of the Budget Committee in a professional manner. We have sharp differences but have expressed them in a civil fashion.

I also want to agree with him with respect to the great job the Budget Committee staff has done, both Democrat and Republican, and agree with him on one more thing—and it may be the last thing I agree with the gentleman on during this debate. Dr. Elmendorf, the current head of the Congressional Budget Office, has done a great job, and we are going to have a little bit more to say about that later.

We all believe in America, Mr. Chair, but I do not believe this Republican budget reflects the values and priorities. It is the wrong direction for America.

Now, as we gather here today, we are facing some good news, we are facing some bad news, and we are facing some really bad news.

The good news is the economy is improving. More people are going back to work. In fact, the private sector has added 12 million new jobs over the last 60 months.

It is not all rosy. Many Americans are still looking for work, but the unemployment rate has fallen to 5.5 percent, and trends are good.

The bad news is that Americans are working harder than ever, but their paychecks are flat. This is not a new problem, Mr. Chairman. It is not even a problem in the last 2 years or just the last 5 years. It goes back quite a ways. In fact, as this chart indicates, we have seen a growing gap between worker productivity, which has been rising steadily, and the incomes and paychecks of most working Americans.

If you look at this chart, it is very interesting, because it goes from 1948 to the 1970s, and you see these two lines are convergent. That means the additional worker productivity—the hard work of American workers—was translated into higher paychecks and compensation for them.

But starting around the 1970s, you saw the great divergence. Worker productivity went up. People are working harder than ever, better than ever, but their paychecks and compensation have been pretty much flat.

So, where is the value of that hard work going? If people are working harder than ever, why aren't their paychecks keeping track?

Well, that additional value of hard work is no longer going to regular working Americans—people working for a paycheck. It has gone, overwhelmingly, to folks at the top. And I don't mean just the top 10. It has gone, overwhelmingly, to the top 1 percent of Americans, who have seen their incomes rise dramatically even as everybody else has pretty much been running in place and flat.

So, our challenge to all those people working really hard—harder than ever—is: How can we make sure that they benefit from that increased productivity?

Mr. Chairman, we had some hope right after the November election. I remember opening up the newspaper—The Wall Street Journal. There was an op-ed piece by Speaker BOEHNER and Republican Senate Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, and here is what they said. They said that they were humbled by the opportunity to ''help struggling middle class Americans'' and to deal with ''wage stagnation.'' That is what they said right after the election.

But, Mr. Chairman, the very bad news today for the country is, if you look at this Republican budget, it turns out they were just kidding. This Republican budget is really hard on hard-working Americans and those who are looking hard to find a job. It says, Keep working harder, but you are going to get less.

It will do nothing to increase paychecks and take-home pay for working families. In fact, it squeezes them even harder and tighter. It will increase the tax burden on millions of families—those in the middle class and those working hard to join the middle class.

Amazingly, it just drops the higher education tax credits. It ends the boost in the child tax credit. Millions of Americans will lose access to Affordable Care tax credits.

It is not just working families. Students who are working hard to try and get a job are going to find college even less affordable than today.

This Republican budget cuts student loans. It increases the cost of student loans. It starts charging students interest while they are still in college. It cuts $90 billion from Pell—mandatory—and more.

It is not just students and working families. Seniors who have worked hard to secure a healthy retirement are going to see their costs go up immediately. Prescription drugs will cost more. Copayments for preventive health services go up right away. Nursing home care will get much more expensive as they cut $90 billion out of Medicaid, two-thirds of which goes to help seniors and disabled individuals. Most of the rest goes to families with kids. And then they turn Medicare into a voucher program that will reduce Medicare benefits.

So while this Republican budget squeezes hard-working families, increases the cost of college for students, squeezes seniors—higher costs for them—it is great for those who are already in the top 1 percent. It is great for millionaires. In fact, this budget paves the way for the Romney-Ryan plan to cut the tax rate for millionaires by a third. It paves the way. It green lights it.

If you look at this budget, it is based on a failed and unproven economic theory—top-down, trickle-down economics—the same old theory, the theory that collided with the real world under President Bush in the 2000s, right? It cut the top tax rate. The theory was that benefits would trickle down and lift everybody up. Guess what? Incomes to the top 1 percent went up. Everybody else ran aground. Yachts went up. Everyone else's boat ran aground. That is what happened.

Guess what else went up? Deficits went up, Mr. Chairman, but everybody else was running in place or fell behind.

And here is the thing. While this Republican budget makes life harder right away for hard-working Americans—life will get harder immediately—it also disinvests in our future. It slashes the part of the budget we use to invest in our kids' education—from early education and Head Start to K–12 and beyond.

It is a sad day when we start chopping away at the ladder of opportunity in this country.

It will also devastate the investments our country has historically made in scientific research and innovation, investments that have helped power our economy and keep us at the cutting edge of world technology.

And guess what else? It provides no solution, no answer to the fact that in just a few months, in May, we are going to face a shortfall in the transportation trust fund that will result in a construction slowdown this summer. It does nothing about that in the budget. It says: Oh, we're going to come up with something after today—in a couple months.

So, Mr. Chair, when I say that this budget disinvests in America, it is not rhetoric. It is a mathematical reality.

I want people to look at this chart. This is a chart of the share of our economy that we spend on the investment portion of our budget—the investment in our kids' education, the investment in scientific research like the medical research to help find treatments and cures to diseases like cancer or diabetes or other diseases that plague American families.

Here is what the Republican budget does. It takes that investment budget and throws it off the cliff, to the point that it is 40 percent below the lowest level as a share of the economy since we have been keeping records in the late 1950s.

Here is a country that invested in the GI Bill. We invested in our infrastructure and the National Highway System. We have invested in our kids' education. This Republican budget disinvests in America. So it cuts all those things.

I will tell you one thing it doesn't cut. It doesn't cut one single tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Not one penny. Not one penny to reduce the deficit.

□ 1445

We hear that the highest priority is to reduce the deficit; but, yes, let's cut our investment in education. Yeah, let's cut our investment in innovation. Let's not fund the transportation trust fund—but we are not going to cut one

single tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit, not for corporate jets, not for hedge fund owners, not one.

Despite all that and despite the deep cuts it makes in our investment, the reality is this budget doesn't balance. It doesn't balance, not by a long shot, Mr. Chairman.

This budget takes budget quackery to new heights. It claims to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but it uses the revenues and the savings from the Affordable Care Act to claim balance at the end of 10 years.

Senator ENZI, the new Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, said that was kind of a budget accounting that he didn't think was right. The Heritage Foundation, they called that question as well in comments last time this came up.

Here is the other thing. The budget doesn't account for the almost $1 trillion in tax extenders that our Republican colleagues brought to the floor last fall and are on the way to bringing to the floor now, $1 trillion. If you add that to the deficit, which is real money, it is even farther out of balance.

Then they go and claim a deficit dividend based on phantom deficit reductions. Here is the number. This is in the 10th year. This is in the 10th year when they say their budget is really in balance by $33 billion. Well, it is not.

If you take out the Affordable Care Act revenue, if you take out the Affordable Care Act savings, if you add in the tax extenders costs that our Republican colleagues keep bringing to the floor, you don't come close to balance, not close, Mr. Chairman. This balanced budget stuff, it just isn't true. It is just not true. It would make Enron accountants blush.

I think, Mr. Chairman, most Americans would agree that this budget—cutting tax rates for the very wealthy, while increasing the tax burden on working families, raising the cost to seniors, raising the cost to students, cutting vital investments—will simply stack the deck even more in favor of the very wealthy and the very powerful and make it harder on everyone else to get ahead.

Mr. Chairman, we can do better. We can do much better, and Democrats will propose a budget that promotes a more rapidly growing economy, with more broadly shared prosperity. That will be the right direction for America.

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

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, so much misinformation just presented and we will work through that over the course of the next 3 hours as we debate this bill.

I guess the most disheartening thing is the rhetoric that divides the American people. This is a time for the country to come together and solve the challenges that we have.

An individual who has been leading in that is the current chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the past chairman of the Budget Committee. I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just want to, first of all, tip my hat to the new Budget chairman. It is a very difficult job putting a budget together. I did it for the last 4 years and served in the capacity of the gentleman from Maryland as the ranking member of the Budget Committee for the prior 4 years before that, so I want to thank the gentleman for bringing an outstanding budget to the floor.

First of all, this is a budget to be proud of. This is a budget that makes our country stronger. This is a budget that balances. It is pretty important to note that hard-working taxpayers, the people that elected us here to represent them, they have to live within their means. Well, so should government. That is the basic decision here.

When you take a look at the budgets that are being considered here today, we are basically trying to get the government to get back into the business of being honest with people about our finances.

Here is the problem, Mr. Chairman. Our government is making promises to people in this country that it knows it can't keep. That is dishonesty. What this budget does is it puts our budget back on track so that the government can keep these promises, the promises that people are organizing their lives around.

What the gentleman from Maryland and the President's budget says is just keep raising taxes; tax more. Oh, by the way, that is not enough. Then we need to borrow more and spend more.

That seems to be the path to prosperity, according to them, and look at where we are, highest poverty rates in a generation. Our economy is growing below 2 percent in most cases, below 3, which is what we were supposed to be growing at. The gentleman, I just listened to his rhetoric. He says this slices, this slashes; we are chopping away at opportunity.

Here is what this budget does. Instead of increasing spending, on average, like the President's budget does at 5.1 percent, it does it at 3.4 percent. We are saying let's get the government to live within its means.

Government spending will still increase, on average, 3.4 percent a year, instead of 5.1 percent a year. I guess that is the difference between whether people can live the American Dream or not, whether we are slashing or chopping or doing all these horrible, awful things to people.

Mr. Chairman, just don't buy all this overheated rhetoric. The problem is we have got to balance the budget. We have got to get this debt under control.

We see the storm clouds on the horizon, and what this budget does is it gets government to be honest with the taxpayers that give us this money in the first place so that we can meet these priorities honestly and balance the budget and get this debt on the right track.

We invest it the right way by giving people more of their own money so that they can make decisions on what is right for their family, instead of having Washington run it all.

Now, there is one last thing I would like to say as I get carried away on the rhetoric. The CBO is an agency we use quite a bit here, and the Congressional Budget Office is a very important government agency that gives us all of our cost estimates. This budget is written on their estimates.

For the last 6 years, we have had a Director at the Congressional Budget Office by the name of Doug Elmendorf, who has done an outstanding job as Director of the CBO. I have worked very closely with Dr. Elmendorf and with CBO in my prior capacity. He was a Democratic appointee, but the CBO Director is supposed to call the balls and the strikes and play it fair. Doug Elmendorf has done that.

I just simply want to say, for the record, Mr. Chairman, that we wish him well. He is leaving at the end of the month. We wish him well. We thank him for his service. We thank the Congressional Budget Office for all the hard work that they put in so that we can be here on the floor with these budgets, and we wish him great success in the future in whatever it is he chooses and thank him for his service to this House, to this Congress, and to our country.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say this is an outstanding budget that deserves our support. Don't buy all the hype you are hearing from the other side, and pass this fantastic Price budget.

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

I listened to my friend and the former chairman and his remarks. The reality is that the President's proposal and the Democratic proposal, we don't increase tax rates; but, yes, we do get rid of some of the tax loopholes in the Tax Code that are riddled with preferences that are there not because they make America more productive, but because someone had a powerful lobbyist who was getting a special interest break for them.

If you think about it, if the government provides a grant of $1,000 to somebody, that is $1,000 in value; but if I say to you, Of the taxes you have to pay, I am going to give you a special break so it is $1,000 less, that is a pretty good deal, too.

The reality is we spend $1.4 trillion, according to the Congressional Budget Office, each year on tax expenditures, more than on Social Security. Now, some of those are for good purposes, good public policy purposes, but some of them are for like corporate jets, and some of them are for hedge fund managers.

Here is the thing. We think that we can get rid of some of those tax breaks

to help reduce the long-term deficit. Our colleagues would just prefer to devastate our investments in education and other areas,

Math is math, to the former chairman. The reality is—and he knows it—that the portion of the budget we use to make these investments, the Republican budget does absolutely cut that to 40 percent below the lowest levels of the shared economy since we have been keeping records. That is a fact.

Another reality is that this Republican budget doesn't balance unless you are using phony math.

Mr. Chairman, I am now very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a great member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

I want to add my voice to those who congratulate everyone on the Budget Committee, particularly the chair and the ranking member, for their really hard work—and the staff—that we put into this labor.

I can tell you that I was, indeed, shocked. Even though I have been on the Budget Committee for several cycles, I continue to be shocked at how this budget does not reflect what I call democratic values. I mean democratic, not as a Democratic Party, but as our democracy. I believe that our democracy is really at risk when we put forth such a budget.

I think that this budget hollows out the middle class; and, based on the constructs that we have seen in the past, it would raise taxes on middle class families. I am talking about those people earning modest incomes—$50,000 to $75,000 a year—by $2,000 a year.

Of course, it abandons the poor. Of the $5.5 trillion, 69 percent of this is on the backs of those who are the most poor and most vulnerable. A lot of people just don't care that much about poor people; but who do we care about in this budget?

This budget pulls up the ladder of opportunity from our kids, that next generation that is going to make our economy work. They are doing us a favor by trying to go to college; yet we cut Pell grants in this Republican budget by somewhere around $90 billion.

It deconstructs our job-creating infrastructure investment by $187 billion. There used to be a time when the transportation budget was a bipartisan thing; but, in the name of balancing a budget, we even throw these workers under the bus.

It pulls the lifeline from seniors, disabled, and kids by block granting our Medicaid program and cutting $913 billion, that being a portion of the $2 trillion that we cut from health care, a lifeline, by repealing the Affordable Care Act and all this in the name of a phony balancing of the budget.

□ 1500

We are going to see a display here at some point. I don't know if you call it the king of the hill, the queen-of-the-hill budget, the price-is-right budget—I don't know—where we are either going to have $94 billion or $96 billion in a slush fund, the overseas account that is $36 billion, $38 billion above what the generals and the President say they need for war.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. That is $1.4 trillion of entitlements that we spend through the Tax Code for gas and oil subsidies, jets, hedge fund managers. There is talk in this budget of eliminating the estate tax. Millionaires and billionaires are benefiting tremendously on tax income from CEO pay.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. Don't believe the hype. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. Don't believe the hype. This is not a democratic budget, as Americans have come to know it.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this appears to be a common theme, moving forward with this rhetoric that is hyperbole and dividing American against American. It is just not positive. It is not what this Nation needs.

The gentleman from Maryland said that it is all about math. Math is math. And he is right.

We now spend about $12,000 per American every single year, and we collect about $10,000 per every single American each year. It doesn't work.

What does it get you? This is what it gets you. This is the debt-to-gross domestic product ratio, the debt since 1940 of this country until 2015. The red line is where the debt is going. This is the President's plan. This is the Democrat plan right here. That is what will crush this country. Our friends want to stick their heads in the sand and ignore that. This is what destroys lives. This destroys every American.

We stand for all Americans. We believe that having a balanced budget for a stronger America is the way to solve these challenges. We believe it is important to save and strengthen and secure the programs that are so vital for the American people.

I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chairman of the Budget Committee who has been working diligently on this from the very beginning.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chairman for his hard work. I thank all of my Budget Committee colleagues for their hard work.

Mr. Chairman, it has been hard work—it continues to be—to have this honest conversation with the American people.

The whole goal here is to allow the opportunity for Americans to build better lives for themselves and their families, not for the Federal Government to attempt to provide that better life because, Mr. Chairman, after 50 years of the War on Poverty, for example, we know that the Federal Government can't do the job.

There is a lot of rhetoric out there. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, for the committee, it is not positive and not right either. It is just plain wrong.

We talk about hard work. You know what is hard work? Getting the competing priorities and a continuing usurpation of our limited moneys in terms of our mandatory spending and getting a budget to balance in 10 years. Yet again, this Budget Committee and this House of Representatives has a plan to do it and, unlike you have heard, to do it honestly.

What is not hard work, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, what is easier to do is to never balance, and this chart shows that. The President's budget never balances, ever.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, you know that you can't start paying down the $18 trillion of debt that we have with another $100 trillion on the way until you first count the balance. We do that in a responsible, honest way. We don't try to do it in a year. We do it in a responsible, logical 10-year window.

The Federal budget is very big. It is like an aircraft carrier, Mr. Chairman. You have got to turn it, and you have got to turn it decisively, but it doesn't turn on a dime. And that is what we show here. That is what we do here. Again, it is hard work.

It is also hard work, as I mentioned earlier, because, as time goes on, more and more of our over $3 trillion worth of spending per year is spent on programs that are eventually going to bankrupt us if we don't reform them. If we don't strengthen them and save them for future generations, no one will be able to take advantage of Medicaid, of Medicare, of Social Security.

And I know we all put money into those programs—especially Medicare and Social Security—but on average, we only put about 30 percent into them, Medicare, for example. And that 70 percent delta goes on the backs of our children and grandchildren, a lot of whom haven't yet been born. Talk about taxation without representation.

Our budget solves this problem. We have the ability, and we on the committee have had the honesty to have this direct, forthright conversation with the American people, frankly, now for 5 years. The worst thing we could have done is to turn tail and run and not have this honest conversation.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROKITA. But we did it 5 years ago when the new crew came in. We continue to do it. And I am encouraged, Mr. Chairman. I think the American people see the light. They see that unless we correct and reform this mandatory overspending, no one can be helped. We can't have Americans building better lives for themselves and

their families. We are going to have them more dependent on the Federal Government, and in doing so, more and more people will be hurt.

Slush fund, no. A very important fund to fight the global war on terror, to keep our troops safe and effective. That is an important fund. I wouldn't call that a slush fund. And I wouldn't call dependency on broken programs good or positive either.

Republicans on the Budget Committee, Republicans in this Congress, I hope all of us eventually will have the courage and ability to not only have this conversation with the American people but to start putting this conversation into direct action.

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

I am a little surprised the gentleman from Indiana brought up what is called the OCO funding. These are the funds in the overseas contingency operations account for overseas contingencies, like wars and other contingencies that come up.

The reality is that what the Republican budget does here is create a slush fund out of the overseas contingency account. It sends a signal that we are confused about how we are going to fund our defense obligations, and it is in total violation of what the Budget Committee itself stood for for years.

I want to read, Mr. Chairman, from the 2015 Republican budget. It is just a year ago, but we have got real amnesia among our Republican colleagues.

Here is what they said in their report:

> Abuse of the OCO cap adjustment is a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process;
>
> The Budget Committee will exercise its oversight responsibilities with respect to the use of the OCO;
>
> The Budget Committee will oppose increases above the levels the administration and our military commanders say are needed to carry out operations unless it can be clearly demonstrated that such amounts are war-related.

I didn't write that. Our Republican colleagues put it in their report. It is like, ooh, didn't mean it.

So I am really baffled that our colleagues keep bringing this up. It is a total violation of what the Budget Committee has always stood for on a bipartisan basis.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee and a great friend to entrepreneurs around the country.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose a budget that will cut the legs out from under our Nation's small businesses. This budget would mean $10 billion of cuts to initiatives that foster small business growth. Taken together, these reductions would mean 190,000 fewer jobs created.

For many would-be business owners, the SBA's entrepreneurial development centers provide critical training and guidance; yet this budget would shortchange those programs, removing local resources that allow small businesses to take root and grow in our communities. Nationally, Small Business Development Centers and Women's Business Centers would see cuts of $195 million. This would mean 16,000 fewer small businesses are able to launch, while 150,000 existing small companies would be deprived assistance that speeds their growth.

Beyond technical assistance, small firms need capital to expand. Sadly, this budget also undermines credit programs. New York City alone would see a $22.5 million reduction in microloans—microloans. Do you know that 62 percent of microloan borrowers are women, low-income women with a default rate of less than 3 percent? Shame on us. This lending helps the smallest businesses create opportunity in economically stricken communities. So it only makes sense that this budget, which targets the most vulnerable, would slash this program too.

Small businesses would suffer in other ways. For many small businesses, having the Federal Government as a customer can mean significant revenue and job creation opportunity. Under this plan, small business contract awards would be reduced by $142 billion, lowering job creation by 2.1 million positions. New York City companies would lose out on $3.6 billion worth of Federal work over the budget period.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans like to position themselves as small business champions. However, supporting small firms takes more than lip service. It requires wise investments in programs promoting entrepreneurship. This budget slashes those programs, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I was amused by my friend from Maryland's comments about the global war on terror fund, understanding that in 2015, 2014, and 2013, for those fiscal years, he voted for the appropriations bills that included the defense money and the OCO money. In fact, the levels were $91.9 billion, $91.9 billion, and $98.7 billion that the gentleman voted for.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Maybe I will yield to the gentleman later if I have time.

I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my friend and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we need to discuss the budget under the ominously growing shadow of unprecedented debt that has literally doubled in the last 8 years.

With crushing debt comes ruinous interest costs that the CBO warns will exceed our entire military budget within the decade on our current trajectory.

The budget produced by Chairman PRICE's House Budget Committee meets our current defense demands by adding additional money into the war account. But I would reassure the ranking member that it funds that increase through a concomitant decrease in other spending. That will hold us on a trajectory to balance the budget in less than 10 years and then begin paying down the unprecedented debt that this administration has run up.

Unfortunately, this plan is met with opposition from so-called defense hawks who want the extra spending for defense, which this budget provides, but who don't want to go through the fuss and bother of paying for it. And therein lies the problem.

This is not just a 1-year increase. Because it increases defense spending without making other cuts, it changes the overall spending trajectory over the next 10 years.

And here is the simple math of the matter. This adds more than $20 billion to our total spending this year, and it, in effect, repudiates the budget plan for additional reductions next year. On this new trajectory that these budget hawks would set, there will be no balanced budget in 10 years, even if we enacted every other reform called for in the budget and maintained all other departments within these constraints.

After 10 years, we will still be running deficits of nearly $100 billion a year, and interest costs will have eaten us alive. That is why it is so important to pass the budget intact, without the amendments being proposed.

□ 1515

I am curious how the self-proclaimed defense hawks claim to defend our country when our credit is shot and our debt service is approaching $1 trillion a year. They forget that in the spring of 1945, carrying a debt proportional to the one we have today, there was serious doubt over whether we could continue to conduct the war for another year.

When he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullin warned that in his professional military judgment, the greatest threat to our national security is the national debt. He made that warning 5 years and $4½ trillion of debt ago.

History warns us that countries that bankrupt themselves aren't around very long because before you can provide for the common defense, you have to be able to pay for it, and the ability of our Nation to do so is coming into grave doubt. The Budget Committee's budget offers us a very narrow path out of debt while continuing to fund our military at the requested levels, and its adoption, intact, is indispensable both to our short-term and to our long-term defense needs.

Mr. Chairman, we have a stark choice before us: pay for the needed increases in defense by reducing other

spending, or refuse to pay for those increases and sacrifice the long-term security and prosperity of our country on the altar of instant gratification.

Amongst the most chilling words in history are those attributed to Louis XV, ''After us, the flood.'' Let that not be the epitaph of this Congress.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK is right about this OCO slush fund.

To the chairman of the committee, you actually made exactly my point in your remarks. I did support the OCO money—again, this is for overseas contingency operations—at the level requested by the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our military commanders. It was higher a couple of years ago because we had tens of thousands more troops in Afghanistan. The gentleman may recall that we brought a lot of those troops home. As a result of that, we don't need as much money in our war account, the overseas contingency account.

So what I did, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what our Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee said we should do at that time; in other words, I opposed increases above the levels the administration and military commanders said were needed to carry out those operations. Yes, I did support a budget level at the level the President and our military commanders said was necessary, but as Mr. MCCLINTOCK said, the Republican budget does just the opposite. It does what we said we would not do—and I say ''we,'' Republicans and Democrats alike. So it is important to heed our own words; otherwise, as the Budget Committee itself said, we will undermine the integrity of the budget process. That was the point Mr. MCCLINTOCK was making as well.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He is somebody who knows we have to fund the modernization of our country's infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, let's depart from a little bit of the acrimony, the acronyms, the magic asterisks, and the end runs. Let's be concrete. So let's talk about infrastructure investment and what the Republican budget would do.

We are running a deficit this year. We fall off a cliff the end of May, and if we don't put up $10 billion, many States will cancel projects this summer. That is not the subject of this budget. This budget is for next year.

So what are they doing for the long term? They are going to reform the highway trust fund. Oh, thank you very much. I appreciate that. They are going to limit expenditures out of the fund to future income. We have been supplementing it from general funds because the income is not adequate, but they are going to say: No. No more general funds. You live on the income.

What does that mean? Well, it means, in this budget put forward by these people, there would be a 99 percent cut in State funding. Yes. No, I'm not exaggerating, 99 percent. Because basically the money is paying for past obligations, past projects for the States. When the States finish a project, they get reimbursed. While they are building it, they don't. So under their budget in fiscal year 2016, your State Department of Transportation will get 99 percent less Federal funds. That kind of has a pretty big impact in some States here. If you are in a bright yellow State, you are over 70 percent, depending on the Federal funds; if you are in a green State, 50 to 69; and a light green, 30 to 49.

I would note on the Republican side that the chairman of the committee, Georgia, they would get $1.1 billion less. Now, I guess Georgia doesn't need the money. The roads, the congestion around Atlanta is not a problem. The Speaker's State would get $1.2 billion less under this budget; California, $3.2 billion less, the majority leader; and Louisiana, the whip, $619 million less. These are facts. That is the actual impact of their proposed budget. It digs a hole so deep we will never get out of it.

What happens after the first year of their reform of the trust fund? Well, actually, unless we pass a long-term bill with new funding, which they are quite resistant to thus far, it would mean 30 percent less funding than today for all States and a 60 percent cut in surface transportation.

We already have a system with 147,000 bridges that need repair or total replacement. Forty percent of the surface on the National Highway System is in such bad condition it has to be dug up—not just resurfaced, no, major work—and a $75 billion backlog in transit systems. Our legacy systems in our major cities are so obsolete, they are killing people. Right here in the Nation's Capital, people are dying unnecessarily because they can't afford to bring in modern cars without the Federal partnership.

We held a hearing just last week in the committee, and we heard from the Governor of North Carolina—red State, red Governor—the mayor of Salt Lake, and the transportation director from Wyoming. They all say the Federal partnership is absolutely critical, and you are going to reduce it to 1 percent.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would note for the gentleman that if he reads the budget resolution, we accommodate for appropriate funding for infrastructure and for highways in section 510. With a deficit-neutral reserve fund, that means that we actually accommodate for paying for it, for transportation and for infrastructure, because we believe it is a priority. We believe it is a priority for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the diligent work on the Budget Committee and the leadership you have shown there.

Mr. Chairman, Americans know that this country was built on a strong work ethic. This budget provides a framework to create work requirements for able-bodied, working-age adults receiving Federal benefits.

Some may ask, Why work requirements? In 1996, President Clinton, a fellow Arkansan from my hometown of Hot Springs but from across the aisle, said: Today we are taking an historic chance to make welfare what it is meant to be: a second chance, not a way of life. The goal of workforce requirements on able-bodied, working-age adults is simply to give Americans a hand up, not a hand out.

Mr. Chairman, we should be concerned about the negative effects these Federal benefit programs are having on our American work ethic when we review the data. The maximum an individual can earn and still receive government assistance under some programs, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, is only $1,000.

The Cato Institute reports that in 39 States, individuals can make more on government assistance than by working an 8-hour, $8-per-hour job. In six States, government benefits pay more than a $12-per-hour job; and in eight States, government assistance pays for more than the average salary of an American teacher.

In my home State, where Medicaid expansion was accepted, 40 percent of the able-bodied, working-age adults receiving 100-percent-funded Medicaid had zero income. By adding workforce requirements for able-bodied, working-age adults in the Medicaid population alone, this budget establishes a blueprint for work requirements that will result in savings by 2022 of up to $376 billion federally, with an additional $170 billion saved at the State level.

President Franklin Roosevelt made clear during a 1935 address to Congress that these programs were not intended to be an entitlement but a temporary aid to those in need. He said:

''The lessons of history, confirmed by the evidence immediately before me, show conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fibre. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. It is inimical to the dictates of sound policy. It is in violation of the traditions of America. Work must be found for able-bodied but destitute workers.''

The principles President Clinton and President Roosevelt before him promoted are more important now than ever before as we find ourselves in a fiscal crisis created by dependence and entitlement. President Clinton reminded us in 1996 that this is not the end of welfare reform, this is the beginning, and we all have to assume responsibility.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WESTERMAN. This budget incentivizes work, not dependence. This budget reduces spending growth instead of growing government. This budget moves us in the right direction.

I encourage my friends on both sides of the aisle to assume responsibility by voting for this balanced budget for a stronger, working America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, actually, this Republican budget strips away provisions that are in existence today to make work pay. Child tax credits for working families, they get rid of the bump up. They get rid of the enhanced earned income tax credit for working families. As I said, they get rid of the higher education deduction for families so that they can send their kids to school.

I also want to say a word about the transportation trust fund, because as the ranking member, as the senior Democrat on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee just pointed out, this Republican budget has no provision inside the budget numbers for dealing with the crisis we are going to face in a few months.

Now, the chairman of the committee mentioned the deficit-neutral reserve fund, section 510. I am looking at it now. Deficit-neutral reserve funds can play an important role in signaling a policy direction. After all, these are 10-year budgets. I would understand if we didn't know exactly what we were going to do with our transportation trust fund 10 years from now or 9 years from now, but we are talking about 1½ months from now. We are talking about in the first year of this budget. In the middle of May, we are going to see a construction slowdown.

Now, the Democratic budget alternative, we have a plan. The President put forward a 6-year plan, $478 billion. It is included in his budget numbers. It is not like, okay, a little asterisk, we will figure this out in a month and a half. The President makes sure we don't have a shortfall, and, actually, he says we need to modernize our infrastructure so we can compete in this global economy.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is just reckless to put forward a budget where it doesn't even provide any solution to something that is going to face us in a month and a half.

Now I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, there is a stark choice to be made, there is no question about it, as I am quoting from the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, this is the stark choice. Look at this. This is what you tried to do to the American people after Bill Clinton left office.

During his term, 21 million jobs were created. Then the next 8 years when we dropped the tax rate down from 39.6 to 35 percent for those most affluent, we didn't gain anything. In fact, we lost 463,000 jobs. You want to try this again? We are not going to try it again. You want to talk about dead on arrival? Those are your words. This is dead on arrival.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this budget. Forget about the trillions of dollars worth of cuts to programs that help people with low or moderate incomes. Forget about the tax increases that hit the middle class and working poor so that some millionaires and billionaires can squeeze a little more from the stone. Forget about repealing ObamaCare for the 56th time, taking affordable health care out of the hands of 16 million Americans, leaving them with nothing and not having the guts to tell them what is going on. Forget about all of that.

The fundamental problem with this document is that even with all the draconian spending cuts and with all the tax increases I just described, at the end of the day, it still doesn't balance, as the ranking member, just a few moments ago, said over and over again.

In fact, Mr. Ranking Member, it is not even close.

□ 1530

This budget, while calling for the complete and total repeal of the Affordable Care Act, continues to assume that the law's $2 trillion revenue increases and Medicare savings—it assumes that. We will do away with the bill, but we will keep the money. I don't know another way to put it.

When we get to taxes, the budget assumes that revenues remain unchanged for the current law. Yet you, yourself—you, yourself, Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for you, Doctor—you stated explicitly through the Chair that you don't think we should be using the current law baseline. You said that, I didn't.

Last Congress, we passed $956 billion in unpaid-for tax breaks. You all voted for that. They weren't assumed in the current law baseline. This year, we have already passed $100 billion in unpaid-for tax cuts. Where is this money coming from? We are the tax-and-spend Democrats. You folks know better than that.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you.

Two hundred billion dollars more have been reported out of Ways and Means. And tomorrow, we are going to report out another $300 billion tax cut for Paris Hilton, Ivanka Trump, and others fortunate enough to be left a nice inheritance. That is what you are going to do tomorrow.

My friend, the chairman, might just be assuming that your majority will shortly pass a trillion-dollar tax increase to offset these unpaid for tax breaks and abide by his budget's revenue assumptions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote for this budget. It is simply not worth the paper it is printed on.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body in the second person.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to make a comment about the highway trust fund that was referenced. My colleague from Maryland stated there is nothing in this budget that will deal with the problem that is about to occur in a month and a half. And he is right. This budget deals with fiscal year 2016, which begins in October.

The good news, Mr. Chairman, however, is that in last year's budget, FY15 budget, which addresses this year, this current year that we are in right now, we also had a proposal to be able to provide for a deficit neutral reserve fund for transportation, which was used previously for MAP–21. So a path to how we are able to actually solve the challenges before us.

I am so pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

At a time when our Nation is grappling with over $18 trillion in national debt and an uncertain economic future, now more than ever Washington must learn to live within its means. Washington's spending problem is one that cannot be taken lightly.

According to former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen, the ''single, biggest threat to our national security'' is our national debt. House Republicans are working to confront this issue head on.

In our budget proposal, we seek to tackle Washington's spending addiction by reducing Federal spending by $5.5 trillion and balancing the Federal budget in less than 10 years. This is a sharp contrast to President Obama's budget, which never balances, ever, despite the President's continued insistence on raising taxes.

Our budget aims to strengthen vital programs like Medicare and Social Security in a fiscally responsible way so that we can fulfill the promises we have made to our Nation's seniors.

One of the Federal Government's top priorities is providing a strong national defense. This budget boosts defense spending above the President's levels so we can ensure a strong, safe, and secure Nation.

Furthermore, our proposal repeals ObamaCare in full, including the law's taxes, regulations, and mandates that are crippling hard-working Americans and small businesses nationwide.

We also empower patients by repealing the President's Independent Payment Advisory Board, an unelected, unaccountable board of bureaucrats charged with making patient's health care decisions.

The Republican budget is a positive step forward for our Nation. It seeks to address our Nation's debt crisis while also supporting the programs that are critical to our national and economic security.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, as we have previously pointed out, this Republican budget keeps the revenues from the Affordable Care Act even as it claims to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Without that level of revenue, along with other savings, it doesn't come close to balancing. No accountant would certify this Republican budget close to balance.

I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a terrific member of the committee and someone who is an expert on all sorts of issues, including health care.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the ranking member.

This budget, the Republican budget, is a collection of $5.5 trillion of devastating cuts to both mandatory and nondefense discretionary programs.

I have heard my colleagues say that we need to treat the budget like we do American families: when you can't live within your means, then you have to figure that out. The problem is, this is a budget that actually takes away those means. If we are going to talk about entitlement reform, you have to provide an investment and actually create jobs and create opportunities to have careers and meaningful wages.

Now, as we debate these numbers, I really hope that my Republican colleagues, when they vote for this budget, will you really know what you are doing and what these numbers mean for hard-working American families? Because I know what the budget does and how it impacts them.

Here is what it means. It means 290 fewer New Mexican children are going to have access to Head Start. It means 18,700 fewer New Mexico residents are going to receive job training and employment services. It means 59,000 New Mexican students are going to lose access to their Pell grants for college. It means 24,100 New Mexican seniors are likely going to have to pay more for their prescription drugs. And about 431,000—that bears repeating—431,000 New Mexicans receiving SNAP, half of which are children, will be in jeopardy of losing their nutrition support.

Now, when we think about the budget, we cannot just think about the numbers that sit on a piece of paper. We need to think about the human meaning behind the numbers. We need to think about the child that will go hungry, the student who can't afford to pay for college, and the seniors who won't be able to pay their medical bills. We need to invest in economic security for everyone.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and, instead, pass a budget that lifts people out of poverty, invests in hard-working families who have been left behind by the economy, and that provides for shared prosperity.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), a senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, back on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the Federal debt in this country stood at $10.6 trillion. The Federal debt today, as we stand here today, is over $18 trillion. That is an increase of over 70 percent during his tenure.

Debt now represents 101 percent of the GDP. In other words—let's put this in context—America owes more money to its creditors around the world than the value of all the goods and all the services that are produced right here in the United States in 1 year.

That level of debt, quite honestly, is unsustainable. In fact, that is not just me saying this. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, states that our ''high and rising debt would have serious negative consequences for both the economy and the Federal budget.'' And it certainly does.

Admiral Michael Mullen, also quoted on this floor before, perhaps put it best when he said: ''The single, biggest threat to our national security'' in this country is what?—''our debt.''

So, Mr. Chairman, Americans are faced with two paths right now: one that continues down the path of blissful neglect of our very real budget crisis; or on the other path, one that seeks an honest solution to it.

Instead of solving our debt problem, President Obama has committed to exacerbating it.

The President's budget would add another $8.5 trillion to our already staggering debt. But despite his $2.1 trillion in new tax increases, in addition, the Obama budget never ever balances. It is a vision that consigns our children and grandchildren to a future of crushing debts and heavy tax burdens.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, is a stark alternative to the past 6 years of reckless spending and failed policies. Instead of ever-increasing debt and ever-higher taxes, Republicans will balance the budget in less than 10 years without raising more taxes on you.

Instead of pretending that Medicare is sound, Republicans will strengthen the program by making much-needed structural improvements to it.

Instead of dictating that Washington knows all the answers, Republicans will promote by innovation and also by flexibility for Medicaid, for education, and other programs by restoring local control.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge today all Members of this body to stand up to support the budget and to support the American taxpayers, to stand up for strengthening our social safety net, and to stand up for our children and to stand up for our grandchildren, who do not deserve to be handed the bill for our irresponsible spending today.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Republican budget.

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

I don't think that huge disinvestment in education, starting with early education going through K–12, helps our kids in their future. I don't think that the efforts that strip away a lot of the job training programs help hard-working Americans.

The President's budget's priority is to accelerate economic growth and have more broadly shared prosperity. I would remind my colleagues that the day the President was sworn into office we were losing 800,000 jobs every month in this country. The bottom was falling out. Now we have seen over the last 60 months 12 million jobs created. We have got a long way to go, but we are certainly on the right track. And the President's budget provides for additional economic growth in a fiscally responsible way. The President's budget reduces the debt-to-GDP ratio. The President's budget reduces the deficit's share of the economy.

But what the President's budget does not do is disinvest in our kid's education, it does not increase the cost to seniors for prescription drugs and copays for preventive health care, and it doesn't get away from a lot of the important tax credits and relief for middle class Americans and those working to join the middle class. So, no, it does not do that.

Now I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN), who knows a lot about the importance of economic growth, especially as it relates to small businesses, a distinguished member of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Chairman, I think a budget is a reflection of our priorities. The choices we make about how to invest and spend have an impact on our American families. We must make it easier for hard-working Americans to own a home, to send their kids to college, and to have a secure and enjoyable retirement.

That is why it is so important that we invest in our Nation's ports, which create good-paying American jobs and sustain American businesses. Providing our ports and waterways with the funding and support they need is a high priority for me, and one that is shared by many of my colleagues, especially the almost 100 members of the bipartisan Congressional PORTS Caucus.

□ 1545

We know that America must invest more in our ports to remain globally

competitive and to be prepared for the expansion of the Panama Canal, which will impact international trade and shipping routes.

The budget we are considering today, however, does just the opposite. Cutting funding for programs that support American commerce is both shortsighted and harmful to the competitiveness of American businesses.

I applaud the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget because it fully meets the targets we set in the 2014 WRRDA bill for the harbor maintenance funding, using more of the revenue collected at our ports for its intended purpose of maintaining and improving ports and navigation channels.

Let me emphasize that the harbor maintenance trust fund is self-funded. This is not new spending or new fees. Shippers already pay this tax to fund improvements that Congress is refusing to authorize.

The trust fund now has a surplus of $9 billion in fees that America's ports have collected; but unless we act, these funds will not be used as intended, which is to improve our ports.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting a budget that returns this tax back to the ports, where it is collected.

I want to thank the bipartisan group of 86 Members who signed the letter, which Congressman BOUSTANY and I sent to House appropriators last week, calling for the harbor maintenance trust fund funding to be at the WRRDA level.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for her comments because she is absolutely right. The budget is about priorities, and the priorities that we have in our budget, we believe, address in a very responsible way the challenges that we face in this Nation.

What is the President's priority? If you look at where his budget would take us, it is debt. This, again, is the chart that demonstrates the debt that this Nation has held since 1940. That is the dark area here. You see the debt has increased since this President came into office. It is at virtually the highest level it has been since World War II.

Where does his path go? Where does the Democrats' path go in their budget? Higher than ever before—ever before—that is their plan, apparently. It is what their budget outlines. It is what the President's budget outlines.

What does that mean? What that means is the interest on the debt, paying the debt service. Everybody knows what interest means. They pay it on their credit cards. They pay it on their home mortgages. They pay interest when they buy a car. That is money that you pay just to be able to borrow the money that you are using for whatever it is.

In this instance, the interest on the debt, when we get to numbers not too far away, consumes the entire Federal budget. That is what we are talking about. In a very short period of time, within the budget window of this 10-year period of time, interest on the debt rises to over $1 trillion a year.

That is more than the amount spent on defense. That is more than the amount spent on Medicare. That is more than the amount spent on Medicaid. That is more than the amount spent on education. All of the priorities that the American people have is going to be spent on interest on the debt.

That is why we believe it is a moral question. Are we going to leave our kids this kind of debt? Are we going to destine them to a life that has no opportunity, to have them be servants to the Federal Government just to work so they can send their tax money to Washington to pay the interest on the debt?

Mr. Chairman, you know that is not the America we want to leave our kids and our grandkids. I don't believe it is the America that our friends on the other side of the aisle want to leave our kids and grandkids.

Sadly, that is what their budget does. That is what the President's budget does. That is why we are so excited about A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, a budget that puts us on a path to balance within less than a 10-year period of time and that saves $5.5 trillion.

Our friends on the other side say, Oh, no; it really doesn't get to balance. Even if you conceded that—and I don't—our goal is to get it to balance. Theirs never does. It is more and more and more borrowing, more debt, more taxes, more spending. It is not what the American people want.

What we need to do is to come together and address these challenges that we have in a positive way, in a real way, in an honest way, and get real results for the work that we do here.

We are proud of the work that this budget does. It lays out a positive path, a path of real solutions, one of saving and strengthening and securing Medicare and Medicaid, one of tax reform that actually works to get this economy rolling again so we can grow the economy in this country and put people back to work. Those are the positive things that this budget does.

The safety net programs are vital. They are important. We protect those programs. We actually make them work better for the individuals who are receiving those moneys, and we encourage them, in a moral way, to better their lives and get back on their feet. We assist them in getting back to work.

Those are positive solutions, Mr. Chairman, positive solutions. It is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As I said at the beginning of this debate, the one thing that the Republican budget, unfortunately, will do immediately is make life harder for hard-working Americans. How does it do it? As I indicated, it actually increases the tax burden on working Americans—middle-income Americans and people working their way to the middle—while providing another tax rate cut for folks at the very top.

For people who are working harder than ever and feel that they are just on a treadmill, it doesn't help them at all. In fact, they are going to move farther behind, in addition to the fact that they are going to pile more costs on to students by increasing the cost of student loans.

It is right there in their budget. They are going to start charging you interest while you are in college. They are going to start charging seniors with high prescription drug costs even more because they are going to reopen what is called the prescription drug doughnut hole. I don't know how that is good for seniors in America.

It is hard on seniors, hard on students, hard on working families.

The Democratic budget, like the President's budget, meets those priorities. For example, working families are facing huge childcare costs, so we propose a significant expansion of the child independent care tax credit. We make it a little bit easier for those families who are working but who want to make sure their kids have quality childcare. We make it easier for them by providing them a significant tax credit for that cost.

For couples who are working, we scale back the marriage penalty so the second worker doesn't begin work at the same higher tax rate as the first worker in the household. That is the kind of important relief we provide to middle class families and to those working to join the middle class.

The Republican budget actually gets rid of some of the important provisions that are already there to help those families, but our budget does this in a fiscally responsible way. As we have seen, the Republican budget doesn't balance, not by a long shot.

I mentioned a quote in my opening remarks. I am going to quote the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Mr. ENZI, who said:

> One of the problems I have had with budgets that I have looked at is that they use a lot of gimmicks. Now, when there was anticipation that ObamaCare would go away and that all of that money would still be there, that is not realistic. I would like to see us get to real accounting with the budget.

That is what Senator ENZI said; yet this budget assumes the revenue from the Affordable Care Act at the same time it repeals the Affordable Care Act.

What the President's and the Democratic budgets do is put us on a fiscally

responsible path, reducing the debt to GDP ratio and doing it in a way that improves economic growth and provides for more shared prosperity, not a budget that provides another round of tax cuts for folks at the top with the hope that somehow it is going to trickle down and lift everybody up.

Somebody who knows a lot about these areas is someone who is both a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, a budget is a statement of values and priorities.

You have heard people standing up here, talking about what their priorities are, that we don't want to load up our kids with debt, that we don't want to do all this kind of stuff; yet the budget that is put forward by my Republican colleagues is a shortsighted statement that has no view of the future.

It gambles away the future of the next generation's in order to supply business and the ultrawealthy with near-term gains. What has made this country great is the strategic Federal investments in health care, roads, education, bridges, research—the types of investment that build the middle class and America.

Now, the Republicans say their budget plan balances the budget in 9 years. What they don't tell you is that they do this at the expense of Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, Pell grants—everything in the social budget.

What you learn from this budget is that, when they say they are balancing the budget, they mean we are cutting domestic programs. We are cutting anything that helps hard-working families in this country.

It also fails to cut one single dime from the military, not one single dime. They actually want to give the military more than they asked for. Now, despite raising taxes, you would think they could at least cut a dime from the Defense Department.

By now, people's eyes are kind of glazed over at home in thinking about this, but let me talk to one group of people, to anybody who has a student with student debt. It is the largest debt load we have in this country. We have made our kids indentured servants of banks and of the Federal Government.

This budget contains $127 billion over the next 10 years that we will have extracted from students in interest on their loans to give cuts in taxes to the wealthy, to lower the rates, to make it better for the rich.

If you know anything about student loans, those loans can't be renegotiated. You can renegotiate on your house, or you can renegotiate on anything else, but not on a student loan. When a student and his mother and father or her mother and father sign up for a loan and put their home in the deal and put their futures and their 401(k)'s and everything behind that kid's education, they are stuck with that loan rate.

You have got people in this country who are paying 6, 8, 9 percent—as high as 13—on loans, and they can't renegotiate them. Is that fair? Is that the future you want, to stick the kids in this country with those kinds of loans?

In my view, this budget has no humanity and no view of the future for our kids.

I urge Members to vote ''no.''

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a freshman Member and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has a spending problem.

Last week, the Government Accountability Office released a report estimating that the government made $124 billion in improper payments during 2014. Wasteful spending like this is one of the reasons the national debt has skyrocketed to $18 trillion today.

Divided among 320 million Americans, a child born today inherits $56,250 in debt—or $225,000 for a family of four. Americans work too hard to have the government waste their tax dollars. It is time to start our country on a new course. This Republican budget puts America on a more sustainable and responsible fiscal path.

In my district, there are over 130,000 Medicare-eligible residents and over 169,000 Social Security recipients. This budget keeps the promises that have been made to our seniors and to those near retirement age by stabilizing the Social Security trust fund. It also grants flexibility to the States on Medicaid, allowing them to craft their own programs to serve the needs of their States and their local communities.

This budget also enhances our national security. Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen, said our debt is ''the single biggest threat to our national security.'' Over 20 percent of it is held by foreign governments.

By balancing within 10 years, this budget ends deficits and slows the amount that will have to be paid to other countries. With less spending needed for debt payments, more future funding can go to our national security.

□ 1600

This is a budget for solving problems and creating a better future. This budget addresses our country's fiscal problems in a responsible way, without raising taxes, and puts our Nation on a brighter path for our children and grandchildren.

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

I do want to say a word about the impact on seniors. We have already talked about the fact that the Republican budget will immediately increase the cost to seniors with high prescription drug burdens, it will increase the copays immediately for preventive services.

Let me just say a word about what it will do to seniors who are in nursing homes and other settings that rely on Medicaid. The previous gentleman just mentioned the number of people in his district on Medicaid. Let me just say that seniors and people with disabilities account for 85 percent of Medicaid spending; 65 percent of that spending is to the aged and the disabled, 20 percent to kids.

Now, here is what the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan folks, said about the Medicaid cuts of this magnitude in the Republican budget and the impact that they would have on States: even with significant efficiency gains, in other words, even if you imagine that the States are going to somehow come up with incredible efficiencies, even with that, the magnitude of the reduction in spending relative to such spending in other scenarios means that States would need to increase their spending on these programs, make considerable cutbacks in them, or both; in other words, you are just passing the buck down to the States. So they have a choice: either they raise taxes to make sure that folks in senior homes, seniors in nursing homes don't take a hit, or seniors in nursing homes take a hit through fewer benefits. You just can't have it both ways when you are cutting $900 billion out of the program that helps seniors and the disabled; right?

Okay. Here, States, you do it on your own; we are just going to give you $900 billion less. Any nonpartisan person looking at this would arrive at the conclusion the nonpartisan budget folks at CBO concluded, which is: either States are going to increase their taxes to maintain those services, or those people are going to get less services. That is why this Republican budget is hard on seniors, just like it is hard on students and why it is hard on working families around the country.

As I said, it is great if you are already at the top; right? If you are a millionaire, you are going to get greenlighted for the Romney-Ryan tax plan that cuts your rate by 30 percent while increasing the tax burden on working Americans. That is just not right.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard our friends on the other side talk about gimmicks. If you want to talk about a gimmick, let's talk about the President's budget and what he does for defense. The President comes out and pounds his chest and says: I am a big defense hawk. I think we need to give our defense folks more money—something that we actually believe—to keep this Nation safe, protect us from the threats we have today. The President

says: Oh, oh, I believe in our budget, we will put $566 billion in our budget for defense, in the base defense budget.

What the President knows, what our friends on the other side of the aisle know, is that that number is fiction. You talk about a gimmick. The President doesn't lay out any path at all to deal with the sequester cap, to deal with the law of the land right now that says that that number is going to be $523 billion unless the law is changed, which is why we positively, honestly, sincerely bring about appropriate increases for our men and women who are in harm's way and defending our liberty and freedom.

If this House actually stuck with the President's number, went with the President's number—and the President lays out no path to be able to change the law—that number would snap right back down to $523 billion as soon as the next fiscal year, the next calendar year begins. That is why we believe it is appropriate to lay out that path, to lay out the path to be able to solve the challenge that we have, and we do that in our budget.

You talk about gimmicks, Mr. Chairman, the President's budget is full of gimmicks. What it isn't full of is responsibility, as I mentioned before, increasing the debt beyond where the eye can see. So we have got a positive budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my colleague on the Committee on the Budget, to talk about the responsible things that this budget can do.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman for yielding me the time. It has been a great privilege to work with Chairman TOM PRICE on the Committee on the Budget.

I was down here earlier bringing the rule to the floor, but I was trying to defend a rule that was going to allow all the ideas. Now we actually get to talk about which ideas are the good ideas. That is why I wanted to come down here and speak.

I heard my friend from Maryland speak with such passion and conviction on Medicaid, and I share his passion, and I know his conviction to be true. But if we do nothing, interest payments alone are going to be larger than the entire Medicaid budget. We have six different budgets that we can consider down here on the House floor. Three of them balance; three of them never, ever do.

I was listening to what the chairman said earlier. He said: I do not concede any of the discussion from the other side about whether or not this budget balances or not. But the point is at least we are trying. Even if you are right that the numbers don't work out, even if the economic circumstances change, we have as a goal ending this wasted taxpayer resource, which is interest to our creditors. It dwarfs everything—everything. It is larger than the defense budget. It is larger than the Medicaid budget. It is five times larger than the education budget, five times larger than the transportation budget.

Whatever it is you care about, whatever investments in America you want to make, by failing to commit yourself to a balanced budget today, you are trading away those opportunities. Every dollar borrowed today is a tax increase on children and grandchildren or a benefit cut for children and grandchildren.

I could not be prouder. When faced with a deteriorating economic situation, where every year the CBO says we are constraining growth more and more and more, it has been the hardest year since I have been here to balance the budget. Our chairman said: If it is a big challenge, I want it in my committee. And he has done it.

It is a partnership in that committee. I have great respect for the ranking member from Maryland and his leadership of that committee as well. We are trading it all away. Balance this budget. Let's do it together; let's do it responsibly. But let it not be a question of whether or not we do it; let it be a question of when we do it. We will have that debate together.

I thank my chairman.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, just a couple of points. Again—and we keep hearing that the Republican budget balances—it does not balance. It is interesting that instead of having the priority right now be accelerated economic growth with rising paychecks and rising wages for Americans, our Republican colleagues have made the absolute priority a balance which their own budget doesn't achieve.

In fact, the Republican budget that was brought to the floor just 3 years ago didn't balance until something like 2047, and yet now instead of having the priority be growing the economy in a way that raises wages for all families, they have got a priority which their own budget doesn't meet.

Now, American families who are focusing on their pocketbooks know that from time to time they do borrow to invest in their future. They borrow to buy a home that can go up in value. They sometimes borrow for education because they know that is a good investment.

Actually, interest rates are very low right now. We should be investing in our national infrastructure so we don't become a pothole nation in the days ahead. You know, the chairman of the committee mentioned again the transportation trust fund a little earlier today.

The reality is that the President's proposal puts forward in the budget a 6-year transportation plan that avoids the shortfall and actually helps to boost our national infrastructure, our investment in roads and bridges and modernizing our national infrastructure, so that we can remain at the cutting edge and don't fall behind. The Republican budget has no plan more than the 10-months plan we have had, and in this budget nothing real at all.

Now, I do want to say one word about what the chairman said about the President's defense spending and the way the President did it. You ought to know, the President did not put it in the slush fund. He put our base defense needs where they always have been: in the defense budget for the Defense Department. In fact, I was really surprised to hear the chairman say that, because the Republican study group budget—I believe the Republican study group budget represents a majority of Republicans; I am not sure—does it the same way the President did it, in a straightforward manner. They put the funds that the Joint Chiefs of Staff say they need for our base defense needs, they put it in their budget. They do exactly what the chairman said the President was doing in some indirect way.

Look, I really am pretty surprised that our colleagues keep coming back to this point because it is a total violation of what they, themselves, said, wrote down on paper a year ago, that you shouldn't be funding our defense needs as part of the ongoing defense budget by putting them in a slush fund for the overseas contingency account when the military leadership says they don't need that money for that purpose.

I am pleased the President did this in a straightforward manner, in the manner that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military leadership said. In fact, it turns out the same way the Republican study group did, but apparently not the way the Republican majority wants to do business anymore.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, who understands the impact that the Republican budget decisions are going to have on everyday Americans, including in their pocketbooks.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for his leadership on the Committee on the Budget.

As ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, I would like to express my serious concerns about how this budget resolution undermines our financial stability, protection for American consumers, and the entire housing market.

It is now 7 years since our country's financial system was rocked by Wall Street greed and predatory lending. All of our constituents bore witness to an economy where family members lost their jobs, friends were made homeless, and everyone's savings, no matter how modest, were depleted. In all, trillions of dollars of wealth vanished in the span of a few months. When some of the money returned, it was not shared equally.

Democrats in Congress worked to prevent a repeat of this disaster by, among other things, putting in place the tools necessary to prevent bailouts of megabanks and creating an independent regulator solely tasked with defending consumers from financial harm.

Rehashing failed policies, the Republican budget resolution would repeal these tools and bind the hands of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The Republicans would return us to a system where a company like AIG would once again threaten the entire financial system. The Republicans would return us to a system where lenders can make predatory mortgages to some of the most disadvantaged communities, including communities of color, but that is not all.

□ 1615

This budget resolution goes even further. It would privatize Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac along the lines of the failed PATH Act, a terrible piece of legislation rejected by everyone—housing advocates, realtors, mortgage banks, academics, and, I might add, a majority of Members in the House.

Why do we all reject it? We fear it would be the end of safe mortgages like the 30-year fixed rate mortgage. We fear it would favor only the big megabanks, hurting community banks. We fear that it would further widen the wealth gap in this country.

This budget resolution is built upon a flawed foundation that harms some of our most vulnerable communities. I urge that the Members of this House oppose the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a very productive member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Republican House budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

Mr. Chairman, as we have seen over the last several years, the tax-and-spend policies of this President have made our economy very sluggish. It is a very slow recovery. Our wages are stagnant. Our national debt has increased to more than $18 trillion. This is a 70 percent increase since President Obama took office. And if the President had his way, we would actually add another $8.5 trillion of debt over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, if we look at this chart, it shows interest versus other spending. This line right here—net interest—is the one that we should all be very concerned about because this is something that we have to pay for. This is not a line item that we can all of a sudden say: No, we're not going to pay as much on net interest as we're going to maybe on defense or education or transportation. This is something that we as American people have to pay because of the interest on our debt. This only gets worse if we don't do something sooner.

And so today, in contrast to the President's budget that increases taxes and increases spending—and his budget actually never, ever balances—we, as Republicans, are putting forward a responsible budget, a balanced budget, and one that I believe is critically important for the future of our country and for the future of our economy. Our budget balances in 10 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, if you look at this chart, it doesn't take an economist to see which plan will ultimately lead to debt and decline and which plan will lead us to growth and prosperity.

The House Republican budget begins making payments on our national debt in year 2024, and the President's budget just digs us deeper and deeper into the hole.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, I have two sons, Payton and Preston, 13 and 9 years old. We cannot continue to hand them the bill and expect them and future generations to pay for the spending of Washington that is out of control. That is why we have to get to a balanced budget sooner rather than later.

On top of balancing the budget, this plan calls for a fair and simpler Tax Code. It ends ObamaCare's broken promises and strengthens our entitlement programs for current seniors and for future beneficiaries. In light of current threats, this budget also increases defense spending, which is a priority for us, so that our military—our men and women in uniform—can defend this country at a very dangerous time.

This plan is an opportunity for us to stand together and to show the American people that we are committed to A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, to starting to pay our debt down to make sure that future generations don't have to pay for those debts and that we can work together on commonsense reforms.

I thank the chairman for his work on this particular budget. I am proudly standing here today in support of that hard work, and I ask my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, not only does the Republican budget not balance, but it doesn't eliminate one special interest tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Not one. These are tax breaks that powerful interests have put into the Tax Code over many years.

Apparently, it is okay to deeply cut our investment in our kids' education. Apparently, it is okay to increase the cost of prescription drugs for seniors on Medicare, but, for some reason, we are not going to get rid of one corporate tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Those are not Americans' priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS), someone who understands the importance of moving America forward, my colleague and friend and a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank my friend and colleague from Maryland for his leadership on the Budget Committee, and also the Democrats on the Budget Committee.

Mr. Chairman, Congress is really tasked at this time of year with developing a budget that lays out our Nation's priorities and spending, but those priorities really should reflect our values. As hard as it is to imagine—and it is hard—this Price budget resolution is actually worse than the previous Ryan budget for hard-working American families.

Once again, we see how little Republicans value protecting critical priorities that actually help Americans live a healthy life and enjoy a secure retirement. In fact, the Republican budget would force working families to pay more in taxes. It would make college education less affordable. It would force seniors to pay more for their health care and prescription drugs. It would end the Medicare guarantee by turning it into a voucher program. Lastly, Mr. Chairman, it would block grant both Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

The fact is that this budget would decimate our Nation's already crumbling infrastructure by reducing funding by 19 percent over the next decade. If you would imagine that, that means that every road that needs to be repaired, the bridges that are falling apart, the mass transit that needs investing in, this budget would actually cut our spending by 19 percent over the next decade.

It would require an additional $318 billion from Federal and postal employees and their retirees—hard-working people who have given all that they can to deficit reduction. In fact, that is a constituency that has already contributed $159 billion to deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, Republican priorities are making tax cuts for the wealthy permanent, and they are shrinking the size of government, regardless of the damage—great damage—that it would cause.

House Democrats, I believe, are investing in hard-working Americans. We have said it is important for us to improve access to high-quality child care and dependent care. It is important to invest in quality education for all our children. It is important to end the draconian across-the-board sequester cuts.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS. The Democrats' budget would protect seniors' health care and retirement. It would create jobs in America through rebuilding our infrastructure and support jobs by making sure our Nation's manufacturers get to invest in the research and development that they need.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote down this draconian Republican budget and support each of the Democratic alternatives. I know I will be voting for them because each of them, even though they are different, would be way better than the draconian budget that has been proposed by Republicans.

I thank my colleague from Maryland for his leadership. We need to invest in America's future, including our hard-working men and women.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard the budget described as draconian. I would say that doing nothing, ultimately, is draconian because what the numbers show is that if we do nothing, roughly in 10 years we will be spending about $800 billion a year in interest alone—more than we spend on all of our Nation's defense.

I could give any number of different indicators that say if we do nothing, we are headed for a train wreck that will have real impact on the very constituencies that my Democratic colleagues were just alluding to.

It is not a perfect budget. We are having an intense debate, whether it is on the Democratic side or, frankly, even within the Republican family.

I just had a conversation with my colleague, MIKE TURNER from Ohio, who is really passionate about the need to spend more on defense. We are still working out those wrinkles. But what I do know, in fairness to the chairman and what he has tried to do in managing the different folks that are affected by this budget, is to say: If you are in a hole, you quit digging. And fundamentally, if you look at our Nation's budget trajectory, we are in a hole that is going to get far worse if we don't do what the chairman and the committee have suggested.

I would say, one, we are spending too much. And yet the President's proposal is to go from spending roughly around 20 percent of GDP up to 22 percent of GDP, from a historic average of, frankly, around 18 percent.

We are taxing too much. We are going to go in the President's proposal from spending of around 18 percent to around 20 percent—a little bit over that. That doesn't sound like much, but you take two points of a GDP in 2025, and you are looking at more than $500 billion—more than, again, roughly what we spend in defense for our entire Nation on a yearly basis.

We have a budget trajectory where we are handing too much debt to the next generation. And we are headed, again, for this unsustainable train wreck.

Think about it this way. It took our country 200 years to accumulate $5 trillion in debt. Under the Bush administration, in fairness to my Democratic colleagues, it went from $5 trillion to $10 trillion in the course of about 8 years. And then, under the Obama administration, it has gone from $10 trillion to roughly $20 trillion.

The growth is becoming geometric. And the question is: What are we going to do about it? What we can do is what the President has proposed, which is nothing—adding $2 trillion in new taxes, adding $8 trillion in new debt, and going from structural $500 billion deficits to $1.1 trillion deficits.

I think that what we are talking about here is ultimately made important by what Admiral Mike Mullen had to say on the subject. When asked what the biggest threat is to the American civilization, his response was the American debt and deficit.

We are reaching this tipping point. If you look at the numbers, by 2025 we will only have enough money for interest and entitlements, and nothing else, without raising taxes substantially or cutting those benefits that my colleagues have just been talking about.

I will leave you with one point, and I think it is this. Sir Alexander Fraser Tytler studied history for the whole of his life.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SANFORD. He got to the end of his life and the quote that was attributed to him at life's end was: A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves largesse from the public treasury, with the result that democracy always fails under a loose fiscal policy, and it is generally followed by dictatorship.

The average age of the world's great civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed to this sequence: from bondage to spiritual faith; spiritual faith to great courage; great courage to liberty; liberty to abundance; abundance to selfishness; selfishness to complacency; complacency to apathy; apathy to dependency; and from dependency back again into bondage.

Ultimately, what I think that this budget is about is avoiding that very bondage that that historian and many others have talked about over the years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, who understands the importance of a growing economy—a growing economy with shared prosperity and a growing economy with fiscal responsibility.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for yielding, and I thank him for the extraordinary job that he has done as ranking member of the Budget Committee.

My friend from South Carolina has left the floor. I regret that. He was the Governor of a State. This budget would not have been tenable during his administration or, frankly, the administration of my own Governor, who happens to be a Republican. We have had Democrats in the past.

The gentleman ended with a number of cautions about the path of fiscal irresponsibility and what it would lead to. I agree with him on that, but I will tell him it is indeed unfortunate that, once again, we have a budget that does not put us on a path of fiscal sustainability. We have a budget that is not real. We have a budget that pretends. That is what USA Today said today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolutions offered by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. PRICE, for whom I have great respect. I say budget resolutions, plural, because there are two of them. One was reported by the committee that channels $36 billion into the overseas contingency operations account, disguising it as emergency war funding as a way of getting around the defense sequester caps while offering token language providing about $20 billion to be offset at a later date.

The other budget was unveiled by Republicans yesterday. It includes an additional $2 billion on top of that $36 billion in overseas contingency operations and removes any mention of paying for this effective negation of the defense sequester. The gentleman from South Carolina referred to devices like that.

□ 1630

This dueling budget strategy came about because Republicans didn't have the votes for their own proposal yet again. They are offering their Members two options: blow through the defense sequester ceiling by $36 billion or blow through it by $38 billion.

Apparently, some are going to mask their either hawkish perspective on the defense or hawkish perspective on the deficit by a vote either for A or for A.

Of course, while they blow through the cap on the defense side, they continue the cap on the domestic side for this year, before cutting dramatically below that level in future years, mercilessly gutting priority investments in education, job training, innovation, research, and other priorities of this Nation if it is to remain competitive in world markets, if it is to remain a growing, thriving nation.

This budget is a severe disinvestment in America's future and our long-term economic competitiveness. This approach is not a blueprint for growth and opportunity for America's businesses and workers. It is, rather, sadly, a recipe for economic and fiscal disaster in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, if we fail to invest in the next generation or to continue the War on Poverty in this country, we are doing a grave disservice to our children and our grandchildren by not giving them the tools they need to secure the

jobs and opportunities that open doors to the middle class.

Like the Ryan budgets, which were never implemented by the majority party at any point in time from this House—forget about blaming Senator REID or the Senate, they were never implemented in this House—Mr. PRICE's budgets rely on a magic asterisk, hiding the specifics behind over $1 trillion in cuts in order to appear to balance it in its stated goal of 9 years.

No one—no one—knows exactly what programs Republicans would cut or by how much. That is not being honest with the American people. They would turn Medicare into a voucher program and would take access to affordable health care away from millions of Americans by repealing the Affordable Care Act.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, make no mistake. These budget alternatives are political documents that are unworkable and unserious when it comes to governing.

Like previous Republican budgets that rely on sequestration, I have no doubt that the majority will not be able to enact appropriation bills that adhere to whichever version that you will pass. You have not done so in the past, and you will not do so this year.

They will continue to be, as the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS, said, ''unrealistic and ill-conceived.''

Budget Committee Democrats, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and the Congressional Black Caucus have all put forward alternatives that are far better than these dueling Republican budget resolutions.

Democrats prioritize replacing the sequester, which Mr. ROGERS believes should be done, on both the defense and domestic sides, so that we can make investments in America's future that are fiscally sustainable.

I urge my colleagues to reject the two Republican budget alternatives and their strategy of selective sequester.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct all their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank Chairman PRICE and his staff for their hard work on this budget. With all the difficulties and complexities in drafting a budget, including inheriting an $18 trillion debt, Chairman PRICE and the committee have managed to find savings of $5.5 trillion and to balance the budget in 10 years, all without any new taxes.

This has not been an easy task, but this budget resolution stands in stark contrast to what the President sent us. The President's irresponsible proposal makes no attempt to balance the budget, leaving future generations with even more debt. Indeed, his plan proposes returning to trillion-dollar deficits, leaving a legacy of staggering debt and further eroding our standing in the world.

For decades, Americans have been told that spending for things you can't pay for is good fiscal policy and that debts and deficits don't matter. President Obama believes that maxing out the Federal credit card to pay for government programs and using more of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to pay interest on the debt is actually good for our economy.

Well, the ruse is over. Families aren't buying it. The ''charge now and pay later'' mentality is no longer affordable. Parents know debt and interest payments add up. They understand that out-of-control debt cripples their ability to respond to an emergency, for example, when the basement floods or the furnace goes out.

Mr. Chairman, what is true for American families is true for the Federal Government. Just like working families must do, so must the government. Purchases we can't afford need to be put on hold until we can afford it; tough choices must be made.

Every day, families make responsible financial decisions. Do we sign up the kids for Little League, or do we buy the bigger van? The same principle must apply in our government.

This budget, Mr. Chairman, acknowledges that addressing our debt is a national priority. It puts forth parameters that will force the government to make reforms and live within its means so we can start to address a debt that now exceeds $18 trillion.

This budget eliminates all of the ObamaCare taxes and mandates that are costing small businesses tens of thousands of dollars, cutting into Americans' take-home pay, and driving up healthcare costs for the American consumer.

Importantly, Mr. Chairman, this resolution sets the stage for us to pass real healthcare reform that will actually address cost and coverage and help American families in their healthcare choices with more freedom, more choice, and less bureaucracy. This budget respects the rights of conscience for our Nation's doctors and religious institutions and people of faith.

Finally, this budget will result in a leaner, more efficient government that is transparent and accountable to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the Budget Committee's resolution makes the hard choices needed to move the country forward, to make possible increases in our defense budget needed to address the threats in our world, and to set us on a path to a balanced budget.

Again, I thank Chairman PRICE for the work of him and his committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, this budget doesn't make tough choices. The Republican budget makes bad choices. It doesn't cut one single special interest tax break in the Code while it makes deep cuts to our kids' early education. That is a bad choice, not a tough choice.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I honor my friend from Maryland for his extraordinary and outstanding leadership on a very difficult set of complex numbers and policies known as the U.S. budget. Thank you so much for your leadership.

Mr. Chairman, this year's Republican budget resolution is incredulously titled ''A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America,'' but by every measure, the draconian cuts proposed in this budget would severely weaken America's innovative advantage and competitiveness. It might as well be called ''Let's Disinvest in America.''

Consider the cuts to basic research, once a bedrock, a Federal priority that spurred new discoveries that are now vital in our daily lives and the economy. R&D is critical for my northern Virginia district, where the technology community is driving innovation.

This Republican budget would slash R&D funding by 15 percent, to its lowest level since 2002. That is a retreat from America's role as the global innovation leader and, essentially, cedes the playing field to our international competition.

Similarly, the Republican budget would disinvest in our classrooms. To achieve their ruse of balancing the budget over 10 years, Republicans would cut nondefense spending 24 percent below the already reduced sequester levels.

For K–12 education, that translates into an $89 billion cut over the next decade and would surely leave every child behind their international peers. It would also put higher education further out of reach for low and middle class families. America did not ascend to its role as the world's leading economy by quashing the potential of future innovators and leaders.

Mr. Chairman, our Republican colleagues are, once again, showing they know the cost of everything and the value of very little. I often hear my colleagues lament that we should run government more like a business.

Well, if that is the case, perhaps we should start by listening to the business community which is advocating for us to invest more—not less—in R&D, in education, and in infrastructure for the future workforce of America and the building blocks of a competitive economy.

These are investments that yield tremendous returns for our families, for our children, for our future; and the Republican budget would eviscerate those pillars of American exceptionalism.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for

bringing up the issue of business in America, jobs in America.

I include in the RECORD letters from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America and from the National Federation of Independent Business in support of our budget.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation, representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers of commerce, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, appreciates your proposed budget resolution, ''A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America,'' which would establish the budget for fiscal year 2016.

This proposal recognizes the importance of restraining federal spending, correcting the unsustainable growth path of entitlement spending, reducing federal budget deficits, containing the growth of federal debt, and enacting comprehensive tax reform—all goals shared by the Chamber.

The proposal would balance the budget within 10 years without raising taxes through $5.5 trillion in spending reductions, out of a base spending level of $48.6 trillion. The Congressional Budget Office estimated the macroeconomic effects of the proposed deficit reduction and concluded output per person would be 1.5 percent higher at the end of 10 years, which in turn would reduce the budget deficit an additional $147 billion. Such budgetary savings would move the budget from modest deficit to modest surplus by 2024.

The nation faces many challenging issues in budget policy that will require sustained debate over many months and, in some cases, years. Over the long term, the budget is a blueprint for restoring fiscal discipline by shrinking the size of government and debt compared to current law.

This budget proposal marks an important step toward a more sensible, more sustainable, pro-growth fiscal policy. The Chamber urges the Committee and the full House of Representatives to debate the issues fully and then adopt a budget resolution on a timely basis. The Chamber further urges the United States Senate likewise to meet its responsibility by passing a budget addressing our long-term challenges. The Chamber looks forward to working with Congress on the vital reforms to entitlements and our tax code necessary to get our fiscal house in order.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, thank you for your efforts to address our nation's fiscal problems in the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Resolution.

A budget that balances in fewer than ten years, and includes support for comprehensive tax reform, regulatory reform, and repeal of the Affordable Care Act, is a budget that addresses the top concerns of small business owners—our nation's job creators. NFIB and small business owners strongly support these efforts.

COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM

In your budget blueprint you state, ''The U.S. tax code is absurdly complicated, patently unfair, and highly inefficient.'' NFIB members could not agree more and strongly support the inclusion of comprehensive tax reform in the budget resolution. The complicated tax code, which forces small businesses to pay 67 percent more for tax compliance than larger corporations, needs to be simplified. Most importantly, high tax rates continue to be a persistent problem for small business owners. Specific tax concerns account for five of the top ten most severe problems facing business owners. As over 75 percent of small businesses are structured as pass-through entities, lowering individual income tax rates is especially important. Pass-through entities employ 54 percent of all private-sector workers—their tax burden is directly tied to their ability to keep their workers employed.

SENSIBLE REGULATORY REFORM

NFIB appreciates that your budget ''calls on Congress, in consultation with the public, to enact legislation to reform our regulatory system.'' While regulation is necessary, it must be pragmatic. Unfortunately, federal agencies rarely take into account how their regulations affect small business. Federal regulators should work with small business owners to help ensure compliance, rather than aggressively impose fines for violations that result from confusion. Government regulations rank as the fifth most severe problem for small business owners in the NFIB Research Foundation's most recent Small Business Problems and Priorities survey. Federal agencies, notably the Environmental Protection Agency and Occupational Safety and Health Administration, continue to demonstrate a lack of understanding of how regulatory proposals impact small business operations.

In order to provide for meaningful regulatory reform, Congress should eliminate loopholes and clarify language in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) to ensure that all federal agencies take into account, and make public, both direct and indirect costs to small businesses in their rulemaking; expand the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act (SBREFA) and Small Business Advocacy Review (SBAR) panels to apply to all federal agencies; waive fines for first time paperwork errors and provide small business with a grace period to fix minor violations when the public and employees are not at risk; and make compliance assistance programs a priority, instead of minimizing them in order to provide for the expansion of enforcement programs.

HEALTHCARE REFORM

The budget resolution also addresses small business owners' most severe business problem: the cost of health insurance. NFIB members continue to advocate for full repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Thank you for including this provision in the budget resolution. The Affordable Care Act only exacerbates a system of health insurance that is financially unsustainable, threatening the health and financial security of Americans. Small business owners and their employees are especially vulnerable to the weaknesses of the current system. As Congress addresses future healthcare policy, we urge you to put forward reforms to balance the competing goals of affordability, access to quality care, predictability and consumer choice.

According to a December 2014 survey by the NFIB Research Foundation, ten percent of small business owners had their personal insurance plans cancelled last year, something the President and the law's supporters promised wouldn't happen. Twelve percent of owners renewed their old plans early in order to avoid higher premiums and narrower choices, two results that were also not part of the deal. The NFIB survey found that 62 percent of small business owners are paying higher premiums while only eight percent say their costs have dropped. The President's sales pitch for the law included promised health insurance premium relief for small businesses. Five years later, a substantial majority of small business owners are reporting the opposite result.

PROVIDING FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

Small business owners have long supported balancing the federal budget. Additionally, according to the NFIB Federal Ballot, 90 percent of NFIB members support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Our nation's small businesses are calling on Congress to fix our dangerous fiscal situation without damaging economic growth or raising taxes on job creators. If our long-term fiscal outlook is not addressed by lawmakers today, future generations will continue to be faced with higher debt and interest payments, increased tax rates and fewer investment opportunities. Small business owners must compete in today's economy while operating within their budgets and so too should the federal government.

Thank you again for introducing the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Resolution. NFIB strongly supports its passage when considered by the full House of Representatives. We look forward to working with you on this, and similar measures to protect small business as the 114th Congress moves forward.

Sincerely,

AMANDA AUSTIN,
Vice President, Public Policy.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Virginia (Mr. FORBES), a senior member of the Republican Conference.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend Chairman PRICE for shepherding this budget to the floor and doing such a tremendous job; yet, with the great job he has done, I know it is confusing, probably, to people listening to this debate at home because, throughout today and tomorrow, a lot of very smart men and women are going to come to this floor and argue various debates.

When all those voices have silenced and everybody sits back down in their chairs, we all know that it is going to come down to two choices. Those two choices are going to be what we refer to as Price 1 or Price 2.

Mr. Chairman, we also all know that the difference between those two bills is going to be how much we are willing to spend for the national defense of this country to defend the greatest nation the world has ever known.

In addition, one of the things that will be clear is not that we will be spending what we need to defend the country, but we will be spending the amount we have to spend to keep from putting our national defense in a crisis situation and a devastating situation to the men and women who serve this country around the globe.

Just two points I would like to leave Members with as they cast those votes

and the first one is this. The difference in the amount of money we will be spending for national defense between Price 1 and Price 2, if the budget were $1, would be equal to half of this penny if I could cut it in two—half of this penny; yet, as small as that may seem, it makes the difference between a crisis in national defense and a devastating situation to our men and women in uniform.

The last thing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave everyone with as they cast those votes is this. It will not be about the men and women in suits who make speeches in here, but it is going to be about the men and women who wear uniforms around the globe because they will fight to defend this country, regardless of what we do.

The question is whether we will leave them in a crisis situation and a devastating situation. That is why I hope this body will vote ''no'' to Price 1, ''yes'' to Price 2, and then, if Price 2 passes, vote for final passage of this budget, which is a well-done document by the chairman.

□ 1645

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, just for all Members listening, the last gentleman was talking about the differences between the two versions of the Republican budget.

I want to point out that the President of the United States funds our defense budget in the straightforward way and in the way that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have asked for, funding the base budget as it should be and funding the OCO budget as it should be.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee who understands that growing our economy depends on our kids getting a good education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the underlying Republican budget for fiscal year 2016, and I also rise to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for his strong opposition.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is not a serious plan. It contains trillions of dollars in tax cuts, but it doesn't show a dime's worth of tax increases when they say it is going to be revenue neutral. It includes trillions of dollars in unspecified cuts that will not be made. For example, are we really going to repeal Medicare as we know it?

If you actually believe that the Republican majority will carry out this plan, it would actually devastate our economy by balancing the budget on the backs of students, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities across the Nation.

The Republican budget assumes that sequestration cuts will be enacted and then adds an additional $759 billion in nondefense discretionary spending cuts. That is the part of the budget that invests in education, workforce training, scientific research, transportation, and infrastructure.

With those cuts, the budget would be funded at 40 percent below the lowest level in the last 50 years as a percentage of GDP. Those cuts will not be made, but if they are, that would be devastating.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am particularly concerned about the cuts in education. Education funding would be cut by $103 billion over 10 years. That is a 22 percent cut in Federal aid to teachers, principals, school districts, colleges, and universities.

That will include significant cuts in title I funding, resources that go to areas of high poverty school districts. It would cut the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which supports educational services and resources for students with disabilities, and there would be significant cuts to Head Start. College students are having trouble paying for tuition, room, and board. Well, this budget cuts Pell grants.

In the area of job training and employment services, the budget would result in 2 million fewer workers receiving critical support and does nothing to help the long-term unemployed get back into the workforce.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget sends students, families, and workers down the wrong path at this important crossroad. We need a strong budget that reflects the values of all Americans and makes the necessary investments in programs that we know will expand the economy for all.

The Republican budget fails to do this and, therefore, should be rejected.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the former mayor of the great city of Dayton.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman PRICE for the work that he has done. The chairmanship of the Budget Committee is one of the most difficult.

He has a 360-degree responsibility of all aspects of funding the Federal Government, balancing our priorities, looking at our financial security, and most of the time, we ask the Budget Committee chairman to produce a budget. In this instance, we asked him to produce two.

I greatly appreciate that the chairman has produced two. We have what is coming to this floor, Price 1 and Price 2. I am here to speak in support of Price 2, but even beyond that, I am asking people to vote ''no'' on Price 1.

It is very important that you vote ''no'' on Price 1. We can't pass multiple budgets. We have to have one agenda coming out of this House, and that one agenda is only the difference between Price 1 and Price 2 with respect to how do we defend this Nation.

Now, Price 2 has $523 billion for the Department of Defense and $96 billion in overseas contingency operations funding. It fully funds our national defense. It is the amount that is endorsed by Chairman Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Department of Defense.

It is what he has asked for from this House and what he says is necessary in the face of things such as ISIS, ISIL, what is happening in Libya, what is happening with Putin and his aggressiveness.

The Secretary General of NATO was just here today and spoke to Members of Congress, and he said we are facing a Russia that is both willing to use its military force, modernizing its military force, and also is not being bound by international agreements. This is only going to be able to be responded to not by force, but by strength, a strength that we must give in this budget of Price 2.

Secondly, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Ray Odierno, was before us, and I asked him: What will happen if we go to the sequestration levels? What happens if we don't fully fund, as in Price 2? He says that it means that it will take us longer to do our mission. It will cost us in lives. It will cost us in injuries.

The difference between Price 1 and Price 2, from the Chief of Staff of the Army, is lives and whether or not we can win and do our mission and whether or not our men and women in uniform are injured.

That is serious stuff. It is serious enough that people in this Congress need to vote ''no'' on Price 1 and ''yes'' on Price 2.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to jeopardize our national security and reduce funding for defense anymore. Our men and women in uniform need to have a clear message, and that clear message is that we are behind them. That message only comes by a vote ''no'' on Price 1 and a vote ''yes'' on Price 2.

I urge all Members of Congress to support our men and women. Vote ''yes'' on Price 2.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am now really pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have been in Congress now 13 years, and I have had many discussions with the chairman over the course of my career, but I am stunned—and I know he won't be stunned that I am stunned—with the inability of the Republican Party to govern this Chamber or to govern the country.

I mean, if you just look at Price 1, Price 2, the contortions that the Republican Party has to go through in order to meet the basic standard of trying to govern the country is mind-blowing—and then to go through all these contortions just so you don't have to fund the domestic agenda that is going to actually grow the economy in the United States.

I say this because I was here and watched when President Bush was here

and the Republicans controlled Congress: cut taxes, deregulate, and the economy will grow, and jobs will be created.

We had a stagnant decade of growth because we failed to make the kinds of investments that we need to make in this country in order to grow the pie.

Here we are today, after we were able to survive a huge economic collapse after that agenda was fully implemented, and we have the average CEO making $296 for every $1 that the worker makes; we have the top 1 percent getting 17 percent of the tax expenditures that this Chamber and this government doles out, and wages have been stagnant.

I think we have got to go back and ask ourselves: How did we grow this great middle class? How did we grow this economy? How did we have the highest standards and the highest wages in the entire world for such a long period of time? We invested in research and development at the National Science Foundation. Now, we are down hundreds of grants from the National Science Foundation.

Do you think China is not putting money into these programs? India? Pacific rim countries? They are investing in research, development, technologies, alternative energy; and they are beating us to the punch. We are cutting our budgets and some of these programs that ultimately lead to growth.

These budgets are supposed to provide stability for the government and the private sector. We say: well, we are providing stability, but we will tell you what the tax rates are going to be later. We are going to fund transportation; we will tell you how later.

This formula is fairly simple: invest in research, educate your workforce, invest in transportation, and make sure that everybody has access to a decent education, and your economy will take off.

This budget does the exact opposite. The ultimate contradictions are the deep cuts in the SNAP program, the cuts in the Medicaid, and everyone is supposed to pull themselves up by their bootstraps and go to work, but then we try to raise the minimum wage, and you fight us on that.

I think that we have proven how to grow this economy. I am sure most Americans would want to go back and say: we will take the Clinton economy; we will take the Democratic budget in '93, and we will grow the economy where we see every income group increase in the incomes that their families are making.

This budget continues to hollow out our military and our domestic priorities.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman for his hard work on this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Republican budget with the defense fix. Our country needs to get back on a responsible financial path, a path that protects our national security, repeals ObamaCare, and reforms our entitlement programs so they are sustainable.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind us of the rapidly deteriorating security situation we face. Russia has invaded Ukraine. ISIS is spreading. Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons and long-range missiles while actively supporting terrorist organizations around the world.

North Korea is pursuing a submarine-launched ballistic missile capability to go with its nuclear weapons program. China is threatening our friends and allies in Asia. This is just a laundry list of bad actors that threaten the very safety of our Nation.

Meanwhile, President Obama's foreign policy is a disaster, which puts us at even greater risk. Shockingly, the President is even turning his back on Israel, damaging our partnership with our closest ally in the Middle East.

Our military has already faced drastic cuts. The Air Force is the smallest it has ever been. The Army is on a path to being the smallest since 1940. The Navy will soon be the smallest since 1915.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe most Americans agree that now is not the time to cut our national security spending. Russia isn't cutting its military budget. Iran isn't cutting its military budget. ISIS certainly isn't cutting its military budget.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this budget by voting ''yes'' on Price 2. This is a vital step in keeping our military strong in the face of dangerous threats around the world.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am now really pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as a 6-year member of the Budget Committee and the second ranking Democrat, I have seen this budget proposal up close and personal. I have seen the way it has been reshaped over the years, from its early days as the first Ryan budget, to the collection of budget tricks and gimmicks we find before us today.

Despite the highly questionable math and mysterious growth projections, the consequences are clear. This budget hurts American families now and in the future, hitting their pocketbooks and their checkbooks today while disinvesting in our and their future.

It immediately raises taxes on the hard-working families who are simply looking for a shot at the American Dream: owning a home, providing their kids with access to a good education, living a healthy life, and being able to save for retirement while their parents enjoy theirs.

It makes college more expensive for those families, cutting Pell grants by $90 billion and eliminating higher education tax credits. It cuts investment in our infrastructure and innovation, leaving us less competitive in the global economy.

This budget takes more than 16 million men, women, and children off of the health insurance plan they have now, thanks to the Affordable Care Act. People will, again, be denied care because of preexisting conditions. Lifetime caps on coverage return.

If the Affordable Care Act were repealed, as proposed in the Republicans' ''work harder for less'' budget, here is what would happen in my State: more than 500,000 Kentuckians would lose their healthcare coverage.

We wouldn't gain the 40,000 new jobs that are projected over the next 6 years because of the Affordable Care Act, and the Kentucky budget would miss out on $800 million more in revenue.

For seniors, this budget ends the guarantee of Medicare as we know it. Prescription drug costs will go up on day one. Copays will increase. The prescription drug doughnut hole will reopen.

Eventually, seniors will be given a voucher and sent on their way, told to find their own health plan—ironically, something that very, very closely resembles the healthcare exchanges that our friends on the other side despise so much.

This is not what the American people want. They want us to invest in our people, invest in innovation, and continue our economic recovery by creating new opportunities.

The Democratic budget will do just that, cutting taxes for working families, making college more affordable, health care more accessible, and retirement more secure.

It is time we reward hard work, and I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it gives me particular pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), one of the most diligent and dedicated Members of this Congress who is a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Budget Committee.

□ 1700

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, Chairman. You are a wonderful chairman and have helped us produce a wonderful, responsible budget.

Mr. Chairman, this budget goes a long way to address the out-of-control spending problem and crushing debt the administration has fostered over the last few years. Unlike the President's proposal, though, our budget contains progrowth economic reforms, repeals ObamaCare, and it balances. Most importantly, Price 2 restores harmful defense cuts and provides the necessary resources our warfighters need.

The threats facing this Nation and the world right now are vast, real, and

expanding: ISIL has proclaimed a caliphate in the Middle East, and it is now looking to expand into other countries; Russia is continually making headlines with aggression and invasions into Ukraine and surrounding areas; China continues to build its military as it gains more and more power globally; and Islamic extremism continues to spread to more and more countries.

We, as representatives of the people, are charged with providing for the common defense. Given the size, reach, and increasingly brutal nature of the threats we face, we should feel obliged to make sure that we create a budget that gives our military the tools necessary to address today's threats and be fully prepared to address the threats of tomorrow, whatever they may be and wherever they may come from.

As the only Member to sit on both the House Budget Committee and the House Armed Services Committee, I am proud that these two committees have come together for Price 2 to provide total defense funding spending above the President's request.

Missouri's Fourth Congressional District is proud to be one of our Nation's most military-intensive congressional districts, home of two major military installations—Whiteman Air Force Base and Fort Leonard Wood—and thousands of dedicated military families sacrificing so much to keep us safe.

Providing our military the resources necessary to safeguard our liberties and protect our shores is one of the top legislative priorities I have, and I am proud that these resources are provided in Price 2.

Again, I thank Chairman PRICE for his leadership on this committee and in this process, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on Price 2.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I think our colleagues can hear that there is an awful lot of confusion and uncertainty among our Republican colleagues about funding our national defense. The President's budget is very clear. He funds the national defense the way the Joint Chiefs of Staff proposed is best for the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee who fights for justice and other really important causes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my good friend from Maryland for his leadership consistently that really speaks to the hearts and minds of Americans because we know what Americans want: just a simple opportunity to live, thrive, and to create the values that we have built this country on. If you work hard, you are successful.

Mr. Chairman, the budgeteers on the majority side have a very poor track record when it comes to economic forecasts and projections.

Let me also acknowledge the chairman of this committee for the work that he has done. We just happen to disagree.

Ever since the Affordable Care Act was passed, it has been the challenge of Republicans to suggest that it wasn't working. We have close to 11 million people insured. Some populations who were never insured now have high numbers—citizens who were uninsured. And so the idea of the Affordable Care being a failure, you are just dead wrong.

I am very glad to support the Democratic alternative because it is the opposite of the Republican budget, which says work harder for less when we know what Americans need and what they want for their families. They want to be able to buy a home; they want to be able to send their kids to college, and they want a secure retirement. Under the GOP budget, it is harder to buy a home, absolutely almost impossible to send your children to college, and certainly harder to enjoy a secure retirement.

House Republicans oppose increasing the minimum wage, claiming that it costs jobs. Wrong again. For every increase in the minimum wage, it has been accompanied by an expanding economy.

House Republicans opposing comprehensive immigration reform, wrong again. Studies conducted by groups as far apart as the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO indicate that the gross domestic product will grow $1.5 trillion over 10 years.

This is a sorry track record of economic forecasting, and therefore, this budget is one that I have to oppose because it favors the wealthy over working class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class. I oppose the Republican budget because it asks major sacrifices of seniors who can barely make ends meet and fundamentally alters the social contract by turning Medicaid and the SNAP program into a block program and Medicare into a voucher.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It is clearly not a working road map for success. If the House Republican's ''work harder to get less'' budget were adopted, here is a sample of the pain and misery that will be visited on working families: an end to higher education tax credits, an end to needed increases in the child tax credit, the loss of access to tax credits for the Affordable Care Act, a reduction in tax rates for the wealthy, yielding average tax cuts of $200,000 for millionaires financed by a $2,000 tax increase on the typical working class family.

Mr. Chairman, this ''Price is not right'' budget will make it harder to get to the middle and working class parents to send their kids to college, ending these higher education tax credits and cutting student loan programs and Pell grants.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. As I close, let me thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN is right. I have served on the Judiciary Committee. It is there that we deal with the problems, particularly on the Crime Subcommittee, at the end of someone's detour in life. Do you know what, Mr. Chairman? Those detours in life that wind up with 75,000 persons in the Federal prison system on mandatory minimums has been because people cannot read, do not have opportunities, and do not have jobs.

I want to invest in a budget that lifts the boats of all people; if you work hard, you get a home; if you work hard, you can send your kids to school; if you work hard, you can retire. That is the budget I want to support, not this no-success budget that is being proposed by our Republican friends.

I ask my colleagues to support the alternative budget along with the CPC and the CBC budget.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 27, the House Republicans' ''Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016'' because it continues the reckless and irresponsible approach to fiscal policy that the House majority has championed for years, with disastrous results.

Mr. Chair, the budgeteers on the majority side have a very poor track record when it comes to economic forecasts and projections.

For years, they have based their entire legislative agenda and strategy on their belief that the Affordable Care Act or ''Obamacare'' would be a failure.

The wish was father to the thought. But they were wrong.

Because of Obamacare more than 16.4 million Americans now know the peace of mind that comes from affordable, quality health insurance that is there when you need it.

House Republicans oppose increasing the minimum wage, claiming that it costs jobs. Wrong again.

Every increase in the minimum wage has been accompanied by an expanding economy, especially during the Clinton Administration.

House Republicans opposing comprehensive immigration reform claim that it will lead to lower incomes and lost jobs.

Wrong again. Studies conducted by groups as far apart as the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO consistently show that comprehensive immigration reform will grow the Gross Domestic Product by $1.5 trillion over 10 years.

Given this sorry track record of economic forecasting, I strongly oppose the Republican budget because it favors the wealthy over middle class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class.

I oppose this Republican budget because it asks major sacrifices of seniors who can barely make ends meet, and fundamentally alters the social contract by turning Medicaid and SNAP programs into a block grant and Medicare into a voucher.

I cannot and will not support a resolution that attempts to balance the budget on the

backs of working families, seniors, children, the poor, or mortgages the future by failing to make the investments needed to sustain economic growth and opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, the GOP "Work Harder, Get Less" Budget squeezes hard-working Americans by making it: 1. Harder to buy a home by keeping their paychecks stagnant; 2. harder to send your kids to college by cutting student loans; and 3. harder to enjoy a secure retirement by privatizing Medicare.

If the House Republicans' "Work Harder to Get Less" budget were adopted, here is a sample of the pain and misery that will be visited on middle-class and working families: 1. An end to higher education tax credits; 2. an end to needed increases in the child tax credit; 3. the loss of access to tax credits for affordable health care for millions of Americans; and 4. a reduction in tax rates for the wealthy yielding an average tax cut of $200,000 for millionaires financed by a $2,000 tax increase on the typical middle class family.

Mr. Chair, this "Price is not Right" budget will make it harder to middle and working class parents to send their kids to college by: 1. Ending higher education tax credits; and 2. cutting student loan programs and Pell Grants, making college less affordable and adding to the already huge levels of student debt.

The damage caused by the Republican budget is not limited to working families and students; there are also lumps of coal for seniors who have earned and deserve a secure retirement: 1. The Medicare guarantee is turned into a voucher program with increased costs for seniors. 2. Seniors who have worked hard for a financially secure retirement will immediately have to pay new co-pays for preventive care and much higher costs for prescription drugs.

The Republican budget also disinvests in America's future: 1. Slashes the part of the budget we use to invest in our children's education; and 2. devastates our investments in scientific research and innovation.

Mr. Chair, the Republican budget exacerbates the drag on the economy resulting from a crumbling infrastructure by cutting $187 billion, or more than 19 percent, from transportation funding over the coming decade and provides no solution to address the current shortfall in the federal transportation fund, which means we can expect construction slowdowns beginning this summer.

Mr. Chair, compared to the President's budget, the Republican budget would result this fiscal year in 35,000 fewer children in Head Start and up to 6,000 fewer special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and other related staff.

The Republican budget also shortchanges America's future by cutting investments in scientific research and innovation in real terms by failing to lift the draconian sequester on domestic priorities.

As a result, under the Republican budget, there would be 1,300 fewer medical research grants at National Institutes H and 950 fewer competitive science research awards at the NSF, affecting 11,600 researchers, technicians, and students.

Finally, Mr. Chair, the Republican Budget mistreats the poorest and most vulnerable persons in our country.

The Republican "Work Harder, Get Less" budget takes aim at millions of families with children struggling to make ends meet and put food on the table by converting the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) into a block grant beginning in 2021 and cutting funding steeply—by $125 billion (34 percent) between 2021 and by 2025.

These dramatic cuts could mean in 2021 through 2025 either cutting off assistance to 11 to 12 million eligible people each year, or cutting benefits by almost $55 per person per month.

In contrast, the Democratic Budget works FOR American families by giving them the tools to buy a home, send their kids to college and enjoy a secure retirement.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic Budget represents a better way.

We Democrats understand that we are all in this together and that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach between increased revenues and responsible reduction in expenditures.

Our plan will protect and strengthen our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but it is disastrous for the people from my home state of Texas who sent me here to advocate for their interests. Let me highlight a few examples.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

2. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by $5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

3. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to "wither on the vine."

4. If the Republican budget resolution were to be adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a senior member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Chairman PRICE, for your extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful today to join with my House Armed Services Committee colleagues and speak in support of Chairman PRICE's defense alternative budget, Price 2.

As the chairman of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee on the House Armed Services Committee, my top priority is to provide adequate funding for our Special Operations Forces who are currently deployed in more than 80 countries worldwide defeating the terrorists overseas. I support our cyber forces who play a critical role in the defense of our national security from state and nonstate aggressors alike. And I appreciate our scientists and engineers who develop the cutting-edge technologies provided for our warfighters to protect American families.

In an environment where our Air Force is the smallest since its creation, the Army is on the path to being the smallest since 1939, and the Navy will soon be the smallest since 1915, we cannot risk reducing our national defense. We can best provide for peace through strength.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that tomorrow we will be taking a vote on two seemingly similar budgets, Price 1 and Price 2, but there are two major differences between the budgets. Price 2 represents the product of fruitful negotiations between the leadership, the House Budget Committee, and the House Armed Services Committee.

In Director of National Intelligence James Clapper's recent Worldwide Threat Assessment before the Senate Armed Services Committee, he said:

> In 2013, just over 11,500 terrorist attacks worldwide killed approximately 22,000 people. Preliminary data just for the first 9 months of 2014 indicate nearly 13,000 attacks, which killed 31,000 people. When the accounting is done, 2014 will have been the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled.

The world is becoming more dangerous, and it is time Congress came together and funded our troops appropriately. Terrorists have declared war on American families.

I would like to thank our leadership team, Chairman PRICE and Chairman MAC THORNBERRY, for their work in negotiating Chairman PRICE's defense alternative, Price 2, and it is my hope that tomorrow we can come together and pass Price 2.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my Republican colleagues, if you want to vote for a defense budget in a straightforward manner the way the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended, then vote for the Democratic alternative.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HILL). The gentleman from Georgia has 27 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Armed Services Committee and a gentleman who has served this country in the armed services.

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for dealing with the entire Congress and coming up with only two budgets, Price 1 and Price 2.

I think that the chairman has been pulled in just about every different direction, and I am actually glad that this is coming to fruition.

I would like to urge my colleagues to vote for Price 2, the defense budget that Chairman PRICE is putting out, and vote ''no'' on Price 1. There is a reason for that: Price 2 is the defense budget.

Our job as Members of Congress is to do a lot of things. We go to different meetings. We vote on transportation, education, labor issues, and all kinds of things. But our number one job, our number one job of the American people is to keep them safe. It is national security. That is why I am here.

I did three tours. I did two tours in Iraq and one in Afghanistan. I was in Iraq when we didn't have up-armored Humvees. I was in Iraq when we didn't have enough scopes for our Marines and security forces. I was in Afghanistan when we didn't have enough stuff, too. In fact, if you vote for Price 2, you are still only voting for the ragged edge of what our Defense Department needs.

We have things going off all over right now. Africa is gone. The Middle East is gone and going. Eastern Europe is going now because of the Russians. And Asia and China, China is impinging and coming eastward towards the United States. Things will never be safer. Things will never be safer. I think the American people have to realize that, but they have to contend with it.

The American people need to know that their Navy is patrolling the ocean, that their Marines and their Army are able to go wherever we ask them to at a moment's notice and wherever we need them to. The American people need to know that their Air Force is patrolling the skies.

If we are $20 billion under the ragged edge of what our Defense Department needs, we are going to have to make sacrifices, and the American people are not going to be as safe. If we vote and Price 1 wins, we are going to have to leave here and tell the American people that the American military cannot do what they think it can do. Price 2 will fund the U.S. military where it needs to be to face all these challenges, still barely—still barely—but the American military will be able to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to look around the world and ask themselves one question: What is their job as a U.S. Congress Member? What is their number one job? There is no social security without national security. It doesn't matter what our education budget is if another 9/11 happens.

I wear this 9/11 memorial bracelet on my wrist. That is what made me join the Marine Corps is when our towers went down. When those towers fell, we realized what was important, and it was keeping this country safe. Price 2 will help keep this country safe; Price 1 will make it a more dangerous place. Again, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on Price 1 and vote ''yes'' on Price 2.

Again, I thank the chairman for giving his heart and soul to this and listening to so many people and trying to come up with something that this side of the aisle can agree on.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I just point out to my colleagues that both of what we are referring to as Price 1 and Price 2 are a total violation of what the Budget Committee, on a bipartisan basis, has said we would not do with respect to using the overseas contingency account as a slush fund. Both Price 1 and Price 2 do that to different degrees. If you want to fund defense in the straightforward manner that the military leadership has recommended to the President and the President has put in the budget, then you should support the Democratic alternative.

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

□ 1715

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It saddens me to have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about a slush fund when they are talking about the military. I think it maligns our military. It doesn't give the honor and the dignity to the men and women who stand in harm's way every single day to protect our liberty and protect our freedom. It is hard to even recognize the comment when you are talking about those men and women of a slush fund.

I have great respect for members of the armed services, incredible respect for their leadership. We believe strongly in their ability to take the resources that we provide them and do the job, do the mission, make certain that this Nation is safe and kept from harm.

So I would encourage our colleagues on the other side to rethink their language and their rhetoric. Words mean something. Words mean something. I hope that they are able to recognize that that language doesn't do dignity to this Chamber, it doesn't do dignity to the men and women who stand in the breach.

I want to take a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, and I want to recognize those folks who have recognized us in supporting A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, groups all across this Nation, men and women who stand up and say: We know that there is a challenge out there, we know that the fiscal situation of this Nation is difficult, and we want to support those who are actually providing positive solutions:

Council for Citizens Against Government Waste—I have a letter from the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste supporting our budget; Americans for Tax Reform, supporting our budget; Americans for Prosperity, supporting our budget; National Taxpayers Union, supporting our budget; 60 Plus Association, supporting our budget; Association of Mature American Citizens, supporting our budget. And I mentioned before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters of support that have been provided by these organizations.

AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM
Washington, DC. March 17, 2015.

Chairman TOM PRICE,
Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMEN PRICE: On behalf of Americans for Tax Reform, I write in strong support of the recently released U.S. House of Representatives budget proposal. The budget blueprint authored by House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price (R–GA) will ensure that Washington lives within its means by balancing the budget in less than ten years and cutting $5.5 trillion in federal spending.

The budget proposal calls for a fairer, simpler tax code, reforms struggling entitlement programs, clamps down on inefficient and ineffective government programs, and lays the groundwork for strong economic growth. The plan also empowers the states to make their own decisions by restoring the principle of federalism.

By keeping to the proposed reforms, Congress stands to secure America's economic prospects, protect jobs, and accelerate economic development to levels which would be unattainable given the current spending policies. Lower, flatter taxes plus a competitive international tax regime would enshrine our place as the world's number 1 destination for entrepreneurship. Simply put, asking taxpayers to pay $160 billion per year is an undue burden that we can do without.

Notably, the House budget repeals Obamacare in its entirety and reforms the health care system to increase access to affordable care and provide patients with better medical choices. Repealing Obamacare would eliminate numerous job killing regulations including the employer mandate and the individual mandate. In place of this complex system, the House budget prioritizes a patient-centered approach that gives power back to the individual.

Repealing Obamacare will also put a stop to the raiding of the Medicare trust fund. In turn, this will help secure and strengthen Medicare so the program can continue to provide retirees with the care that they deserve. The budget will also build a new premium support program for Medicare that will further empower seniors to make their own choices.

Finally, the budget implements improvements to Medicaid. Specifically, it repeals the Obamacare Medicaid expansion and grants increased flexibility to the states, which will allow the states the opportunity to build a strong and sustainable system of Medicaid that suits their needs.

The House Budget maintains the spending restrictions mandated in the Budget Control Act of 2011, ensuring the continuation of the savings from discretionary spending. In contrast to the White House budget, which ignores 2011 spending caps and raises spending through misleading promises, the House budget abides by federal law. The budget allocates funding to the DOD's Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) fund to meet the

complex and dangerous global threats, balanced by cuts to mandatory spending.

It is important to keeps the caps in place that have stabilized federal spending since 2011 and will lead to $1.79 trillion in savings through 2021. You should be congratulated for proposing a more fiscally responsible solution despite the urging of some of his more reckless colleagues to break spending caps and undo years of fiscal restraint.

We urge the House Budget committee to support this bold pro-growth proposal. It returns power to states and localities while making great, positive strides in the tax code.

Sincerely,

GROVER G. NORQUIST,
President,
Americans for Tax Reform.

THE 60 PLUS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, March 18, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
Chairman, House Committee on the Budget,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE: On behalf of more than seven million senior citizen activists, the 60 Plus Association applauds your leadership in putting forth a responsible Balanced Budget plan. Not only will this legislation protect seniors but also our children and grandchildren.

We need positive, common sense solutions to put our nation's spending on a path of sustainability that both strengthens and preserves our Social Security and Medicare benefits. By reducing spending though responsible government-wide reforms, the House Republican budget also ensures America's economic security.

Again, we thank you for your efforts and introducing a Balanced Budget that puts our nation back on the right path! This plan will protect the investment of our generation as well as for future generations.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. MARTIN,
Chairman.

ASSOCIATION OF
MATURE AMERICAN CITIZENS,
March 18, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
6th District, Georgia, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,
8th District, Maryland, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE AND RANKING MEMBER VAN HOLLEN, On behalf of the 1.3 million members of AMAC, the Association of Mature American Citizens, I am writing to convey our strong support for many of the policies set forth in the House Budget Committee's FY 2016 budget resolution, ''A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.'' This budget proposal correctly identifies the financial and economic challenges facing America today and provides a blueprint for tackling those problems with positive, responsible solutions.

Time and again, it is has been said that America's national debt is the single biggest threat to our national security. For this reason, it is imperative that Congress unite around a plan to pay down our debt and balance the budget so that Washington can begin living within its means. ''A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America'' promises to balance the budget in less than 10 years without raising taxes by reducing federal spending by $5.5 trillion and making government programs more effective and efficient.

Not only does this budget promote healthy economic policies and reduce federal spending, it also provides a path forward to save and strengthen vital programs like Social Security and Medicare. On Social Security, the budget clearly states that Congress should not raid the retirement trust fund to temporarily patch the disability program, which is projected to be insolvent in 2016. AMAC strongly supports this policy position and believes this is the kind of forward-thinking leadership that is required to save and secure this critical program. While these important senior programs face uncertain futures, AMAC appreciates that this budget compels Congress to adopt long-term legislative solutions that will guarantee Social Security and Medicare benefits for today's seniors and tomorrow's retirees.

Last, AMAC is pleased to see that the budget fully repeals the ''Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act,'' or ''ObamaCare.'' Repealing ObamaCare will save over $2 trillion, will end the egregious $700 billion raid on Medicare, and will unburden the public from obtrusive government mandates and regulations. Instead of imposing one-size-fits-all government health care on the American people, this budget proposes health reform that is patient-centered. AMAC supports the budget's patient-centered approach to health care that places value on increased access to quality, affordable care and expanded choices for individuals, families, and businesses.

As an organization committed to representing the interests of mature Americans and seniors, AMAC is encouraged by the positive vision outlined in ''A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.'' We feel that this budget will help to restore our nation's financial and economic security and will put America on a path toward greater prosperity.

Sincerely,

DAN WEBER,
President and Founder of AMAC.

CCAGW PRAISES FY 2016 HOUSE BALANCED BUDGET RESOLUTION

(WASHINGTON, DC).—Today, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW) praised House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price's (R-Ga.) fiscal year (FY) 2016 Budget Resolution. The blueprint balances the budget in less than 10 years, a clear divergence from President Obama's budget, which never balances at all.

The budget proposal cuts waste, improves accountability, and eliminates redundancies in the federal government. A particularly laudable component is the elimination of ''double dipping'' of Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment Insurance, as recommended by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) on March 4, 2015. The budget proposal also makes note of duplicative programs that need to be consolidated, including food aid and housing assistance that not only waste millions of taxpayer dollars but also fail to achieve their stated objectives.

The budget includes numerous recommendations from ''Prime Cuts,'' such as the privatization of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the elimination of the Commerce Department's Hollings Manufacturing Extension Program and International Trade Promotion Activities, and the termination of dozens of green energy grants funded in the stimulus bill that would ''protect taxpayers from being on the hook for future boondoggles.'' The 2015 Prime Cuts will be released on April 1.

Moreover, the budget proposal's commitment to devolving programs to the states, particularly Medicaid, food stamps, and educational programs, will spur innovation, increase flexibility, and save taxpayers money. Government that is closer to the people governs more effectively, with less waste and more accountability.

''We are very supportive of Chairman Price's budget proposal and look forward to working closely with the committee to safeguard the interests of taxpayers,'' CCAGW President Tom Schatz said. ''We are also pleased to see the budget contains many Prime Cuts recommendations. With the national debt more than $18 trillion, it is time to balance the budget and end deficit spending in Washington.''

The Council for Citizens Against Government Waste is the lobbying arm of the nation's largest nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to eliminating waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in government.

[March 17, 2015]

AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY ON THE HOUSE BUDGET PROPOSAL

ARLINGTON, VA.—Today Americans for Prosperity, the nation's largest grassroots advocate for economic freedom, applauded the House Budget Committee for introducing a budget resolution this morning. AFP Vice President of Government Affairs Brent Gardner issued the following statement:

''We applaud House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price for putting together a common sense budget resolution. While not perfect, we are pleased to see a number of positive policies proposed in this common sense budget. We applaud Chairman Price for holding firm on Congress's past agreement to control spending by adhering to the discretionary spending caps established in the Budget Control Act. Keeping these caps is the best tool for lawmakers to restrain spending, and we encourage Congress to keep these caps.

''This is a welcome change from the President's recent call for higher levels of federal spending and higher taxes on American families. Additional reforms that Americans for Prosperity supports in this budget resolution is that it balances within 10 years, sets the stage for comprehensive tax reform, and turns control over certain mandatory programs over to the states. It also includes a full repeal of the President's health care law that has already seen millions of people lose their health care plans. Overall, this budget resolution is a strong step in the right direction.''

Earlier in March, Americans for Prosperity sent a letter of specific items that should be included in the upcoming budget resolutions in Congress. Online here. We continue to encourage federal lawmakers to work towards budget solutions that protect American taxpayers and reduce spending.

Groups Supporting: Americans for Tax Reform; Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Americans for Prosperity; US Chamber of Commerce; Association of Mature American Citizens; National Federation for Independent Business (NFIB); 60 Plus Association.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I also want to address this issue of morality. We have had a number of folks on the other side of the aisle talk about the morality of a budget. And budgeting is priorities, it is a moral document; there is no doubt about it.

In the earlier debate, a number of folks on the other side talked about this notion that moral documents, moral issues, are raised in budgets. And I agree, there is no doubt about it. Budgets say what kind of people we are. They say what kind of people we want to be.

So I want to ask this question, Mr. Chairman:

What is the morality of trapping disadvantaged people in a web of welfare programs that discourage self-sufficiency and instead shackle them to government dependency? What is the morality of that?

What is the morality of keeping retirees in a health care coverage program that is going bankrupt, becoming insolvent, not according to my numbers, according to the trustees of the program itself, and that can't keep its promises if its so-called providers keep blocking reform? What is the morality of that?

What is the morality, Mr. Chairman, of forcing low-income people into a second-rate health care program in which many can't get appointments with doctors and those doctors are grossly under-reimbursed by the government? What is the morality of that?

What is the morality, Mr. Chairman, of stifling medical innovation, preventing new treatments from reaching patients because of ever-expanding Washington bureaucracy and red tape? Where is the morality in that kind of program?

What is the morality of tying college students to years of crippling debt because of a government-run student loan program that drives up tuitions? I hear my friends on the other side talk about how difficult it is for students, and it is. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult because of the student loan program that they put in place when they were in the majority that doesn't give students access to low interest rate loans. Where is the morality of that?

Where is the morality of heaping trillions of dollars of debt onto future generations to finance today's government spending because today's policymakers refuse to stop outspending our tax revenue? Where is the morality in that, Mr. Chairman?

And these are only a few examples of the regrettable consequences of well-intentioned, government-sponsored compassion.

Our Republican budget aims to break that pattern. We aim to respect the American people and talk to them about the seriousness of the challenges that we face, but provide positive alternatives, real solutions with real results. That is what they are longing for, real leadership in this town.

Our budget isn't about cutting programs, it is about improving and saving them to ensure a sustainable safety net for those who need it, while encouraging and helping others sustain themselves, the most truly compassionate thing one can do for another. That is the morality of our Republican budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just start with some comments about the importance of making sure we make investments in defense in a straightforward and honest way.

The chairman's comments were directly contrary to the position he took 1 year ago. Here is what he said as part of the Republican majority: ''Abuse of the OCO''—that is the overseas contingency account—''is a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process.'' That is what our Republican colleagues said. They said they weren't going to allow it. They are using the overseas contingency account as a slush fund for moneys that should be invested in the normal Defense Department accounts. That is what they said last year. They have done a 180 here. That is a discredit to this House.

We keep hearing all day about Price 1 and Price 2. What is that all about? I am sure colleagues listening have got to be going: What is going on, Price 1 and Price 2? It is because our Republican colleagues haven't figured out how they are going to fund the defense of the country. But both Price 1 and Price 2 are a violation of the position our Republican colleagues took just a year ago.

So let's do this in a way that honors our commitment to our defense and do it in a straightforward manner, the way that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others have recommended.

Now, it is always interesting to understand people's different perceptions in morality. I would just ask a question: Is it right to have a budget that refuses to cut a single special interest tax break in order to reduce the deficit while cutting our investment in our kids' education? Is it right to have a budget that won't cut a corporate tax break, like the corporate jet loophole, but cuts our investment in our kids' education, increases the cost of prescription drugs to seniors, says to students you are going to pay more for your student loans?

I was really interested to hear the chairman's comments about the student loan program. What the Democrats did when they were in the majority was get rid of a system where the big banks were making guaranteed returns off of taxpayer dollars that were not going to students. They were making guaranteed 9 percent returns.

So we said: Why should we have a system where the big banks are getting these guaranteed taxpayer-subsidized returns? And we moved to a direct loan program. That meant every dollar could go farther in terms of providing student loans. Cut out the big banks. They were just siphoning off dollars that were intended to go to students. That is what we did. But we also understand that despite those improvements, our students are finding it costly to go to college.

That is why actually in our budget we provide for increased opportunity and more affordable college, the opposite of what our Republicans do, which is they say they want to increase interest rates on student loans and cut $90 billion-plus from Pell grants.

Is it moral or, I should just ask: Does the country really think it is right to have a budget that paves the way for cutting the top tax rate for the wealthiest people in the country, the people who have done just great over the last 20, 30 years? Is it right to cut their tax rates by one-third, from 39 percent down to the mid-20s, while increasing the tax burden on working families, middle class families, and those who are working their way into the middle class, getting rid of the deduction for higher education, getting rid of the increase in the child tax credit, getting rid of the Affordable Care Act tax credits that help people afford education?

The Tax Policy Center did a study that said a proposal like the Romney-Ryan plan would provide about an average tax cut of $200,000 to millionaires and increase the tax burden on middle-income families by $2,000. Is that right?

Look, the issue here is whether you believe that we should grow our economy and accelerate economic growth in a way with more shared prosperity, or whether you believe in an economy that grows through trickle down, the idea that cutting tax rates for the top will somehow lift everybody up. That theory ran into the hard wall of reality. Folks at the top had their incomes go up, everybody else was running in place. We should not go back to that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am amused by my colleague's interpretation of what happened with student loans. It is an interesting rewriting of history.

What the translation is is that the Federal Government now controls the vast majority of student loans, controls and dictates interest on those loans. So the money that the students are paying out there in interest on those loans, where is it going? It is going to the Federal Government when, in fact, those students could actually get loans at a lower rate, but that is now precluded. So our friends have a proclivity for rewriting history. Their plan, by the way; that was their plan to put the Federal Government in charge of student loans.

The gentleman says, What has changed in a year? Well, a lot has changed, Mr. Chairman: Russian aggression in Eastern Europe, ISIS, Chinese making more noise.

Look, I admit that funding the defense for our country in this way, $613 billion—$523 billion in the base budget and $90 billion in the global war on terror fund—is not ideal.

Why are we doing that? The President so far has refused to lay out a path to change the law, which it takes in order to put it in the base defense budget, which is why we in our budget responsibly, proactively, honestly lay forth the path to be able to get that done.

Our friends know that if the President's number were included in the budget, as soon as the next year begins,

boom, right back down to $523 billion. He can talk about the number he has got all he wants, but the law of the land brings it right back down to $523 billion unless the law is changed.

We look forward to working with our colleagues, we look forward to working with the administration, so that we can actually do so in a way that modifies the base defense budget. I hope that that is able to happen, I hope that that is able to happen.

I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a very active member of the Appropriations Committee and of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, first, to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the job he has done and the staff of that committee.

As the chairman stated, this budget actually deals with the issues that are important to our country. The President has put together and has put forward a budget, but as the chairman stated, it is a budget that assumes that the law is not the law. He assumes that you can just throw money on top of the law and that it is going to stay there by some miracle of nature when the reality is that we know, as the chairman stated, that that is fake, because if we were to mark up to those numbers, the sequester would kick in and just eliminate those funds outright.

□ 1730

This budget deals with reality. This budget deals with the fact that, if we don't deal with and if we don't reform what is causing, frankly, the debt, the deficits—which is mandatory spending—it will consume 100 percent of the budget in a generation.

This budget also demands from Congress tax reform, tax reform that we all know would increase the economy, that would create more jobs, that would make it easier for Americans to open businesses—small, medium, and large—to create jobs here in this country.

I want to thank the chairman because it also recognizes the fact that, no, al Qaeda is not on the run; that, no, we have not defeated terrorism; and that the world is not as safe as any of us would like it to be. This recognizes that we have to give our military what it needs to do its job.

Yes, the President adds money to the base, but I repeat—and the chairman mentioned this—that that is fake because, unless you change the law, which this budget cannot do, that money automatically goes away.

The one thing that we can do that is in the hands of this bill, of this budget that is in front of us, is to do precisely what the chairman has put forward.

Is it perfect? Absolutely not—it is responsible. It helps create jobs, and it will grow the economy. It will stop this out-of-control spending; and, yes, it will deal with making sure that our military has the tools that it needs to fight the enemies of freedom and the enemies of America. It does it in a realistic fashion, not in this dream world that the President's budget seems to be living in.

I encourage my colleagues to support this effort from our chairman of the Budget Committee. Again, I thank the chairman for his effort.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am just a little puzzled by the comments from the gentleman from Florida since the Republican study group's budget—and I understand the Republican study group consists of about 170 members of a big majority of the Republican caucus—funds defense in a straightforward way that the President's budget does and that the Democratic alternative budget does.

I am interested to hear the Republican study group's budget approach to defense characterized as a fake. I think that would be a surprise to the members of the Republican study group.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to put a little more meat on the bones, if you will, of this issue of discretionary spending and of mandatory spending because it really is the locus of the problem that we have, and I think our friends on the other side of the aisle would agree.

When you look at history, over the last 50 years or so—the red on this is mandatory spending, and the blue is discretionary spending—back in 1962, mandatory spending was about a third of our Federal budget, and discretionary spending was about two-thirds.

Over the last 50 years, what has happened is that that has flipped, and mandatory spending has become two-thirds or even more of Federal spending, and discretionary spending has become about a third.

Now, why is that important? All of the things that we say that we care about outside of Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, basically, are in this blue area. Defense is in the blue area, as are transportation, energy, education, research.

All of the things we say that we want to protect are in the blue area. This is what our Appropriations Committee deals with. The automatic spending—the mandatory programs—are crowding out, as you see, Mr. Chairman, the discretionary spending. The challenge to my colleagues is to recognize this problem, to recognize what needs to be done.

What needs to be done is that the mandatory programs need to be addressed. You can't bury your head in the sand and say it doesn't make any difference. We spend about $3.6 trillion a year on the entire Federal budget.

About $2.6 trillion—ballpark figures of $2.5 trillion, $2.6 trillion—is of basically three things, which is Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt, which has been talked about and that we aren't able to do anything about. We can't change it.

When you think about the Federal Government, everything else is about $1 trillion a year: education, energy, legislative branch, judiciary, court system, transportation, research, defense. Everything else in the Federal Government, with the exception of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, is about $1 trillion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, people out there across this great Nation know that, for 4 out of the last 6 years, Washington—this country—has run a deficit of greater than $1 trillion each year, which means that you could do away with the entire Federal Government—the entire thing, everything—with the exception of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, and you wouldn't even balance the budget. That is the challenge. Very shortly, mandatory spending is going to consume the entire Federal budget.

We have got a problem that we have got to deal with. If we don't, what happens is that we are no longer going to be able to pass off to our kids and our grandkids the kind of opportunity for them to realize their dreams.

That is what we need to do, Mr. Chairman. We need to recognize the problems, and we need to recognize the challenges, and that is what our budget does. It recognizes that mandatory spending can't continue on the path that it is on.

Sadly, in that mandatory spending, those programs are actually going broke: Medicare, insolvent by 2033; Social Security, insolvent by 2034.

What our budget does is responsibly, positively, honestly say to the American people that we recognize that challenge. It is reckless for us not to recognize and address that challenge, so we do in our budget put forward positive solutions to those challenges so that we can, as a percentage of the amount of spending in the Federal Government, narrow the amount of money spent on mandatory programs so that we have more moneys available for the kinds of things that everybody on this House floor and everybody in this Chamber wants to do.

We want to make certain that we have the greatest opportunity for the next generation, but that light is getting dim unless we address the challenges that we face. That is why it is so important to adopt a positive budget, an honest budget, a sincere budget, a budget that recognizes these challenges but that puts in place positive solutions.

I appreciate the conversations and the discussions of my friends on the other side of the aisle, but it is absolutely vital that we, as Representatives of the people, come together and solve these challenges that we have from a financial standpoint so that we can pass on to our kids and our grandkids the greatest nation the world has ever known.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). The gentleman from Maryland has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve unless the gentleman wants to close.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I would say to my friend that I am prepared to close, so I am happy to have the gentleman close.

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

When we are talking about the budget and priorities, the chairman of the committee left out one of the biggest areas of ''spending'' in the Tax Code according to the Congressional Budget Office, and that is the amount of spending that goes through a whole range of tax breaks.

If you look at this chart, you will find that what the Congressional Budget Office calls ''tax expenditures'' exceed the amount spent each year on Social Security, on Medicare and Medicaid, on defense: $1.4 billion in tax breaks.

Now, some of those are for good policy purposes, but some of them and a lot of them are there because some powerful special interest got some special break that helps him and nobody else, and this Republican budget doesn't touch one of those in order to reduce the deficit, not one. It doesn't close one of those $1.4 trillion in tax expenditures to reduce the deficit.

What it does do is make life harder for people who are working hard every day. It increases the tax burden on middle class Americans and on those who are working to join the middle class. It raises the cost of going to college by increasing the cost of student loans. It increases the daily costs of seniors, who are going to face higher prescription drug costs and higher fees for copayments—seniors, students, working class families.

I started this discussion by pointing out that we have seen worker productivity grow. American workers are working harder than ever, but their paychecks have been flat. Our Democratic alternative budget will address that issue.

This Republican budget makes the situation worse. It doesn't do anything to help hard-working Americans get ahead. It says, Work harder, but get less. You are going to take home less, and you are going to get hit with higher taxes because they take away certain important tax benefits for middle-income and working people.

Why in the world we would want to pass a budget that makes it harder on hard-working people today and that disinvests in the future of America tomorrow, I don't know. There is a much better way to do it. We will present an alternative tomorrow which does that.

It says we should have a Tax Code that is not rigged in favor of making money off of money, but that actually favors people who earn a living through hard work every day. Our current Tax Code actually gives better tax rates to unearned income than to earned income. That doesn't make sense.

We propose to provide important tax incentives and benefits to hard-working Americans; whereas the Republican budget just provides another tax rate cut for folks at the top on the failed theory that it is going to trickle down and lift everybody up. That is not the way to accelerate economic growth.

The way to accelerate economic growth is to make sure all hard-working Americans can bring back bigger paychecks to provide for their families, to make sure their families can achieve the American Dream.

That is an economy in which everyone moves forward together, as opposed to an economy that says to the folks at the top: you have made it; we are going to give you even more tax breaks, and once you climb the ladder of opportunity, it is okay to lift the ladder up after you.

That has not been the way our country has worked from the beginning. Let's reject this budget. There is a better way, and we will have a chance to debate that tomorrow.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we have heard a lot of conversation this afternoon about the budget; a lot of hyperbole, a lot of misinformation, I would suggest.

I suspect that those out there watching, if they are looking at this, have said to their spouses: hide the kids and pets, dear; they are talking about the budget.

Let me set the record straight on a couple of items. Some folks on the other side have talked about the research budget is being decimated. Table one in the budget report has a line item for general science, space, and technology. That is research and innovation—for 2016, $28.381 billion; in going to 2025, $34.488 billion; for the 10-year window, $313 billion to research and innovation.

Chairman RYAN, early on in this conversation, in this debate, talked about all of the hyperbole on the other side and of the words ''slashing'' and ''cutting'' and ''decimating'' and ''destroying.''

Mr. Chairman, what the other side proposes, what the President proposes, is a growth in the budget of 5.1 percent on average. That is what gets you this amount of debt.

□ 1745

It crowds out everything else that we want to do in our society. Our growth rate, 3.4 percent—3.4 percent. That is what gets you A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

Now, my friend talks about the productivity in this country; and it is true, productivity is up, but let me talk about the growth. If they want to double down on the policies that we have had for the last 6 years, let's talk about what has happened. This is the Congressional Budget Office estimate of growth over the ensuing 10 years: in 2012, they predicted that the growth was going to average 3 percent; in 2013, 2.9 percent; in 2014, 2.5 percent; this year, 2.3 percent growth over the next 10 years.

Now, what does that mean? What that means is that a full percent growth off the average growth rate over the last 40 years, and such a distinctive decrease in growth that jobs aren't going to be able to be created at the numbers that they need to be, that the economy doesn't get to be roaring at the way that it needs to be, that revenue into the Federal Government is diminished because the growth isn't projected to be what it ought to be.

How much? Is it a little bit? If we—if, when, we are able to adopt the policies in our budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America projection, we would suggest that we can return to the average growth rate of the last 40 years, 3.2, 3.3 percent. What that means is more jobs, more activity, more economic vitality out there. What that means is nearly $3 trillion, $3 trillion more to the Federal Government in terms of revenue just because of the increased activity in our economy. Imagine what we could do with those kinds of resources, to balance the budget, to get this economy going again, to allow the American people to realize their dreams in so many, many wonderful and vital ways.

How do you do that? You do that with tax reform. You do that with tax reform. My friends on the other side of the aisle say: Well, no, you haven't identified what you are going to do. No, that is the responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means. The budget lays out the pathway, and then the committees of jurisdiction go to work and accomplish that pathway, put in place the programs that would accomplish that pathway, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I want to reiterate once again, remember, Mr. Chairman, that every dollar that is taken in taxes from the American people and every dollar that is borrowed is a dollar that can't be used to pay the rent, can't be used to buy a house, can't be used to buy a car, can't be used to send a kid to college, can't be used to expand or to begin a business.

So what we need are positive solutions, real solutions, honest solutions, like we put forward in our budget. Highlights once again: We balance the budget in less than 10 years without raising taxes. Our budget decreases spending by over $5.5 trillion in the 10-year budget window—$5.5 trillion—instead of adding trillions of dollars of spending. We support a strong national defense; we have defined that, $613 billion combined with base defense spending and global war on terror spending. We repeal ObamaCare in its entirety, once again, as a physician, not just because it is harming the economy, but it

is also harming the health of the American people. We secure economic opportunity for all citizens.

We don't leave anybody behind. We recognize the imperative and the opportunity that is so necessary for folks. We do, however, believe that there are places where appropriate federalism ought to occur, where States and local communities can better respond to the needs of their citizens, whether it is in the area of health care, whether it is in the area of nutritional assistance, or whether it is in the area of education, something that so many State legislatures and so many Governors are talking about as we speak.

We hold Washington accountable. We think it is important to have a right size of Washington, not an expanded Federal bureaucracy that continues to overreach and continues to affect adversely, in regulatory schemes, the lives of the American people. We cut waste and fraud and abuse all across the Federal Government, defining areas that need to be audited and where we need to find savings. The American people, the hardworking American people, they are sick and tired of the kind of waste in this government. We support rights of conscience for physicians all across this land, and we push back on the executive overreach.

This is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. It will result in a greater efficiency, greater effectiveness, and greater accountability of this government. I urge my colleagues to support A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate on the congressional budget has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

BENJAMIN P. GROGAN AND JERRY L. DOVE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION MIAMI FIELD OFFICE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1092) to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the ''Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Bureau of Investigation Miami Field Office'', as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1092

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, shall be known and designated as the ''Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1092, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1092, as amended, would designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building.

FBI Special Agents Jerry Dove and Benjamin P. Grogan were killed in 1986 during a gun battle with robbery suspects. Special Agents Dove and Grogan had been a part of a surveillance effort in connection with a series of violent bank robberies in Miami, Florida.

Special Agent Dove was born in January 1956 in Charleston, West Virginia. He earned degrees from Marshall University and West Virginia University and had been in law enforcement for 4 years prior to his death.

Special Agent Grogan was born in Atlanta, Georgia, in February 1933. He became an FBI special agent in 1961 and had been with the FBI for 19 years prior to his death.

This legislation recognizes the ultimate sacrifice of these two FBI agents who were killed in the line of duty. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for her leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, I spoke with George Piro, special agent in charge of the FBI's Miami field office, and on behalf of the families of the fallen officers and of all of his colleagues, he conveyed his sincere appreciation to this House for considering this important legislation today.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1092, as amended, which designates the Federal building located in Miramar, Florida, as the Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Bureau of Investigation Miami Field Office.

I would also like to thank my dear friend and pioneer and legend, the gentlelady from Florida, Madam FREDERICA WILSON, who really is a Floridian icon, but I want to recognize her for her dedicated work with law enforcement officers, including the two who died in the line of duty.

On April 11, 1989, Mr. Speaker, FBI Agents Jerry Dove and Benjamin Grogan were killed in southwest Miami, Florida. While these two FBI agents were investigating a spate of violent armed robberies, they observed a vehicle suspected to be connected to the robberies. When the agents attempted to stop the vehicle and the suspects refused, a high-speed chase ensued. A gun battle followed, and Special Agents Dove and Grogan were killed. Five other agents were injured in the attack.

Now, since this incident, Mr. Speaker, every April 11, the Miami FBI field office has held a special ceremony to honor Special Agents Dove and Grogan and other law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty.

As a former police officer, I have a deep appreciation of this honor being bestowed today. Naming this new facility after FBI Special Agents Jerry Dove and Benjamin P. Grogan is a fitting tribute to these two law enforcement officers who gave their lives in service and protection of the citizens of Miami, Florida.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 1092, as amended.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Florida, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our brand-new Florida colleague, the gentleman from Miami, Mr.

CURBELO, for his leadership in bringing this important bill to the floor before us tonight. I especially commend my good friend, the gentlelady from Miami, Dr. WILSON, for spearheading this effort to commemorate and thank our law enforcement officers, and especially to highlight the sacrifice that these two special agents made.

As was pointed out by the previous speakers, Mr. Speaker, in 1986, Special Agents Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove were killed while serving bravely in the line of duty after they and other agents gave chase to two robbery suspects.

□ 1800

A 5-minute gun battle—the bloodiest in FBI history—erupted when the suspects' vehicle was stopped in my sleepy neighborhood of Pinecrest, Florida, and both suspects began firing on law enforcement.

In addition to the tragic loss of Special Agents Grogan and Dove, five other agents, including the agent who shot and killed the suspects, were injured, as approximately 145 shots were fired during this exchange.

Even though scenes as tragic as this one are very rare in south Florida today, our community understands the dangers that all law enforcement officers face in the course of their daily work to protect civilians. The sacrifice of both special agents and their families is a testament to the ethos of service in our south Florida community.

Although nothing will bring back these brave agents, I am proud to support Ms. WILSON's important bill to name the FBI's new south Florida field office for them. It is just one way, Mr. Speaker, in which we can honor their service and their sacrifice.

Special Agents Dove and Grogan are role models for our new generation of law enforcement officers. Their bravery, their courage, their selfless dedication is seen every day in law enforcement officers in south Florida.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the author of the bill.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a special thank you to Speaker BOEHNER for realizing the urgency of this bill. We just got this information, and I went to the Speaker and he redlined the bill and brought it to the floor.

I am proud to have my Florida colleagues here with me: a legend in her own time, Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CURBELO, who is new. He has really jumped into Congress and has been so helpful in all that we do.

It is a pleasure for the time to be managed by ANDRÉ CARSON, who himself is a police officer and who understands who we consider a role model in that field. I thank you so much for being here today for this important bill.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1092, which proposes to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, in the heart of my district, as the Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building.

This new 475,000-square-foot facility is a state-of-the-art office building and is developed in accordance with the 2030 Zero Environmental Footprint project goal, according to the architects.

This facility is a part of the GSA's Design Excellence Program, and in the words of the architect, it ''expresses the dignity, enterprise, and stability of the United States Government, while the landscape restores the native environment by reintroducing wetlands and vegetation typical of the Everglades.''

The facility is LEED certified and is designed to reduce the consumption of potable water by 95 percent. There are also solar panels on the roof of the annex and garage that will provide renewable electricity. The building will be high tech and be able to support over 1,000 employees.

There are a few major points that I want to mention about the building. First, the building is aesthetically gorgeous and far from what you would consider your typical government building. It sheds the model that government buildings always place function over form. The building stands out from the neighboring buildings so much that most people don't know that it is the FBI's new field office.

Also, the construction cost was approximately $8 million below the budgeted amount, and this was achieved through the operational efficiency of the contractor Hensel Phelps, the FBI, and GSA.

The project provided a boost to the local economy by creating hundreds of jobs for the residents of my community. The employees will be able to give back to the economy—which is so great—by spending money in the city of Miramar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to create an even stronger personal connection with the local community.

We are naming the building in honor of Special Agents Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove, members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who died valiantly on Friday, April 11, 1986, in what is still considered the bloodiest gun battle in the storied history of the FBI.

Most men and women in law enforcement leave their homes for work knowing that there is a possibility that they may not return, but I don't know if that was on the minds of Agents Grogan and Dove as they left their homes on April 11, 1986.

I do know that it was an unusually cool and breezy spring morning in south Florida. I do know that Miami in the 1980s was plagued by crime and graphic violence. This period has been chronicled in media reports and dramatically portrayed on the TV show ''Miami Vice'' and in movies like ''Scarface.''

I know that Agents Grogan and Dove knew about this violence when they said good-bye to their families, picked up their badges and guns, and left home on the morning of April 11, 1986. Yet they still answered the charge to protect their community in the face of this danger.

I know that Agent Grogan was a company man. I know that he had 25 years of dedicated service to the Bureau and was 1 year from retirement. His wife was also an employee of the Bureau.

I know that Agent Dove had only 4 years of service in the Bureau after completing law school, but he was living his boyhood dream, according to his family.

I have their photos displayed here so that you can see the men we are proposing to honor. I wanted to have their pictures so that you can see the bravery in their eyes.

I know that their bravery was the motivation for their joining a team of fellow agents on the morning of April 11, 1986, to tail a vehicle with two suspects on board whom they thought were connected to a string of violent bank robberies.

The agents attempted to hail the driver of the vehicle to pull over, and when that failed, the agents strategically cornered the vehicle, which came to a crashing halt by hitting a tree. A gun battle immediately ensued. There was a barrage of bullets.

I can only imagine how the crackle from the guns cut through the normally peaceful morning of that south Dade neighborhood. Yet our brave men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation returned fire. Their fire hit the suspects several times but, unfortunately, those weapons were not powerful enough to stop them.

On the other hand, the weapons that were used by the suspects were so powerful that the agents were injured by misses that tore pieces of metal from their vehicles. However, those agents continued to battle on. Those agents knew that this could be that day which they prayed to avoid as they said goodbye to their loved ones and left their home, but they still battled on.

I can only imagine the frustration of Special Agents Richard Manauzzi, Gordon McNeill, Edmundo Mireles, Gilbert Orrantia, John Hanlon, Ronald Risner, and Grogan and Dove as they shot dozens of bullets into the suspects' direction and the high-powered rifle continued to return fire, but they still battled on.

In a desperate attempt to flee, the suspects tried to commandeer Grogan and Dove's vehicle. When they came around to the side of the vehicle, Grogan and Dove were on the ground in a defensive position they had taken to battle the suspects. It is reported that the suspects shot both agents with a high-powered rifle at close range. Shortly after, the suspects were themselves fatally shot by Agent Edmundo Mireles.

Agent Mireles made a very impressive statement about his role in that tragic event. He said:

I knew that I was going to die, but I was going to do my best to make sure that the suspects didn't get away.

When the dust cleared, two agents lay dead on that spring morning, and five were seriously injured.

I know one other thing: that if for no other reason, we are here in Congress to honor, commend, and decorate those Americans who live up to the ideals upon which this great country was founded.

Mr. Speaker, I implore you and my colleagues in Congress to join me, the Transportation Committee, and my Florida colleagues, and lift up Special Agent Benjamin Grogan and Special Agent Dove from that street in south Miami and place their names high, where the world can know that we are proud of their sacrifice for their Nation.

It is only fitting that these names should be placed on the same mantle with the letters FBI because Special Agents Grogan and Dove embody the motto for which the agency has become known: fidelity, bravery, and integrity.

God bless the FBI, and God bless America.

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my two colleagues from Florida for their moving and eloquent remarks. I especially want to thank Ms. WILSON for raising awareness and taking this very special initiative to honor these men who gave the ultimate sacrifice for the safety and the security of our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is often in this House that we take time to remember those who are defending our freedoms around the globe, our men and women in uniform, as we should, because many of them also pay the ultimate sacrifice. Less frequently do we take time to honor our heroes in law enforcement, those who live with us in our neighborhoods and who keep our neighborhoods and our homes safe.

By doing this today, this House is honoring not just these men, not just their families, but all of our law enforcement officers throughout this country who every day fight to keep us safe and to guarantee the security of our neighborhoods and of our families.

Once again, I thank my colleagues for this wonderful bipartisan effort to honor those who truly deserve to be honored by this House.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1092.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the 'Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building'.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on Homeland Security and its subcommittees have received document subpoenas issued by the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoenas, I have determined that compliance is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman.

COMMEMORATING FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand here today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize the upcoming 50th anniversary of my alma mater, Florida International University, on April 6, 2015.

Not only is FIU worlds ahead in finding solutions to the most challenging problems of our time, but the university and the entire FIU community has moved Miami-Dade County worlds ahead as well.

Since its founding in 1965, FIU has grown alongside south Florida and has helped enable the region's notable progress and evolution over the last five decades.

To President Mark Rosenberg, my good friend, and the whole Florida International University family, I say happy anniversary, and thank you for decades of outstanding contributions to south Florida. I look forward to the next 50 years of amazing accomplishments to come. As a two-time graduate of FIU, I say, Go Golden Panthers.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand here today on the Floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize the upcoming 50th Anniversary of my alma mater, Florida International University, on April 6th, 2015.

Not only is FIU "Worlds Ahead" in finding solutions to the most challenging problems of our time, but the University and the entire FTU community has moved Miami-Dade County "Worlds Ahead" as well.

Since its founding in 1965, HU has grown alongside South Florida, and has helped enable our community's notable progress and evolution over the last five decades.

Miami-Dade County's only public research university has now awarded over 200,000 degrees in more than 180 bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs, and currently enrolls more than 54,000 students.

FTU is also a major economic engine that contributes nearly $9 billion each year to the local economy as a top-10 employer in the county.

To President Mark Rosenberg, my good friend, and the whole Florida International University family: happy anniversary and thank you for decades of outstanding contributions to South Florida.

I look forward to the next 50 years of amazing accomplishments to come.

And as a two-time graduate of FIU, I say Go Golden Panthers!

RECOGNIZING THE COMPETITIVE CARRIERS ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Competitive Carriers Association, which is the leading organization for competitive wireless carriers and stakeholders.

CCA was founded in 1992 by nine rural and regional wireless carriers. Since its founding, CCA has grown to become the Nation's leading association for competitive wireless providers serving all areas of the United States.

Today is the first day of CCA's 2015 Global Expo in Atlanta. More than 100 CCA member volunteers will gather for a special day of volunteering with Hands On Atlanta. CCA will assemble 2,000 boxed meals and deliver them in person to schools, senior citizen homes, and other locations in the Old Fourth Ward neighborhood.

I am pleased that CCA is bringing the spirit of community to Atlanta, and I am confident this event will be quite successful.

HONORING PUCKETT EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, Georgia's 11th Congressional District is home to some of the Nation's most innovative and leading-edge businesses. One such business has been providing emergency management services to residents in northwest Georgia.

Puckett EMS is a family-owned and -operated business with a strong reputation for delivering state-of-the-art medical services to the people of Cobb and Dade Counties. Today, I am especially proud that this business has recently taken the national stage as one of the leading innovators in emergency health technology.

In 2013, Puckett Emergency Management Services was recognized by the Cobb County Chamber of Commerce as the Small Business of the Year for its work to support the local community and to ensure the highest level of care.

Most recently, Puckett EMS' software company, EMS Technology Solutions, received the Emergency Management Services World Magazine's Top Innovation award for its controlled substance tracking software, Operative IQ.

This cutting-edge solution uses biometric technology to track controlled substances from the time the medication is administered to the very last dose. In fact, using this software is a much more secure way of monitoring prescription drug use and bringing medical records in line with today's technology.

What is even more remarkable is Operative IQ uses available technology to continually update patient medical records, helping prevent substance abuse. In the emergency management industry, where seconds could mean the difference between life and death, this technical innovation is a lifesaver.

I commend Puckett EMS for their tireless efforts to protect the public safety of our citizens and congratulate them on their well-deserved recognition as a top innovator.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand before this body to recognize the contributions the management and employees of Puckett EMS have made to our community and their success in improving the safety and access to critical health care.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of foot surgery.

Mr. RUIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for March 23, today, March 25 and 26 on account of birth of twin baby girls.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 25, 2015, at 10 a.m.

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. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 2. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1558. A bill to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SIRES, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 1559. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes; 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. NUNES (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 1560. A bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 1561. A bill to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1562. A bill to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1563. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1564. A bill to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liability and to require an ethics inquiry into, and the garnishment of the wages of, a Member with Federal tax liability; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1565. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1566. A bill to improve security at State and local courthouses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROYCE, Mr.

ENGEL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. BASS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1567. A bill to authorize a comprehensive, strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, promote inclusive, sustainable agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 1568. A bill to establish processes for certain aliens located in Iraq and certain other countries who are or were nationals or residents of Iraq or Syria who have been persecuted or have a credible fear of being persecuted by the group commonly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, or by a similar group, to apply and interview for admission to the United States as refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify that the estate of a deceased veteran may receive certain accrued benefits upon the death of the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 1570. A bill to provide for greater transparency and information with respect to Federal expenditures under the Medicaid and CHIP programs in the territories of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital stay requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare, and for other purposes; 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 Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 1572. A bill to require certifications by prospective contractors with the United States Government that they are not boycotting persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1573. A bill to require institutions of higher education to provide students with information from the Occupational Employment Statistics program and the Occupational Outlook Handbook of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to add a work-study program for off-campus community service at selected after-school activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 1575. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the pilot program on counseling in retreat settings for women veterans newly separated from service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1576. A bill to require a study by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to assess the Food and Drug Administration's current regulatory pathway for reviewing generic versions of nonbiologic complex drug products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1577. A bill to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1578. A bill to establish the Commission on Long Term Social Security Solvency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1579. A bill to establish United States embassies with consular services in the five countries in the Caribbean with which the United States has diplomatic relations but no permanent diplomatic presence: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 1580. A bill to extend the final planting date for grain sorghum under Federal crop insurance policies because of extreme weather conditions that have adversely affected field conditions for planting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income the discharge of certain student loans of deceased or disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1582. A bill to amend the Forest Legacy Program of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to authorize States to allow certain entities to acquire, hold, and manage conservation easements under the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the requirements related to small business contracts for services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide greater extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction over certain credit card and other access device fraud offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 1585. A bill to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1586. A bill to modernize laws, and eliminate discrimination, with respect to people living with HIV/AIDS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1587. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 17, United States Code, to require the infringement of a copyright for a violation of such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SALMON, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1588. A bill to prohibit the intentional hindering of immigration, border, and customs controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1589. A bill to prohibit the use of funds by the Secretary of the Interior to make a final determination on the listing of the northern long-eared bat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1590. A bill to establish a prize program to award a prize and contract for the development of a fully-integrated electronic health records program for use by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 1591. A bill to require zero-based budgeting for departments and agencies of the

Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1592. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to establish a United States Ambassador at Large for Arctic Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FARR, Mr. FORBES, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan for military surviving spouses to offset the receipt of veterans dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 1595. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to implement security measures in the electronic tax return filing process to prevent tax refund fraud from being perpetrated with electronic identity theft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX:

H. Res. 165. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ASHFORD:

H. Res. 166. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to preclude the Committee on Rules from reporting a rule or order that would provide for the consideration of a bill or joint resolution with less than 10 hours of debate; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H. Res. 167. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the committees of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives should craft replacement language for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that includes the amendments made to the Black Lung Benefits Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H. Res. 168. A resolution expressing support for designation of a ''Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAKAI (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H. Res. 169. A resolution acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific lead to World War II; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H. Res. 170. A resolution recognizing the National Association of Letter Carriers' One Day Food Drive; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California introduced a bill (H.R. 1596) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Special Forces Command Sergeant Major Ramon Rodriguez of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam War; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have power to . . . make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer Thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government support the national security interests of the United States, support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and support the President in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States. Article I, section 8 gives Congress the power ''to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.'' The Necessary and Proper Clause of that section also grants Congress the power ''[t]o make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 3 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 1568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 1575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I SECTION 8

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the 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.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

HA. 1577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; . . .

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 Staes, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 1578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

Hit. 1580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ability to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 1581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I: 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; all but duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, of Section 8, of Article I.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 1583.

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 1 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1586.

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 1 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and intrepreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 1588.

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 Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority for this bill derives from Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1592.

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. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Section 18

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 1594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 1595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 13 and 14

The Congress shall have the Power To provide and maintain a Navy; and to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 38: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 131: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 140: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 213: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 232: Mr. PETERS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 244: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 267: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 292: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 310: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 359: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. JONES, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 420: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 472: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 524: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 543: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 546: Mr. SALMON and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 547: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 556: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 579: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 588: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 595: Mr. HANNA, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 601: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 625: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 628: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 631: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 650: Mr. ROSS, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 653: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 658: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 667: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 674: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 685: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 709: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 712: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 721: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 746: Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 767: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 784: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 815: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 818: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 831: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 855: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 868: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 885: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 908: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BERA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 911: Mr. PETERS and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 912: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 920: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 921: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 944: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 973: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 977: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 978: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 985: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 990: Miss Rice of New York.
H.R. 1057: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1058: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1059: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1062: Mr. LANCE and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1086: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1091: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1104: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1105: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1135: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1137: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1142: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1153: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1154: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 1195: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1210: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1214: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1215: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 1259: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1267: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1269: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1283: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1299: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1300: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1301: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1306: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1309: Mr. POSEY and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1339: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1343: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1358: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1369: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1386: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1389: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1399: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 1413: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 1427: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1434: Mr. HECK of Washington and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1441: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1453: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1463: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1470: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. ABRAHAMT.
H.R. 1479: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1480: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1482: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1485: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1486: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1498: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1502: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1527: Ms. MENG, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1528: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1547: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1550: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. TURNER, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. RUIZ.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. HARRIS and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 11: Mr. JORDAN.
H. Res. 12: Mr. KATKO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. NEAL.
H. Res. 15: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H. Res. 54: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 139: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Res. 161: Mr. HIGGINS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 2, the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Ways and Means in H.R. 2, ''Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2015 No. 49

Senate

The Senate met at 10 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.

Holy God, Superintendent of the universe, thank You that You give us the gift of forgiveness. In spite of our shortcomings, You continue to bury our mistakes in the sea of forgetfulness. Help us to respond with loving gratitude for Your generous mercies.

Today, use our lawmakers to advance Your kingdom. Lord, enable them to contribute to the well-being of our Nation and world. Help them to remember as they labor they are either making a deposit or a withdrawal. May all the deliberations on this high hill of our Nation's life begin, continue, and end with You.

We pray in Your great 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. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, throughout the Obama era, families across the country have had to make a lot of tough decisions. Lost jobs or lower wages meant doing more with less and refocusing on what truly mattered. It wasn't easy, but families made the best of difficult situations in order to position themselves for greater success in the better days to come.

Meanwhile, in Washington, we saw record levels of overspending, trillion-dollar deficits, and historic levels of debt. Hard-working families made tough choices while the Obama administration and its allies aimed to keep right on overspending. It was more than just wrong; many would say it was unfair.

But, today, Democrats can join together with Republicans to help rectify the inequity. Instead of having Washington play by one set of rules and the middle class by another, we can force Washington to start confronting very big challenges, just as everyone else has to do.

We can force Washington to focus on serving the middle class again instead of the other way around, and we can begin by passing the balanced budget before the Senate today.

This balanced budget pivots on an essential truth—that Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem—and strives to make government more accountable, more efficient, and more accessible. It represents a significant step forward when it comes to solving our country's many fiscal challenges.

But that is just one reason this balanced budget is so important. Here is another: It will help promote economic growth right now and promote sustained opportunity well into the future.

It aims to do so in a variety of ways; one is promoting energy advancement as an engine for growth. The energy revolution is truly historic. It is creating thousands of jobs, lowering costs for the middle class, and helping lift many into that middle class. This budget embraces that progress. It aims to remove needless barriers to environmentally responsible energy development. I expect other Members to come to the floor to discuss the energy component in greater detail today.

I also expect Members will come to discuss funding America's national security needs. As we know, there are numerous threats facing our country—terrorism practiced by groups such as ISIL, Al Qaeda and its associates; Iranian efforts to advance its ballistic missile program, pursue a nuclear weapon, and sponsor terror; and Russian and Chinese attempts to expand their spheres of influence, which will require us to modernize our force.

We must eventually give the Defense Department the certainty it needs to modernize the force. Members continue to work toward solutions for funding defense in the most robust and predictable way possible.

I commend Chairman ENZI and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM for providing us with a path forward in the interim. Their proposal represents a good-faith compromise to begin the legislative process for the Defense authorization bill we will consider later this year—when the additional overseas contingency funds can be prudently allocated against the actual procurement and modernization needs of our military, if only for the coming fiscal year.

Short of revising the BCA, this is the best strategy to keep faith with our armed services, and this is the best option we currently have for leaving President Obama's successor in a better position to face so many global challenges.

Every budget, obviously, is a compromise. This one is surely that, but it is a good compromise. It embraces growth. It reaches for a more prosperous energy future. It positions our Nation for a better outcome than we have seen otherwise on defense. It is bold, yet balanced, and it aims to change Washington's focus away from the needs of big-spending politicians and toward the aspirations of hard-working Americans who are very right to demand a government that is efficient, accountable, and focused on growth.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

This budget is all of those things, and I urge our colleagues to support it.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, these budgets we deal with are more than just a piece of paper with a lot of numbers. Each budget we put forward and the Republicans put forward are statements of our values, and it tells Americans basically whose side we are on.

I think, when we look at these budgets, we will find the budget we have propounded—and we will see when the votes take place this week—contains values that put the middle class first. Ours is a budget that supports hard-working families, creates jobs, and invests in our future.

The Republicans, by contrast, have developed a budget that attacks the middle class and serves the interests of special interests and the superwealthy. How can I say that? I say that because it is the truth.

For example, here are some of the priorities the Republicans are proposing in their budget. They want to take away health care from 16.4 million Americans now insured through ObamaCare. The Senate Republicans' budget wreaks havoc on Medicare at the expense of America's seniors. The Senate Republicans' budget makes drastic cuts to Medicaid and undercuts millions of families who rely on it to pay for nursing homes and other care. A lot of the care we have in nursing homes is not for people who are indigent; it is for people who have had to go to Medicaid because everything they have worked for their whole life is gone.

The budget the Republicans are pushing guts nutrition assistance for those in need, slices job training and employment services for millions of American workers, and it cuts billions of financial aid for college students. That is the truth.

These items are all attacking middle-class priorities. The Republicans, as usual, have gone the extra mile to protect special interests and the super-rich.

Incredibly, even as they take money away from hard-working families, seniors, and students, Republicans will not close a single tax loophole to reduce the deficit—not one. Do they indirectly pay those super-rich more money? Of course they do.

Forbes magazine had an article. For 2 years, between 2011 and 2013, the top 14 richest people in America gained during that period of time almost $200 billion. It is hard to comprehend, but it is true—14 people, about $200 billion.

Would the budget that has been put forth by the Republicans end tax breaks for companies that ship jobs overseas? No. Would they close loopholes for wealthy hedge fund managers? No. Would they take away wasteful and unneeded breaks for these huge oil and gas companies? No, not a single one. Would they ask millionaires and even billionaires to pay a penny more? No, not one.

Attacking the middle class while protecting the superwealthy isn't just irresponsible, some would say it is immoral.

There is more. The budget is dishonest. It claims to balance the budget, but it doesn't. To talk about balancing the budget over 10 years is so foolish and so untrue.

USA TODAY—the newspaper—said the Republicans' budget relies ''heavily on huge and politically unlikely spending cuts and bewildering gimmicks that don't begin to add up.''

The New York Times, in one of its op-eds, said the budget is a ''trillion dollar con job.''

I am not saying this. We have USA TODAY and the New York Times.

But who is being fooled here? In fact, there is one area where so far many people have been fooled and they have been fooled a lot.

During the markup of the budget resolution, Senate Republicans claimed to increase defense spending by adding an extra $38 billion in war funding, known as overseas contingency operations or OCO as we call it. The Republican leader talked about that a few minutes ago, but that money isn't even close to being real. Because of what seems to be a drafting error, not one extra dollar can be spent on defense above the sequestration caps.

The resolution currently on the floor puts a strict cap on OCO spending. For whatever reason, Republicans neglected to increase the cap to allow for the additional $38 billion for defense. In other words, the Republicans' extra defense money is a fraud, a hoax, and certainly a political gimmick.

We want to provide real sequestration relief, which has so bewildered the country in so many different ways, not only to defense but also the National Institutes of Health and virtually every program in America. We are going to propose just that as we move forward to get rid of sequestration.

So we all look forward on this side to the debate. When it is over, Americans will have no doubt which party stands with the middle class and which party stands with special interests, millionaires, and billionaires.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 11, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

Pending:

Sanders/Wyden amendment No. 323, to create millions of middle class jobs by investing in our nation's infrastructure paid for by raising revenue through closing loopholes in the corporate and international tax system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Colleagues, good morning. Working with Senator SANDERS yesterday, we made good progress on opening day for the budget resolution. It might not have been as fun as being at opening day for baseball, but getting underway on the first balanced budget resolution this Senate has seen in nearly 20 years was pretty exciting for me, and I appreciate the good work and the full debate we have had.

Today, I am looking forward to more work on a variety of amendment ideas for the resolution. Some Senators want to debate amendment ideas that have to do with the budget and some Senators want to debate amendment ideas that have nothing to do with the budget. So we will hear from some Senators today on issues such as our spending caps or the sequester, how best to preserve and protect Social Security, and what is the best way to ensure women are treated fairly in the workforce.

Other Senators may want to discuss items such as how to treat the waterways of the United States, free from overreach from the EPA, or how our communities and localities are under siege from Washington when it comes to ideas about taxing carbon or coal, and Senators may wish to discuss how our national security is best served by the spending levels contemplated in the budget. But we will also hear about something that really interests me, as it marries the numbers our budget resolution carries with the work our committees and Congress can do once the budget is passed.

I think one of the frustrations of the other side is this is a fairly general budget because it sets the spending limits for the committees and then builds in some reserve funds for some flexibility. It doesn't go into the specifics of exactly how the committees are to operate. The reason for that is the committees are the people who have at least an intense interest in that field or maybe even a lot of expertise. When we try to preclude what they are doing by what we do in the budget, it won't work.

We will also hear about something that marries the numbers our budget resolution carries with the work our committees and Congress can do once the budget is passed. The statutory deadline for passing the budget is April 15. Just prior to that, we are going to have a 2-week recess, which shortens the amount of time we have to work.

I would remind everybody that Republicans have only been in charge for a few weeks and are going to pass the first budget in 6 years. That is a pretty fast track to be on, but I am pleased with where we are at the moment.

Later on this morning, the Senate will consider an amendment to help improve care for children with medical complexity within Medicaid. Children with medical complexity require intensive health care services. These children often have two or more serious chronic conditions, and often see six or more specialists and a dozen or more physicians. They also often require care that takes them across State lines. There are 2 million of these children on Medicaid.

Reflecting a bipartisan bill, Senator PORTMAN intends to offer an amendment to create a reserve fund in anticipation of committee action that recognizes the critical importance of Medicaid to children with medical complexity, and the need for greater coordination and integration of care for this population within Medicaid. If Congress can write a bill that fits this reserve fund, then we can benefit children with medical complexity and their families. I look forward to a good debate and several votes in the Senate today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I look forward to continuing to work with Senator ENZI in a thoughtful and important process, and I thank the Senator for his civility. I think we are going to have an interesting few days.

To my mind, the basic issue surrounding this budget debate is whether we address the enormous needs facing a declining middle class and whether we come forth with ideas that create the jobs—the millions of jobs our people need—whether we raise the wages that millions of workers desperately need who today are working for $7.50 an hour, $8 an hour, whether we deal with the scandal of pay equity in this country where women are making 78 cents on the dollar compared to men, whether we make sure we do not cut Social Security at a time when there are so many vulnerable seniors out there whose entire income or almost their entire income is Social Security.

In my view, we cannot balance the budget on the most vulnerable people in this country. We cannot cut the Meals on Wheels Program. We cannot cut Head Start. Essentially at a time when the middle class is shrinking, we cannot balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor.

On my side of the aisle in the Democratic Caucus, what people are looking at is massive wealth and income inequality taking place in America. Senator REID a few minutes ago made the point that in the last 2 years alone—the last 2 years alone—the wealthiest 14 people in this country have seen their wealth increase by over $150 billion—in 2 years. That is more wealth that they have increased in 2 years than the bottom 40 percent of the American people own. That is pretty crazy. The richer are becoming phenomenally richer, and we have tens of millions of Americans struggling to keep their heads above water.

My Republican colleagues say, well, we want to deal with the deficit by cutting programs for the working families, lower income people, the people who are struggling, but we are not going to ask the wealthy or largest corporations in this country who are doing phenomenally well to pay an additional nickel in taxes. That does not make sense to me. I do not believe it makes sense to the American people.

AMENDMENT NO. 323, AS MODIFIED

Having said that, what I wish to do now is get to an amendment that is currently at the desk, and I ask that the pending amendment be modified with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $25,001,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $51,201,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $65,879,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $71,784,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $72,916,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $73,405,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $48,535,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $22,338,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $7,660,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $1,755,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $25,001,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $51,201,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $65,879,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $71,784,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $72,916,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $73,405,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $48,535,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $22,338,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $7,660,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $1,755,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by $79,667,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by $79,667,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $79,667,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by $79,667,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by $79,667,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by $79,667,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $25,001,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $51,201,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $65,879,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $71,784,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by $72,916,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by $73,405,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by $48,535,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by $22,338,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $7,660,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $1,755,000,000.
On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by $480,000,000.
On page 19, line 10, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by $1,530,000,000.
On page 19, line 13, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 14, increase the amount by $2,580,000,000.
On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by $2,880,000,000.
On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 20, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by $2,970,000,000.
On page 20, line 1, increase the amount by $2,520,000,000.
On page 20, line 5, increase the amount by $1,470,000,000.
On page 20, line 9, increase the amount by $420,000,000.
On page 20, line 13, increase the amount by $11,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by $7,570,000,000.
On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by $11,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by $9,760,000,000.
On page 20, line 21, increase the amount by $11,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by $10,380,000,000.
On page 20, line 25, increase the amount by $11,000,000,000.
On page 21, line 1, increase the amount by $10,650,000,000.
On page 21, line 4, increase the amount by $11,000,000,000.
On page 21, line 5, increase the amount by $10,660,000,000.
On page 21, line 8, increase the amount by $11,000,000,000.
On page 21, line 9, increase the amount by $10,660,000,000.
On page 21, line 13, increase the amount by $3,090,000,000.
On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by $280,000,000.
On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by $177,000,000.
On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by $360,000,000.
On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by $627,000,000.
On page 24, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by $885,000,000.
On page 24, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 24, line 14, increase the amount by $968,000,000.
On page 24, line 18, increase the amount by $983,000,000.
On page 24, line 22, increase the amount by $823,000,000.
On page 25, line 1, increase the amount by $640,000,000.
On page 25, line 5, increase the amount by $373,000,000.
On page 25, line 9, increase the amount by $60,667,000,000.
On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by $14,494,000,000.
On page 25, line 13, increase the amount by $60,667,000,000.
On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by $37,754,000,000.
On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $60,667,000,000.
On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by $50,344,000,000.
On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $60,667,000,000.
On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by $54,432,000,000.
On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $60,667,000,000.
On page 26, line 1, increase the amount by $54,806,000,000.
On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $60,667,000,000.
On page 26, line 5, increase the amount by $54,962,000,000.
On page 26, line 9, increase the amount by $40,517,000,000.
On page 26, line 13, increase the amount by $17,260,000,000.
On page 26, line 17, increase the amount by $4,670,000,000.
On page 26, line 21, increase the amount by $582,000,000.
On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by $2,890,000,000.
On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by $3,030,000,000.
On page 27, line 10, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $3,265,000,000.
On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by $3,495,000,000.
On page 27, line 18, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by $3,685,000,000.
On page 27, line 22, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.
On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by $3,815,000,000.
On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by $835,000,000.
On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by $370,000,000.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, what this amendment deals with is something I think virtually every Member of this body understands to be an enormously important issue, and the American people understand it as well, and that is our crumbling infrastructure and the fact we have to begin the process to substantially invest in our roads, our bridges, our water systems and our wastewater plants, our levees and our dams and our airports. The needs out there are enormous. When we do that, we can create millions of jobs at a time when we need to create millions of jobs. I heard Senator ENZI yesterday speaking on the issue. I think he reflects the views of many. I don't think there is a great debate on whether our infrastructure is crumbling. I don't think there is a great debate—and I speak as a former mayor—that if you allow your infrastructure to continue to crumble, it only becomes more expensive to rebuild it. I don't think there is a debate on that. The debate, of course, comes down to how you pay for it. That debate has been going on here for many years.

If anyone had a magical solution, I suspect it would have been brought forth already. But the proposal we are bringing forth calls for a $478 billion investment over a 6-year period. That will be paid for by eliminating some outrageous corporate loopholes today that, among other things, allow large, profitable corporations to stash their profits in the Cayman Islands, in Bermuda, and in other tax havens and not have to pay one nickel in taxes to the U.S. Government. Our proposal is pretty simple. Let's eliminate some of those loopholes, let's take that money, let's invest in rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, let's make our country more efficient, more productive, safer, and let us create millions of jobs.

The need for rebuilding our infrastructure should not be in doubt. One out of every nine bridges in our country is structurally deficient, and nearly one-quarter are functionally obsolete. Almost one-third of our roads are in poor or mediocre condition. And as everybody stuck in a traffic jam at this moment knows, more than 42 percent of urban highways are congested.

Much of our rail network is obsolete. We are competing against countries which have high-speed rail, which operates much more rapidly than our railroads do. America's airports are bursting at the seams and still rely on antiquated 1960s radar technology. More than 4,000 of our Nation's dams are considered deficient, and nearly 9 percent of all levees are likely to fail during a major flood. That is a pretty scary proposition. Our drinking water systems are nearing the end of their useful lives all over this country. Virtually every day there is another pipe which bursts, causing flooding in downtowns and wasting huge amounts of clean drinking water. Further, our wastewater plants routinely fail during heavy rains, allowing all kinds of crap to go into our lakes and our rivers, which should not be the case. Our aging electrical grid has hundreds of avoidable power failures each year and is unacceptably vulnerable to cyber attacks.

Now $478 billion may seem like a lot of money. It is a lot of money, but the American Society of Civil Engineers tells us we need to invest an additional $1.6 trillion to get our infrastructure into a state of good repair by 2020. To be honest with you, while this amendment is a significant step forward, it does not go anywhere near as far as it should go.

I would hope on this amendment we would have strong bipartisan support. It is not good enough for people to continue to say what everybody acknowledges—yes, we need to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure, but, no, we don't know how we are going to come up with the money to do it. It is too late to keep expressing that rhetoric. We have heard it for too many years. Every day we don't act, it becomes more expensive for us to act.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to today make an important statement that, A, we cannot continue to delay rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure; that, B, when real unemployment in this country is not 5½ percent but 11 percent, when youth unemployment is 17 percent, when African-American youth unemployment is off the charts, we need a major jobs program to put our people back to work at decent wages. That is what work on infrastructure does. The time for rhetoric is gone. The time for action is now. Let's rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. Let's put people to work. Let's end outrageous corporate tax loopholes. Let's make our country safer, more efficient, and more productive. I ask for support for that important amendment which comes up for a vote I believe at around 12:00 or so.

I yield 5 minutes off the resolution to Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if no one arrives, may I have 10 minutes?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, yes, of course.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am so grateful to Senator SANDERS because he explains things like no one else. He takes it down to the average working family in America. That is really who we are here to protect, not the super top rich people. They are doing fine.

Senator SANDERS taught me something this morning. I am just going to make sure I remember it correctly. The wealth of the top 14 richest people in America in the last couple of years went up over $100 billion.

How much was it?

Mr. SANDERS. It was $157 billion in a 2-year period.

Mrs. BOXER. In a 2-year period—the wealthiest of the wealthiest, 14 people—that wealth rose $157 billion. Yet

when we look at this Republican budget, those people get every benefit we can imagine. They are not asked to do a thing—a thing. When people are struggling sending their kids to college, Lord knows, when people are struggling trying to afford a new home, when people are struggling every day to make ends meet—some even to put nutritious food on the table—this budget is a blueprint of unfairness. This budget, this Republican budget, is a blueprint for another recession. It is a terrible budget, and it makes believe it balances. It doesn't balance one bit.

Our ranking member will explain the smoke and mirrors that have been used in this budget. I used to serve on the Budget Committee. Let me be clear to anyone within the sound of my voice. In recent times the only time the budget was balanced was when President Clinton was President, and only Democrats voted for his budget. We balanced the budget. And you know what; we created 23 million jobs because we invested in people, in education, in our children.

Not this budget—they cut—deep cuts out of domestic spending. They take $236 billion over 10 years from nondefense. That means they are cutting education, scientific research, food safety, law enforcement, and every single program the middle class and working Americans depend on.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Budget Committee. He is taking on such leadership in his position here and on the Environment and Public Works Committee by calling attention to our failing infrastructure. There are 63,500 bridges that are structurally deficient in America, and 50 percent of our roads are in less than good condition. And what does this Republican budget do? By the way, this is a big problem for our businesses. They cut 17 percent of overall spending, ignoring the fact that our roads are in disrepair and ignoring the fact that we face the prospect of crumbling bridges. That is a blow to everyone who drives on our roads.

At a time when energy costs are weighing heavily on families and businesses, they cut 85 percent in overall energy spending, including weatherization funding. What are they thinking? When a middle class family weatherizes their home, the energy bill goes down. They are putting a tax on every middle class person who has to pay a heating bill. Energy efficiency grants, no—cut. Research to clean energy, cut. It is a blow to our consumers and to our efforts to mitigate climate change.

At a time when college is a necessity and priority, they want to cut Pell grant funding by 30 percent over 10 years and to reduce overall spending on education and training by 15 percent—a blow to our students. Not for the students whose parents are in that top echelon—there is no problem there. They can afford $40,000 a year college—$30,000, $60,000. It is for our middle class and for those striving to be in the middle class. They are doomed with this budget.

Now, President Obama has turned this great recession around, but our ranking member points out the problems that remain. The solutions aren't that hard to come by. You make investments—not wasteful spending but investments in energy, investments in transportation, investments in finding cures for diseases. And what do you do? You make this a greater country, and you make lives better across the board.

There are 45 million people who are still recovering from the recession, including 16 million children who live in poverty. The Republicans leave the top echelon alone, who are making billions of dollars, and they are cutting $660 billion from income security over 10 years. That means they are cutting supplemental nutrition assistance, school lunch, unemployment insurance, earned-income tax credit.

I don't know who they think they represent, but I will tell you who they fight for—the wealthiest of the wealthiest few. That is who they fight for.

That old notion that you give billionaires money and somehow it will trickle down to the rest of us doesn't work. It doesn't work to cut education funding. It doesn't work to cut transportation funding. It doesn't work to cut energy assistance programs.

I have to say that it is a shock to see this budget. If that is why they think they got elected, then the people better pay attention.

Listen to what they do with health care. They do away with the Affordable Care Act, when 16 million people now have insurance who didn't have it before. And guess what; do they have a replacement? They are working on it. Oh, good, we worked on it for 50 years. We finally got it done. It is not perfect, but it is working. In my State it is magnificent to see people who now know they won't lose everything if they get sick. At a time when 70 million Americans rely on Medicaid and children's health coverage, they want to block grant that program and cut it by more than $1.2 trillion. What will it mean for maternity care when half of all births in the U.S. are financed by Medicaid? This is another blow to our families, to our babies. They fight for your right to be born. How about after you are born? How about after you are born?

At a time when more than 50 million seniors and disabled Americans are on Medicare and the baby boomers continue to age in, they want to cut Medicare by $430 billion. Now, look, they are afraid to spell out how they want to cut it. They kind of hide it in the documents, but we know what happens. People will be suffering, paying more, getting less care—a blow to our seniors.

They do not close one tax loophole for the wealthiest corporations—some of which pay no income tax—or these billionaires. Now, I have nothing against being a billionaire at all, but this Congress ought to ask everyone to pay their fair share, including billionaires—not just the middle class.

Now, their gimmicks are unbelievable. They hide defense spending in an off-budget account called OCO. Oh no, OCO—they hide it, but we got their number. I think Al Sharpton says on his show: ''We gotcha.'' We know what you are doing. Where is the emergency fund for our children? Where is the emergency fund for education? Where is the emergency fund for transportation? No, there is no OCO for that, no.

Then they claim they balance the budget. That is the biggest fib ever. Look at their record. When George W. Bush got elected, he had a surplus. It took him 15 minutes to blow it—two wars on the credit card, tax cuts for the rich on the credit card. This budget continues that legacy of shame—shame—hurting our seniors, hurting our children, hurting our middle class, all at the expense of the wealthy few.

We see that President Obama has cut this deficit by more than half. We are on the right track. Let's not walk away from policies that work.

I want to say to the ranking member, Senator SANDERS, I am strongly supporting your amendment on infrastructure, because to be a great Nation we have to move people, we have to move goods. This is a global marketplace. Ships are coming in to California—40 percent of the imports. They are transferred to trucks, and they go on roads that are full of pot holes. They are a mess. They have rail crossings that are dangerous.

So I will conclude in 20 seconds, if I might.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mrs. BOXER. I will conclude. I want to thank our ranking member on the Budget Committee because he talks from the heart, the soul, and from facts. If we follow his leadership, rather than the leadership of those on the other side of the aisle who want to go back to the days of high deficits, high unemployment, and chaos—and we were here; we know there was chaos—if not, then vote for this Republican budget. I hope we will vote no, and I hope we will support the amendment that will come forward to put us on the right track again.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, it will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 349

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 349.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], for himself and Mr. BENNET, proposes an amendment numbered 349.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve health outcomes and lower the costs of caring for medically complex children in Medicaid)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE HEALTH OUTCOMES AND LOWER THE COSTS OF CARING FOR MEDICALLY COMPLEX CHILDREN IN MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the health outcomes and lowering the costs of caring for medically complex children in Medicaid, which may include creating or expanding integrated delivery models or improving care coordination, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we are here talking about the budget. One of the issues on the budget is how we spend our money, including on health care and in this case on some of our most vulnerable young people, our children, who have what are termed to be ''complex medical conditions.''

I appreciate the fact that Senator BENNET is cosponsoring this amendment with me. It is based on some bipartisan legislation we have been working on over the years that helps to ensure that these children have the opportunity to get better care, and also we can save some funds in what is a very inefficient Medicaid delivery system now for these children.

It would allow, basically, health care providers to deliver health care services to these medically complex kids through models that coordinate care between providers, again helping to improve quality of care—and much better outcomes in the cases where this has been tried—but also to lower costs for Medicaid.

There are roughly 3 million children who fit in this category. It is about 1 in every 25 children. Of these children, by the way, most of them rely on Medicaid to access care, about 2 million out of the 3 million.

Although children with complex conditions represent only about 6 percent of pediatric Medicaid patients, they comprise about 40 percent of the cost, so 6 percent of the kids, about 40 percent of the cost of all Medicaid spending on children.

Children with these medically complex situations tend to have multiple and high acuity and chronic conditions that often require the service of a lot of different specialists. These circumstances call out for better coordination of care, particularly because a lot of it goes across State lines. Each Medicaid Program in each State has some different rules, but specialized care often requires these children to go to specialized providers outside of their State. This amendment would correct that fragmented system which those kids sometimes encounter now when they do seek that access across State lines.

Not only would the amendment ensure that medically complex children have access to necessary care, it would also allow the Medicaid system to realize savings through these increased efficiencies, including reducing hospitalizations and emergency room visits, while providing the array of outpatient and community services and support that are needed by these children. So it is a more holistic approach to their care, avoiding, frankly, some of the costs associated with emergency room visits and other hospitalizations and other fragmented care. It is based on the experiences in the real world.

There are programs that are doing quite well at improving those outcomes and saving costs. Some of the great children's hospitals have established their track record in developing these care-coordination models for kids with medical complexity. I have seen it in action in Ohio, where we are blessed to have a number of great children's hospitals. I have talked to medical professionals who are very pleased to have this better coordination of care. More importantly, I have talked to the parents and talked to some of the children themselves who are ecstatic about it. You know, many of them received their care through a different process previously that was not coordinated. What they tell me is they are deeply grateful for the coordination, partly because it saves them a lot of time and effort, partly because they are getting much better care, and partly because they just feel as if somebody cares. They are getting the love and support and care they need through the coordination. They are grateful for the difference.

As the overall population of children with medical complexity continues to grow, thanks to some great advances in medical science and medical care, including care for premature babies, we are going to see more and more of this need for better coordination. I want to thank my colleague Senator BENNET and many others on both sides of the aisle who have been involved in this issue over the years. This is an important amendment for us to have in the Budget Committee because it shows where our heart is as a Senate—to be able to take better care of these kids and also have more efficient care in the Medicaid system, where, again, 6 percent of these children now comprise about 40 percent of the cost in Medicaid for children.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this commonsense approach to provide better health care outcomes for some of the most vulnerable of our Nation's children.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 386

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 386.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 386.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicaid beneficiaries from benefit cuts)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES FROM BENEFIT CUTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Medicaid, which may include protecting children, pregnant women, individuals with disabilities, low-income adults, and Americans that need long-term services and supports, including nursing home care, who are guaranteed benefits under Medicaid, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, Senator PORTMAN's amendment touches upon a serious issue that I hope and expect will have broad bipartisan support, and that is the needs of children with serious chronic conditions.

In the United States, over 3 million children have medically complex health conditions. Of those 3 million kids, 2 million rely on Medicaid for their health insurance. That is two out of three kids, which should tell every Member of the Senate how important Medicaid is.

Let me repeat. Two out of three children rely on Medicaid. They have medically complex issues—the issues Senator PORTMAN is speaking about.

Last Congress, Senator NELSON offered a similar amendment during the budget process to address this important issue, and I was pleased to support it. I also plan to support this amendment today and hope that we have widespread bipartisan support for it.

But what I must say is that given that the Republican budget eliminates the Affordable Care Act, which throws 15 million Americans off of health insurance—many of whom have just, for the first time in their lives, received health insurance—and given that the Republican budget cuts Medicaid by some $400 billion over a 10-year period, the amendment Senator PORTMAN is offering deals with only one tiny and small part of what the Republican budget is doing. What the Republican budget is doing is decimating health care in the United States of America.

Senator PORTMAN says: Well, we have a situation with kids who have medically complex problems.

He is right, but we have many other issues out there that the Republicans are decimating.

Medicaid provides 6.4 million elderly seniors who rely on Medicaid, many of whom are living in nursing homes—6.4 million elderly seniors, some 80 or 90 years of age, rely on Medicaid for their nursing home care. In some cases, these seniors have incomes of $8,000 to $9,000 a year. The Portman amendment does not address the devastating cuts that happen to elderly Americans in nursing homes.

Pregnant women who rely on Medicaid for vital prenatal care that improves the health and well-being of mothers and babies—those programs are going to be cut. The Portman amendment does not protect them in any way.

Nearly 33 million children in our country rely on Medicaid for their health insurance. These are kids of low-income, working-class families, and they need important medical care when they are young, such as immunizations and well-child visits. The Portman amendment does not address the fact that many of those people will be thrown off of health insurance.

Some 10 million Americans with disabilities rely on Medicaid to treat serious, sometimes life-threatening disabilities. The Portman amendment does not address what happens to people with disabilities who are on Medicaid.

While I support this amendment, I am also concerned about the devastating impact the Republican budget will have on many millions of Americans by ending the Affordable Care Act—16 million Americans thrown off of health insurance, $400 billion in cuts in Medicaid, millions more.

I believe we need a budget that strengthens health care in America, not decimates it. I believe we need a budget that doesn't force us to choose between a seriously ill child and a pregnant woman with small children at home. These are false choices which a great nation such as ours should not be forced to make, especially at a time, as Senator BOXER mentioned, when we have the wealthiest 14 people in this country seeing their wealth increase in the last 2 years by $157 billion. Our Republican friends say: No, these people should not be asked to pay more in taxes, but we should balance the budget by taking millions of people off of health insurance. I don't think anybody in America thinks those priorities make any sense at all.

I am offering a side-by-side, and in doing so, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Portman amendment but also to vote for my amendment, cosponsored by Senator WYDEN, which supports all Medicaid beneficiaries by opposing cuts to the program.

Let's not sit around saying: Well, we are making some progress in one area, but we don't care about the millions of other people who have been thrown off of Medicaid.

I urge support for the amendment Senator WYDEN and I are offering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 12 noon today be equally divided between the managers or their designees; that at 12 noon, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Sanders No. 323, as modified, Sanders No. 386, and Portman No. 349, with 2 minutes of debate equally divided before each vote; and that following the votes, the Senate recess under the previous order. I further ask that the time from 2:15 p.m. to 3 p.m. be under the control of the minority and that the time from 3 p.m. to 3:45 p.m. be under the control of the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. For the information of all Senators, there will be three rollcall votes at 12 noon today, with an additional stack of votes expected at 4:30 p.m. today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, despite the repeated statements and warnings from our military and some of our congressional leaders, including myself, we are again staring down the barrel of sequestration.

This has been the great fear we have had, and I think we have come to a compromise here that might be liveable—not ideal, not where we should be, but where we are at this time.

Each service chief and each Secretary—and I have never seen this before—has testified that no service will be able to meet the wartime requirements under sequestration—that is in the event we have to have sequestration of the military portion.

Let me just mention that it was done wrong from the very beginning. When you talk about sequestration, it would seem to me that we would want to be sequestering or reducing in a relationship or proportion as to what that is of the budget. For example, our military is 16 percent of the budget, and yet we have had to take 50 percent of the cuts. So sequestration has gotten us to this point.

This budget we will be voting on has kind of a temporary solution or relief from sequestration.

Secretary Carter, our new Secretary of Defense, testified that ''readiness remains at troubling levels across the force'' and ''that even with the FY16 budget, the Army, Navy and Marine Corps won't reach their readiness goals until 2020 and the Air Force until 2023.''

This was interesting because we had a hearing where we had faces from the past—Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, and Madeleine Albright. So we had Democrats and Republicans, and they all agreed.

Madeleine Albright testified about her concerns about the deep cuts to the Defense Department, saying that it ''jeopardizes America's military reach.'' This is a Democrat talking—Madeleine Albright.

Over the last 6 years, significant cuts to the national security spending have forced our men and women in uniform to endure a steep and damaging drop in capabilities and readiness.

All of them testified that our readiness is dropping. When you are talking about readiness, you are talking about risk. When you are talking about risk, you are talking about American lives. Our naval fleet is at a historical low level of ships. The Air Force is the smallest in its history. The Army is shrinking to a force not seen since before World War II.

At a time when our security is being increasingly threatened by terrorism, a rising China, ISIL, ISIS, and rogue nations such as Iran and North Korea, the men and women charged with protecting this Nation are being undermined and forced to endure devastating cuts to the tools they need to keep America safe.

What we are talking about is something that has happened up to this point—not the potential of sequestration, which hopefully we can avoid and I think we will avoid, but what has happened up to this point.

The President believes the world is getting safer. He is negotiating a bad deal with Iran. He thinks global warming is a bigger threat to Americans than terrorism, but top leaders inside and out of the administration disagree.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper—James Clapper has been in this kind of capacity for well over 40 years—said:

When the final accounting is done, 2014 will have been the most lethal year for global

terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled. . . . Roughly half of the world's currently stable countries are at some risk of instability over the next two years.

The Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Lt. Gen. Vincent Stewart, before our committee just a couple of weeks ago, stated:

A confluence of global, political, military, social, and technological developments, taken in aggregate, have created security challenges more diverse and complex than those we have experienced in our lifetimes.

That was Lt. Gen. Vincent Stuart, the DIA Director.

Over the last three decades, we have built the most powerful fighting force in history and filled it with the most talented men and women ever to wear our uniform. We can't break our promise to them or our responsibility to protect the Nation.

I believe our military—our men and women in uniform—will not accept failure and will do everything they can to succeed no matter how constrained they are by inadequate budgets. However, there will come a point when, without the training, equipment, and force size, it will fail because it was not given the resources to succeed. We cannot let our military get to this point, but that is what we are risking should we have another level of sequestration.

Before sequestration even came into effect, the President cut some $500 billion from our military. We stood on this floor and talked about it at that time, about how we can't continue having cuts just to the military. That is what happened from this President before sequestration. Because of sequestration for fiscal year 2013, the Army had to cancel seven combat training center rotations, deferred maintenance on aircraft and vehicles, and postponed reset of weapons and equipment. The Air Force stood down 17 combat squadrons, cut 40,000 flying hours for its remaining units, cut training, and deferred maintenance activities.

This is a problem that we have, too, because we have to consider the difference between retraining and retaining in the Air Force. The pilots—to train a pilot to F–22 standards costs in excess of $9 million, while retentions are something like $200,000 over a 9- or 10-year period.

Because of the sequestration in 2013, the Navy and Marine Corps canceled deployments, deferred maintenance on ships, aircraft, and vehicles, reduced purchases of spare parts, and reduced training activities. All the services had to cut or delay weapon system and infrastructure modernization.

Modernization is one of the first things they do when they cut. They really can't do the readiness, they can't cut the personnel who are out there, the force strength, so modernization is what suffers because that is not something people are aware of today. Yet that is where the cuts were. They are still attempting to recover from all of these cuts.

But recent budget turmoil has forced our generals and admirals to worry about our military's ability to fulfill its critical national security role in, arguably, the most dangerous time in our Nation's history.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—that is General Dempsey—warned that continued national security cuts will ''severely limit our ability to implement our defense strategy.'' He means there the defense strategy to defend our country and to save lives out there. ''It will put the nation at greater risk of coercion, and it will break faith with men and women in uniform.'' That is General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Our Nation relies on less than 1 percent who volunteer to risk their lives on its behalf. I was trying to get a comparable figure to put that in perspective, but we are talking about 1 percent of our population is involved in protecting the other 99 percent. When these brave men and women are ordered into harm's way, they will salute with courage, they will go and do their job, their mission, and very effectively, but they do not have the right equipment to do it with. In return, they rightfully expect a supportive nation to provide them with the best training, technology, and equipment to accomplish their mission and then to come home safely. Tragically, we are not doing that.

Put simply, top military leaders are telling us that continued cuts to national security spending are making this country less safe. These cuts are making it more likely that our military men and women will not return from the battlefield alive, and this is immoral.

We must increase our defense budget, and I prefer to increase its base budget in fiscal year 2016 and over the next 5 years to give our military leadership the required and predictable funding they need. Because of Senate rules, however, we aren't able to do this without changing the law. I am committed to working to the point where we can replace sequestration with cuts to mandatory spending, as was originally planned with the Budget Control Act.

We went through the Budget Control Act assuming some of these things would happen. For the purposes of a Senate budget resolution, however, I am proud of the Budget Committee and the hard work they have done for adopting an amendment during their markup to provide additional funding for the Department of Defense through overseas contingency operations. That is OCO. This is far from ideal. OCO money is better than no money at all, and until we provide the solution to sequestration we need, this is the best we can do.

Our country is at war and will be for the foreseeable future and we are going to have to do something to keep America strong. I don't like this alternative. We have had nothing but a series of bad alternatives and this is the least bad alternative. So I salute Senator ENZI and others who are responsible for coming up with something that still is going to defend our Nation, particularly as we are faced with another potential round of sequestration. We can't let that happen to our men and women in uniform nor to America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that even though we had an agreement for time to be equally divided—yesterday, we passed one that said whenever we are in a quorum call, the time would be equally divided—I hope that would continue through all these quorum calls, and so I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, I want to thank my good friend from Vermont for drawing attention to the critical importance of passing a long-term Transportation reauthorization bill. This is one that Senator BOXER and I have been working together on for a long period of time. We have gone through these reauthorizations for many years, and we know this is the way to do it.

The reauthorization bill is far superior to just the short-term efforts for extensions. I think we all realize extensions cost about 30 percent off the top. And while I can't support the specific proposal of my good friend from Vermont, passing a bipartisan long-term fully funded bill is my top priority as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

As we all know, the current Transportation reauthorization expires on May 31, and EPW will be prepared to move on a reauthorization bill before that deadline. That is our goal. My staff has been working closely with the staff of my good friend and partner from California, the ranking member, Senator BOXER, and we are getting close to having our bill ready.

I know my colleagues on the Committees on Finance, Commerce, Science and Transportation, and Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs are also

committed to passing a long-term bill as soon as possible, because this does involve not just the Environment and Public Works Committee but the other two committees as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague and friend from Oklahoma, and I also want to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Finance for being here because he is so right, we have to work together. On the EPW Committee, we know how critical this is. The Committee on Finance knows how critical it is because they have to figure out the pay-fors—let's be honest, the hardest part of all this—and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation also has to work. I am sure Senator THUNE is very aware of that, and his ranking member as well.

MAP 21, our transportation bill, is set to expire as the summer construction season is beginning. Several States—Arkansas, Georgia, Wyoming, and Tennessee—have already delayed or canceled construction projects due to the uncertainty in the Federal transportation funding system. Other States are considering similar actions as the construction season fast approaches.

I want to make this point. We are going to hear from all of our States. I am fortunate, I have such a large State they can go a little longer with the uncertainty, but even California, which receives quite a bit from the highway trust fund, is going to start to hurt pretty soon.

I am so proud that my friend, my chairman, is here, because we have such a great history of working together on infrastructure projects—not so good on the environment; we go toe to toe and don't work together on that, but we work together on infrastructure. He talks about it as a proud conservative and I talk about it as a proud liberal, and we see why it is so critical for our Nation.

So we do have to work carefully to craft another bipartisan MAC–21, and I look forward to bringing that bill to the floor.

I want to make sure that when we do bring that bill to the floor we have no controversial riders on it to bring it to a dead stop. We have seen that on so many bills already. I am really looking forward to bringing such a bill that is a clean bill that addresses our transportation funding to the floor with Chairman INHOFE, with the support of Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN and others.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me say I agree and look forward to that.

Sometimes people forget some of the things we are supposed to be doing around here. The Constitution says roads and bridges. That is what we are supposed to be doing. So I will work closely with my friend from California to achieve this.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, the Senate is going to spend much of this week debating the contours and the details of the Federal budget. Our colleagues are going to offer a variety of amendments, and we will undoubtedly cast a lot of votes. Those watching are going to hear speeches that are peppered with numbers and statistics. So I would like to start out the debate by setting aside, to the extent we can, this flood of numbers and statistics, and focus on what this means to working families in my home State of Oregon and across the country.

My view is the great economic challenge of our time is expanding opportunity for these families. It is about strengthening the middle class and adding sturdier rungs to America's economic ladder so everybody has the chance to climb upward.

Seven years after a crippling economic collapse, we have seen our unemployment rate go down, home foreclosures have gone down, gas prices have gone down. We are finally starting to see wages beginning to grow, and manufacturing is picking up steam. The American economy is now performing better than at any recent time in memory.

But the fact is there are still millions of Americans who feel stuck. They listen to all of the positive economic news that ricochets across the news media and wonder when things are actually going to get better for them and their families. I hear it firsthand in every townhall meeting I hold in our State, including several this month. These are young parents who are overwhelmed by the cost of childcare. There are students practically in shock over the sticker price of a college education. We have workers who are nearing retirement age, confirmed by the Finance Committee, who have hardly been able to save at all.

What the Senate budget is all about is not just facts and figures but about the hopes and aspirations of those people I have described who want things to change. In my view, the budget the Congress sets should take on those middle-class challenges directly. It ought to help working-class families and give more Americans a chance to get ahead in life.

This week, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are putting forward a different kind of budget—a budget that would poke some new holes in the safety net and, in my view, would worsen inequality. We would see millions of Americans face cuts in programs that are a lifeline for them. I have to ask, How will cutting a Pell grant and education tax credits help a disadvantaged student in La Grande, OR, who wants to work hard, play by the rules, and get ahead? How is cutting food stamps going to help a single mother in Ashland who is walking on an economic tightrope every month? How is it going to help her keep food on the table? How will slashing Medicaid help a struggling family in Roseburg, OR, stay healthy and out of the emergency room? And, finally, how would repealing the Affordable Care Act help a cancer survivor in Corvallis who has finally been able to get health insurance for the first time in years?

So my bottom line is pretty direct: Our middle class declines with every rung that is pulled from the ladder of opportunity. So what we all ought to say is the budget is about trying to help Americans climb upward with a budget that is designed to give all Americans the opportunity to get ahead.

To me, we start by investing in America's infrastructure. We simply cannot have big league economic growth with a little league infrastructure. The roads and highways in Oregon and across our country are now pocked by ruts and potholes, making it harder to do business and harder to travel. Dozens of people have been killed or injured in bridge collapses. Without adequate roads, bridges, and transit, drivers spend far too much time sitting in traffic choking on exhaust.

This also has taken a big toll on America's ability to compete internationally. We have to have big league infrastructure to draw jobs and investment to our country, and that depends on the quality of our roads and ports and airports and railways. We know investing in infrastructure creates thousands of jobs in America right away and supports millions more over the long term.

In my view, effective, targeted investments in infrastructure ought to be a no-brainer on both sides of the aisle.

Second, the Congress ought to strengthen programs that assist rural communities and brighten their economic futures. For example, homes in Oregon and across the West are being threatened by fires that are growing bigger and hotter and more damaging each year.

Chairman ENZI's budget took several steps in the right direction to improve the way governments budget for fires, but with a growing threat, more resources are needed to fight and prevent fires. Having just visited Medford, OR, they told me it was going to be the driest in 25 years, and we take out a map and California just looks dry, dry, dry. Passing the bipartisan legislation that Senator CRAPO and I have authored is urgent.

I also feel funding for agricultural research is another vital tool for giving rural communities a chance to get ahead. Each dollar that goes into agricultural research will be far outstripped by the value created in crops and croplands.

I was told just recently by wheat farmers in Eastern Oregon that investing in agricultural research is going to

give them and people all through Eastern Oregon a better chance to get ahead and be more successful with their farms.

I want to make mention of the important low-income and middle-class tax challenge. We ought to make the tax cuts for middle-class and low-income Americans permanent. There is a very big tax looming in 2018, unless the Congress moves to prevent it. Millions of families in Oregon and across the Nation depend on the expansion of the earned-income tax credit, the child tax credit, and the American opportunity tax credit. These are all set to expire, and the longer families sit in the dark wondering what their tax obligations will be, the harder it is for these families—already struggling to get ahead—for them to predict how to budget. In my view, it would be legislative malpractice to leave these low-income and middle-class tax cuts teetering on a cliff while others are permanently enshrined into the law. Furthermore, taking that uncertainty off the table is going to make comprehensive tax reform easier to accomplish.

My colleagues and I on the Finance Committee are working hard to bring our broken Tax Code into the 21st century. I have worked for more than a decade, first with our former colleague Senator Gregg and most recently with our current colleague Senator COATS, to produce the first bipartisan Federal income tax reform plan in more than a quarter century. So I know it is possible to make the Tax Code simpler and fairer. It ought to give everybody the chance to climb the economic ladder, and making the critical low-income and middle-class tax cuts permanent is a big step in that direction.

Next, I think the question of college affordability and doing more to help students get to graduation day ought to be a focus of this budget. The skyrocketing price of tuition keeps far too many young people from enrolling in college, and it keeps too many others from completing it. In effect, the price of college can reinforce inequality. Millions of students are buried up to their eyeballs in debt before they ever put on that cap and gown.

It is time to come at this challenge from every angle. For one, it is important to make student debt more manageable so graduates don't spend decades weighed down by loan payments. It is absolutely essential to help students take on less debt from the start. That will get more students in the door to challenge and free graduates from a lifetime of debt. That is why, in my view, cutting the Pell grant is the wrong way to go, and the Byzantine web of tax incentives for higher education needs to be cleaned up as well. It should not take dozens of calculations and hours of time for students to navigate the Byzantine tax rules. It should be simpler and easier so more students see a more meaningful benefit. Some student loan debt may be unavoidable, but leaving students with less debt is possible.

My next concern with respect to the budget is making sure needless cuts are made in essential health care programs. The cuts to Medicaid, in my view, that have been proposed by the other side are a guaranteed formula to make life harder for struggling families.

Just contemplate—and having been to Iowa, I know of the many seniors in Iowa—seniors who rely on Medicaid to cover the cost of nursing home care. That is, to a great extent, what the Medicaid budget is all about. Medicaid for those frail seniors—whether it is Oregon or Vermont or Iowa, Medicaid is what keeps a lot of those frail seniors from falling into absolute destitution. In another era, impoverished seniors might have been thrown into almshouses or poor farms. Today, Medicaid is a lifeline for tens of millions. But the budget proposal we have seen from the other side, in my view, would inflict substantial cuts on Medicaid, endanger our future. I don't believe that is the right course for frail seniors who rely on Medicaid for nursing home care.

The last point I would make deals with the effects of repealing the Affordable Care Act. If we repeal the Affordable Care Act, make no mistake about it, America goes back to the days when health care is for the healthy and the wealthy because no longer will we have protections for people with preexisting conditions. It is fine if you are healthy and it is fine if you are wealthy, but that is not most Americans. There are plenty of ways to improve the Affordable Care Act in a bipartisan fashion. That is not what the budget from the other side does. I hope we will not go back to the days in America when health care is for the healthy and wealthy, which is the bottom-line consequence of full repeal.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 323, AS MODIFIED

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, first I wish to thank Senator WYDEN for his remarks. I concur with what he said, and I thank him for cosponsoring the amendment on infrastructure that we will be voting on in a few minutes.

Senator WYDEN and I understand that you cannot be a great nation if your roads and bridges, water systems, wastewater plants, airports, levees, dams, and railroad system are crumbling. That is not what a great nation is about.

Years ago, the United States used to be the envy of the world in terms of infrastructure. Countries all over the world looked to the United States and asked: How do you do it? How do you provide clean water to your people? How do you have such an efficient transportation system? How do you have such great roads?

That is no longer the case. Today we are in 12th place, and I don't think any of my Republican colleagues would deny that. In fact, our infrastructure is crumbling. We have to address this issue. We cannot kick the can down the road. We can't say: Well, let's wait a few years until we come up with some magic funding formula.

We have to do it, and we have to do it now. The reason we have to do it now is that every year we delay, the problem only becomes worse. We are spending billions of dollars just to maintain the status quo, patching up a deteriorating system—whether it is transit, rails, roads or bridges. We have to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. There is no disagreement, I believe, in the Senate on that.

Second of all, I hope there is no disagreement that unemployment in this country is much too high. Real unemployment is at 11 percent, counting those who have given up looking for work and those who are working part-time. Youth unemployment is 17 percent, and African-American youth unemployment is higher than that. We need a major jobs program to put millions of people back to work at decent wages, and that is what rebuilding our infrastructure does.

The economists tell us that if we want to create jobs, the fastest way to create jobs in America is to rebuild our roads, bridges, and rail system. That is the fastest way to do it. Many of my Republican colleagues probably understand that as well. Where we disagree is how we fund the front.

Some on the Republican side will say: Well, we are looking at tax reform, and we are looking at this and looking at that, and maybe it will happen, but maybe it will not happen. We certainly have not had a lot of luck on these issues in recent years. Our Republican friends are not particularly interested in investments in America. Their idea of dealing with the deficit is to cut, cut, cut.

What we are proposing here is a $478 billion infrastructure package for 6 years, and it is funded by something I hope all of us can agree is unacceptable, and that is that at a time when corporate profits are at an all-time high, many corporations are stashing their profits in the Cayman Islands, Bermuda, Luxembourg, tax havens around the world. Guess what they are paying in American income tax to the United States Government. Zero.

We eliminate those loopholes. We raise substantial sums of money. We put that money into rebuilding our infrastructure, creating jobs, and making our country more efficient, safer, and more productive. That is what happens when you have a strong infrastructure.

I ask that Americans try to imagine what America will look like when we have some 9 million workers. This proposal would create some 9 million good-paying jobs in all of our States. People would be working to improve our roads and our water systems, and we can try to begin to compete effectively with the rail systems of other countries throughout the world. Think of what America will look like when we

become and develop a first-rate infrastructure, not a third-rate infrastructure. I know people think this is a lot of money, but it is nowhere near what the American Society of Civil Engineers is telling us that we need.

If you are interested in creating a 21st century infrastructure, please vote for my amendment. If you are interested in creating and maintaining some 9 million jobs over a 6-year period, please vote for my amendment. If you are interested in ending an outrageous corporate loophole, which in some cases enables large, profitable multinational corporations to pay zero in Federal income tax, please vote for this amendment. It will send a powerful message that now is the time to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and put our people to work and end absurd loopholes.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I will be very brief. My colleague has expressed his thoughts on this issue well, and we have had a number of discussions on infrastructure with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

I come back to the fact that all Americans have a stake in this amendment—whether you are a commuter, whether you are an exporter, whether you are someone who lives in rural Wyoming or rural Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats' time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I will be very brief. I thank my colleagues for their courtesy.

This amendment is about more than bumpy roads, popped tires, and broken axles. It is about jobs and economic growth in every nook and cranny in our country, and the key to that growth is infrastructure. Attracting investment depends on the condition of our infrastructure. Suffice it to say that our competitors in a tough global marketplace are increasing their investments in infrastructure. It is time to adopt this amendment and for us to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I get a little upset when I hear one side say that the other side doesn't care about infrastructure. That is not true. We even had a colloquy just a little while ago where the two sides said we need infrastructure. I agree that we need infrastructure, but I will oppose this amendment because it is telling the tax committee exactly what to do to provide infrastructure. One committee is getting into another committee's jurisdiction to say exactly how to do it, and that is not right. That is not the way we handle legislation around here.

Senator WYDEN is on the tax committee. He is the ranking member on that committee. Senator HATCH is the chairman of that committee. They are both concerned about infrastructure. There is already a provision in the bill that allows for the money to be put into place to do it, but that provision does not tell the Finance Committee that it must plug a certain tax loophole and put it into infrastructure. The committee can do that, and the President's budget—one of the reasons there is some excitement here—on money that is held overseas by companies, puts a mandatory 14 percent tax on that and expects it to be brought back right away to fund these things. That is a proposal that has been in the tax committee before—but not at 14 percent. It has been at a lower rate. Fourteen percent is more money than both the highway committee and the defense committee are talking about. We cannot produce a budget in which we tell committees exactly how to do their work. We need to build in the flexibility so they can do their job.

The chairman of the committee is convinced that we can do the job of fixing our infrastructure. Of course, we will never fix the infrastructure as well as we would like to have it fixed. I think the ranking member on the Budget Committee mentioned that we have four times as much need as what his proposal addresses. He has a proposal for $468 billion. There is a couple trillion dollars' worth of need out there. Of course, we hope we can get a lot of people involved in fixing these problems. It is not just a Federal problem. It is a local and State problem as well. We hope everybody will participate so that we can improve the infrastructure. It does put people to work, just as Keystone would put people to work.

I ask that my colleagues vote against the bill because we are telling one committee exactly where to get the money for another committee.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of our time.

Madam President, I yield the balance of our time for the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, in a few minutes we will be voting, and while I sincerely appreciate the effort of my good friend Senator SANDERS, I will be opposing this approach mostly because I don't think we need to go through what I consider to be a massive tax increase in order to do this. But just for a moment, I wish to talk about the seriousness of the transportation reauthorization bill. I know this issue has been talked about during the budget conversation and debate, but I think sometimes we ought to drag up that old document that hardly anyone pays attention to anymore—the Constitution.

The Constitution specifically says in article I, section 8 that there are some things we are supposed to be doing here. The two major things that are mentioned in the article I, section 8 are, No. 1, defending America—that is our military—and the other is roads and bridges.

I think we are concentrating and working very hard. A minute ago I had a colloquy with my friend from California, Senator BOXER. Senator BOXER observed that she is a proud liberal and recognized me as a proud conservative. Yet here is something we agree on, something we can do, something that is very important and that we need to take care of.

Now, I won't say anything about the defense problem. We have a serious problem in our defense system right now, but that is not the discussion for today. I do believe that while we have an amendment that would address a highway reauthorization bill—and how critical that is—we are working on that.

I have to remind people that there is a reserve fund in Chairman ENZI's budget that serves as a placeholder for Chairman HATCH to address a long-term highway bill later this year.

The last bill we had was a 27-month bill. Again, that was to setup this idea of having a long-term bill. The last good bill we had was in 2005, and that was a 5-year bill. It was really produced very well. The problem with extensions—and I think we all know this—is that extensions take about 30 percent off the top because short-term extensions—and anyone who has been in business knows this—are things you cannot do in the short term. You cannot get the streamlining. Our 27-month bill had a lot of really good streamlining provisions in there. You cannot do that on short-term extensions.

I look forward to having a very large bill. We have a deadline at the end of May to make this a reality, and I believe we are going to be able to do that. We are meeting on a regular basis, including a meeting today with Senator HATCH. We will be coming up with ways that we can pay for this.

Again, I can remember in the very beginning we used to have a problem in the highway trust fund because we had too much surplus. Well, it is not that way anymore. We all know how we got in the mess we are in right now. We will have to address that, and I look forward to doing that and providing some of the leadership, right along with Senator BOXER and Senator SANDERS, in making this a reality.

With that, noting that 12 noon is here, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator INHOFE for his remarks on infrastructure. I hope we can all work together for what I would suspect every Member here sees as a serious problem.

But this amendment says let's not kick the can down the road. Our infrastructure is crumbling. We used to be the envy of the world; today we are in 12th place. This impacts not just people who are driving cars, it impacts every business in America. We need now to start the process of rebuilding our roads and bridges and dams and levees and airports. When we do that, this amendment, over a 6-year period, can create and maintain 9 million jobs—9 million jobs—at a time when we need decent-paying jobs.

I understand the difference of opinion stems from how we get the funding for this. Our approach is pretty simple. It eliminates an outrageous loophole that allows large, profitable corporations to stash their money around the world and, in some cases, pay zero in Federal income taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for support for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 minute in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as I said a few minutes ago, I agree with Senator SANDERS, the author of this amendment, in terms of what is the problem we have. We have to have a transportation reauthorization bill and we are going to have it.

I know Senator SANDERS has characterized his bill as being paid for by closing tax loopholes, but I would still say that, in my opinion and my analysis of this, this would equate to nearly a half a trillion dollar tax increase, and this is not the way I want to have a transportation reauthorization bill.

Let me remind my colleagues that there is a reserve fund in Chairman ENZI's budget that serves as a placeholder for Chairman HATCH to address a long-term highway bill later this year. We have a deadline of May 31, and I think we can meet that deadline. We are working with Senator HATCH right now to come up with that plan.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against the Sanders amendment and pursue our bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote in the series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 323, as modified, offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	
Ernst	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Kirk	Manchin

The amendment (No. 323), as modified, was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 386

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 386, offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, Senator PORTMAN's amendment touches on a very serious issue that I believe has broad bipartisan support, the need to deal with children who have serious, chronic conditions. In fact, over 3 million kids in this country have medically complex health conditions.

Senator PORTMAN appropriately is calling attention to that issue. I support him. But when you look at the overall Republican budget, it throws 16 million people off of health insurance by ending the Affordable Care Act and millions more through a $400 billion cut in Medicaid. What happens to a pregnant woman on Medicaid who needs prenatal care? No health insurance for her. What about a kid who was in an automobile accident whose family has no health insurance and is thrown off of Medicaid? No health insurance for that kid. What about an elderly person in a nursing home? There are millions of elderly people on Medicaid in nursing homes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. Please support this amendment. No cuts to Medicaid for all our kids.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments and support for the Portman amendment. I want you to know I support the Sanders amendment. We support pregnant women and kids who are hurt in car accidents or face other unfortunate circumstances.

So we would be happy to take this by voice vote.

Mr. SANDERS. I think it would be better to do a rollcall vote. We appreciate your support.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Sanders amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Enzi	Mikulski
Ayotte	Ernst	Moran
Baldwin	Feinstein	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Murphy
Bennet	Franken	Murray
Blumenthal	Gardner	Nelson
Blunt	Gillibrand	Paul
Booker	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Peters
Boxer	Hatch	Portman
Brown	Heinrich	Reed
Burr	Heitkamp	Reid
Cantwell	Heller	Risch
Capito	Hirono	Roberts
Cardin	Hoeven	Rounds
Carper	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Isakson	Sanders
Cassidy	Johnson	Sasse
Coats	Kaine	Schatz
Cochran	King	Schumer
Collins	Klobuchar	Scott
Coons	Lankford	Shaheen
Corker	Leahy	Shelby
Cornyn	Markey	Stabenow
Cotton	McCain	Sullivan
Crapo	McCaskill	Tester
Daines	McConnell	Thune
Donnelly	Menendez	Tillis
Durbin	Merkley	Toomey

Udall	Warren	Wyden
Vitter	Whitehouse	
Warner	Wicker	

NAYS—3

Flake	Lee	Sessions

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Kirk	Manchin

The amendment (No. 386) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 349

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 349, offered by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It is a deficit-neutral reserve fund to help the most vulnerable kids among us to have better coordinated care under Medicaid.

It allows health care providers to deliver health care services to medically complex kids through models that coordinate care between providers, resulting in better care but also lower costs, including helping with regard to a problem, including across State lines.

These children with complex medical conditions make up about 6 percent of the children who get health care under Medicaid, but it is about 40 percent of the cost of pediatric care under Medicare and Medicaid.

This is an opportunity for us on a bipartisan basis, I know, to be able to help these kids to get the necessary care they need and actually allow the Medicaid system to realize some savings through efficiencies, such as reduced emergency room stays, hospitalizations, and other procedures.

I thank my colleague Senator BENNET, who will speak in a second on his cosponsorship.

I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to help these vulnerable kids.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I also rise to speak in favor of the Portman amendment. This amendment is based on a bill I introduced earlier this year called the ACE Kids Act that recognizes the critical importance of Medicaid to children with severe medical conditions. It highlights the need for greater coordination and integration of care across the country for 2 million children.

Earlier this month, I met with Everett Ediger at Children's Hospital of Colorado in Denver. Everett is 8 years old and has spina bifida, a neurological disorder of the spine. It took his mom Maureen 2 years to get him signed up under Medicaid and to establish a system to coordinate all of his care.

While Everett was beating me at air hockey, he let his mom explain to me about the frustrating experience of trying to coordinate all of her son's specialists and the payments for his care.

We need to focus on children such as Everett all across this country.

I thank my colleague Senator PORTMAN for his leadership in offering this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the Portman amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Fischer	Murray
Ayotte	Flake	Nelson
Baldwin	Franken	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Booker	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Roberts
Boxer	Heitkamp	Rounds
Brown	Heller	Rubio
Burr	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Schatz
Cardin	Isakson	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Cassidy	King	Shaheen
Coats	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Markey	Thune
Cornyn	McCain	Tillis
Cotton	McCaskill	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Daines	Menendez	Vitter
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Enzi	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Manchin
Kirk	Reid

The amendment (No. 349) was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:15 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. FISCHER).

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3 p.m. will be controlled by the Democrats and the time from 3 p.m. until 3:45 p.m. will be controlled by the majority.

The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 362

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 362.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. STABENOW, proposes an amendment numbered 362.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to amending the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to allow for punitive damages, limit the any factor ''other than sex'' exception, and prohibit retaliation against employees who share salary information)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to ensure equal pay policies and practices and to reform section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) (commonly known as the ''Equal Pay Act of 1963'') to allow for punitive damages, limit the exception for unequal pay described in paragraph (1) of such section to business necessity rather than any factor ''other than sex'', and prevent retaliation against employees for sharing salary information by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, my amendment is about paycheck fairness, a topic I know the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Nebraska, is absolutely familiar with. I come to the floor to finish the job we began with Lilly Ledbetter to end pay discrimination in the workplace once and for all. That is why I am offering this amendment, which is based on the bill I have offered in the past three Congresses. It is called the Paycheck Fairness Act.

My Senate colleagues and I want to be sure women get a raise. The way we want to do that is to put more money in the family checkbook by putting change in the Federal law book.

My amendment will do three things.

No. 1, it will stop retaliation in the workplace for sharing pay information. For years, the famous Lilly Ledbetter was harassed and humiliated just for asking questions about her coworkers' salaries. In many workplaces around the country, you are forbidden to discuss shared pay information even if

you are the same lab technician, computer operator or others. This would stop retaliation simply for asking not only what do you make but what do others make doing the same work.

It also stops employers from using any reason to pay women less. ''Oh, they are breadwinners.'' ''Oh, he is a family man.'' ''Oh, gee, they do a harder job,'' when it is the same job. We have to make sure it is equal pay for equal work.

This bill also allows punitive damages for women who have been discriminated against. When the only deterrent against pay discrimination is the threat of paying women backpay, discrimination can just be factored into the cost of doing business and treating it like loose change.

Now, people say to me: Hey, Senator BARB. You led the fight on Lilly Ledbetter to make sure we had equal pay for equal work. Didn't we solve that problem?

Well, we made a good first step. That bill kept the courthouse doors open for women who are discriminated against so there would not be a statute of limitations as defined by the original Supreme Court decision, but that was only a downpayment. What this amendment does is say we need to change the law so Lilly would not have had to sue in the first place. This amendment says: Put an end to the incentives that cause employers to think paying women less is just loose change.

This amendment would close loopholes in the law which allow pay discrimination to occur in the first place. It would also put an end to paycheck secrecy—yes, paycheck secrecy—that makes it harder to uncover discrimination. It would also prohibit retaliation against women for even talking about pay differences. These are loopholes that often stop women who have endured discrimination from being fairly compensated.

What are the facts? Women still earn 77 cents for every $1 a man makes. It is even worse for women of color. African-American women earn 64 cents for every $1 a man makes, Hispanic women earn 54 cents for every $1 a man makes. For women closer to the age of retirement, the wage gap increases to more than $14,000 a year. It not only affects their pay, but it affects their retirement, and it affects their Social Security.

When you earn less, you get less in your Social Security benefits because you are making smaller contributions to your retirement. Women's Social Security benefits are about 71 percent of men's benefits, and that is not because of the mommy factor, where women have taken time out of the workplace and the marketplace to be in the home with their children.

Women earn 23 cents less for every $1 a man earns, even when she does the same job and has the same education. Women do not get a 23-percent discount on their student loans. They do not get a 23-percent discount on their utility bill. They do not get a 23-percent discount on their mortgage. So we end up paying the bill just for our ability to work.

Madam President, I could go on and tell you compelling stories about my constituents who have shared them with me.

I have heard from Latoya Weaver. She lives in Great Mills, MD. She is a single parent to three children. She worked in guest services at a hotel. She found out that her pay of $8 an hour—$8 an hour—was $2 less than new males in the same position. So a new guy working in the same job, doing the same thing made $2 more. That makes a big difference when you are making $8 an hour rather than $10 an hour. She filed an EEOC lawsuit, and she prevailed. You cannot necessarily go to the EEOC in every case.

I heard from Donna Smith, who lives on Maryland's Eastern Shore. She worked as a retail clerk. She was also told not to discuss her wages, but she found out she was being paid less than a male clerk—not ''mail'' as in post office mail but ''male'' as in a guy—a guy clerk whom she actually trained and was doing the same exact job she did when she started. Again, in all of the effort to go to the EEOC, it was found that two other female workers were also discriminated against. No one would have known had Donna not sought out that information.

So we can see that paycheck fairness is absolutely needed.

There is a lot of mythology out there about the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Myth No. 1, that the bill would require employers to cut the salaries of their male employees. The Equal Pay Act currently on the books prohibits employers from lowering the wages of men to make up for discrimination against women.

Another myth, that the bill is unnecessary. Well, the facts speak for themselves. When American women who work full time year round are paid only 77 cents for every $1 made by their male counterparts, it speaks for itself.

The wage gap is not merely a matter of choice in their occupation; they are paid less in the same occupation with the same education.

Here is another myth, that the bill would subject employers to criminal penalties for refusing to disclose wage information. No part of this bill provides for criminal penalties for employers for any conduct. There is no criminal penalty in this bill.

Another myth is that the bill would require the government to set salaries for Federal employees. Again, nothing in the Paycheck Fairness Act allows the Federal Government to set salaries for a public or private employer. So I think that speaks for itself.

Madam President, I have a factual document from the National Women's Law Center. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Women's Law Center, May 2015]

WHAT THE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT WOULD REALLY DO

For nearly 50 years, the Equal Pay Act has made it illegal for employers to pay unequal wages to men and women who perform substantially equal work. Although enforcement of the Equal Pay Act as well as other civil rights laws has helped to narrow the wage gap, significant disparities remain and need to be addressed. Women today still make only 77 cents for every dollar paid to their male counterparts. And for women of color, the gap is even larger.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would strengthen current laws against wage discrimination by protecting employees who voluntarily share pay information with colleagues from retaliation, fully compensating victims of sex-based pay discrimination, empowering women and girls by strengthening their negotiation skills, and holding employers more accountable under the Equal Pay Act. Opponents of the Paycheck Fairness Act have put forth rhetoric about the bill that is misleading—this document contrasts the various myths about the bill and explains what the Paycheck Fairness Act would accomplish in reality.

Myth: The bill would require employers to cut the salaries of their male employees.

Fact: The Equal Pay Act prohibits employers from lowering the wages of men to make up for discrimination against women. In fact, the first paragraph of the Act states: An ''employer who is paying a wage rate differential in violation of this subsection shall not, in order to comply with the provisions of this subsection, reduce the wage rate of any employee.'' The bill does nothing to disturb this longstanding rule.

Myth: The bill is unnecessary because there is no wage gap.

Fact: American women who work full time, year round are paid only 77 cents for every dollar paid to their male counterparts. This gap in earnings translates into $10,784 less per year in median earnings, leaving women and their families shortchanged. The wage gap is even more substantial when race and gender are considered together, with African-American women making only 62 cents, and Hispanic women only 54 cents, for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men.

The wage gap is not merely a matter of choice in occupation—women typically are paid less than men in the same occupation. This is the case whether that occupation pays high or low wages, whether they work in traditionally male occupations, traditionally female occupations, or occupations with an even mix of men and women.

Numerous studies show that even when all relevant career and family attributes are taken into account, there is still a significant, unexplained gap in men's and women's earnings. Thus, even when women make the same career choices as men and work the same hours, they earn less. For example, a study of college graduates one year after graduation determined that women earned only 95 percent of what men earned, even after accounting for variables such as ''job and workplace, employment experience and continuity, education and training, and demographic and personal characteristics.''

Myth: The bill would subject employers to criminal penalties for refusing to disclose wage information.

Fact: No part of the bill provides for criminal penalties for employers for any conduct. But pay disparities often go unnoticed because employers forbid employees from sharing wage information with each other. The bill enhances employees' ability to learn

about wage discrimination by merely banning retaliation against workers who inquire about their employers' wage practices or disclose their own wages. It does not ban pay secrecy policies altogether—in fact, employers with access to colleagues' wage information in the course of their work, such as human resources employees, may still be prohibited from sharing that information.

Myth: The bill requires the government to set salaries for federal employers.

Fact: Nothing in the Paycheck Fairness Act allows the federal government to set salaries for any private employer. But the tools for detecting and addressing pay disparities under the Equal Pay Act have been limited by courts over time. For example, courts have opened loopholes in the defenses that employers are permitted to raise when seeking to justify a decision to not pay workers equal wages for doing substantially equal work. Some courts have said that an employer may justify paying unequal wages even if there is no business reason for paying men and women unequal salaries. The bill also would require the Department of Labor to reinstate a survey instrument that will help the Department detect and remedy wage discrimination by federal contractors and would serve as a critical tool in the federal government's effort to enforce civil rights laws.

Myth: There is no need for the bill after the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Fact: The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act restored the protection against pay discrimination stripped away by the Supreme Court's decision in Ledbetter v. Goodyear. But, even after the Act, our existing equal pay laws remain weakened by a series of other court decisions and insufficient federal tools to detect and combat wage discrimination. The Act made clear that each discriminatory paycheck, not just an employer's original decision to engage in pay discrimination, resets the period of time during which a worker may file a pay discrimination claim. The steps taken in the Ledbetter Act are essential, as they enable workers to bring wage discrimination cases again. But the Ledbetter Act simply returned the law to what it was prior to the Court's decision. And wage disparities go undetected because employers maintain policies that punish employees who voluntarily share salary information with their coworkers. The Paycheck Fairness Act would update the Equal Pay Act by closing loopholes in the law and ensuring that workers will no longer be punished simply for talking about their own wages.

Ms. MIKULSKI. So here we are, in 2015. It has been almost 50 years since the first equal pay bill was passed. For 50 years we have tried to have financial catchup to get equal pay for equal work, and every time we make a reform, there are always other loopholes. We want to close the loopholes. We want to end discrimination. We want to end retaliation. And, most of all, we want to end the fact that women often end up for their whole lifetime earning less. It affects the way they raise their families. It affects the way they pay into their pensions, the way they pay into their Social Security. Now we need to pay our respects to them and pass the paycheck fairness bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to thank Senator MIKULSKI for offering this really important amendment because I believe that real, long-term economic growth is built from the middle out, not from the top down. Our government and our economy should be working for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

We in Congress need to be focused on raising wages and expanding economic security and making sure our workers have the opportunity to work hard and succeed. That is exactly what the amendment the Senator from Maryland has offered will do.

It would build on the promise of the Equal Pay Act to help close the pay gap between men and women. Today, nearly half of our workforce is not earning equal pay for equal work. In fact, women across the country, as we know, get paid just 78 cents for every $1 a man makes for the same work. That is not just unfair to women, it hurts our families and it hurts our economy and we need to fix it.

Last year, at a hearing in the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, we heard from a woman named Kerri. For 5 years, Kerri worked for an auto supplier as a supervisor. She liked her job. She did it well. Her boss gave her glowing performance reviews for her work. But when that auto industry ran into trouble, her company had to file for bankruptcy, and it was through those bankruptcy court reports that Kerri found out she was making significantly less than the men she supervised.

After all those years of hard work, she found out her employer valued her work less just because she was a woman. She said she was heartbroken and embarrassed, but more than that, she told our committee last year that those years of lost wages affected her family for the rest of her life. And she is not alone.

Across the country, pay discrimination hurts women and families' ability to make ends meet and get ahead in the workplace.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for her extraordinary leadership in the fight for equal pay and for bringing this important amendment forward today. This amendment will help move us toward an economy where women get a fair shot at pay equity in the workplace and set us up to tackle pay discrimination head-on.

Pay discrimination, by the way, is not just unfair to women, it is bad for our families, and it is a real and persistent problem that hurts our economy.

It is important to remember that women's roles in our economy has shifted dramatically in the last few decades. Women now make up nearly half of our workforce. Today, 60 percent of families rely on earnings from both parents—up from 37 percent in 1975. More than ever, today women are likely to be the primary breadwinners in their family.

So we have to make sure working women can succeed in today's economy because their success is critical to families' economic security and to our Nation's economy as a whole.

According to a recent report, closing the pay gap between men and women would add $446 billion to our economy. I hope we can all agree that in the 21st century workers should be paid fairly for the work they do regardless of their gender, and I hope we can agree we need to expand economic security for more families. That should be our mission to move our country forward.

This amendment supports the basic principle of fairness in the workplace. It would help women, families, and our Nation's economy.

I want to make this clear: I am urging my colleagues to vote for the Mikulski amendment—the only proposal on the table right now that would move us toward a real solution to this problem.

Senator MIKULSKI has been our leader on this issue. I hope Republicans will join Democrats on real solutions and work with us to create jobs, increase wages, and expand economic security that benefits all workers and families, not just the wealthiest few.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this is an important moment in the Senate each year because we try to define what our values are and the way we spend our money.

If you want to know a family's values, take a look at the family budget. Are they putting some money away for their young son or daughter to go to college, making sure they can own a home, paying their bills on a regular basis, or are they wasting money on things they can't afford? The budget tells a story about values.

This budget presented by the Republicans tells another story. It tells a story about America's future.

I have a friend back in Springfield, IL. He has been a friend for years and years. Ten years ago, his wife was diagnosed with Alzheimer's. His life changed dramatically. He could no longer go to work on a regular basis. He devoted every waking minute to his wife. She is still alive today and struggling, but that family was different. Their lives were different. Across America, families just like his family learn about the diagnosis of Alzheimer's every day. Do you know how often we diagnose an American with Alzheimer's? Once every 68 seconds. The millions who are now afflicted by that disease—many of them have a very tough future ahead of them, as do their families.

What does that have to do with this political debate? It has a lot to do with it. It has to do with some basic things. First, should we continue to cut the money for medical research in America? The Republican budget says: Yes. We can't afford medical research.

Really? Well, last year, we spent $200 billion in Medicare and Medicaid on Alzheimer's victims alone—$200 billion.

When we asked for $3 or $4 billion more for medical research in the hopes we can find a way to delay the onset of Alzheimer's or, God willing, even find a cure for it—we will more than pay back the money we invest in research. But the Republican budget says that is something we cannot afford in America today.

When it comes to those who are suffering from Alzheimer's, how do they get by? Many of them get by with Medicare, which, of course, is the insurance policy for the elderly and disabled. But this budget cuts Medicare. Many low-income victims of that disease and many others rely on Medicaid, but this budget makes dramatic cuts in Medicaid.

That is the vision the Republicans present to us in their budget—the vision of an America that cannot afford to do the research to find cures for diseases such as Alzheimer's, cancer, diabetes, and the list goes on. They see an America where we cannot afford to help people who are struggling to get by.

This budget proposes takes 26 million Americans off of health insurance. I will repeat that—26 million Americans off of health insurance. Is that the answer to America's future? Have you ever been the father of a sick child and not had health insurance? I have. I will never forget it as long as I live. I felt helpless and worried that my little daughter was not going to get the right care she needed. Thank God the day came when I was covered with health insurance and could get her the best. But I think about the millions of Americans who never saw that day and the fact that 26 million Americans would lose health insurance because of the Republican budget. We are a better nation than that. We should prepare for a better future than one where the have-nots are growing in number.

The sad reality is that the Republican budget, although it finally answers its political prayer and eliminates the Affordable Care Act, still collects all of the revenue from the Affordable Care Act. They will never be able to explain that one to us.

How will they explain to the millions of seniors who are under Medicare that they are eliminating the program that reduces the cost of prescription drugs? These are seniors on fixed incomes who are trying to stay healthy and independent at home and who depend on drugs that could be pretty expensive. The Republican budget eliminates that provision in the Affordable Care Act which helps those seniors pay for their prescription drugs—the so-called doughnut hole.

As I go through the lengthy list of what the Republicans have done in their budget, I have to ask, is this their vision of America—fewer people having health insurance, fewer seniors being able to afford the prescription drugs they need to get by, cutting Medicaid, where we provide prenatal care for moms so the babies are healthy? For goodness' sake, it is not only the right thing to do, it is the economic thing to do. A sick baby is a tough challenge for any family, but it is a challenge for all of us. The medical bills a premature baby might incur far exceeds the cost of good prenatal care so the mom and baby are healthy. But that is just another area of cutbacks when it comes to this Republican budget.

This budget is certainly not going to become the law of the land. I believe even some Republicans will have a struggle trying to vote for it or explain it.

More, importantly, though, I hope this budget is a chance for us to have a conversation about what middle-income America is going to look like in the future. I think that is the key to America's success.

We talk a lot about income inequality. To put it in a few words, it means that a lot of families are working hard every single darn day and they cannot make ends meet. They are living paycheck to paycheck. What are we doing for them? This Republican budget cuts the available college assistance for their kids to go to school. That doesn't help that middle-income family. This Republican budget doesn't invest in America when it comes to education. This Republican budget cuts back on the help to schools to make sure they are producing graduates with the skills to compete in the 21st century.

If we really want to focus on helping middle-income families, we cannot vote for this Republican budget. It is a set of priorities for them which America really cannot accept.

As Senator SANDERS has said—our ranking member on the Budget Committee—we need to work to give middle-income families in this country a fighting chance. This bill does not do that. Sadly, this bill makes too many cuts in too many critical areas.

I am going to offer an amendment to this bill. See if you like this idea. I think it is a good one. My colleagues will get to vote on it. Here is what it says. We have a tax code full of provisions to encourage businesses to do certain things. We give them deductions, credits, incentives to do things, such as drilling for oil, building wind turbines, so many things—some good, some bad; it depends on your point of view.

I suggest that we put a provision in our Tax Code that says we will provide a tax credit to companies that stay in the United States and don't bail out and head to a foreign country, companies that invest in American jobs by maintaining or increasing the number of workers in the United States compared to the number of workers overseas.

Secondly, those companies will get a tax credit if their corporation pays fair wages by paying most employees a wage so that a family of three doesn't have to depend on the government for a safety net program. That is about $15 an hour.

If a company keeps jobs in the United States and pays about $15 an hour as a minimum, we will give them a tax credit.

Those companies should also provide quality health insurance for their employees. Who would disagree with that one? They should also prepare their workers for retirement by providing a pension or 401(k) with fair employer contributions.

The last point is that those companies should support our veterans, our troops, and people with disabilities by giving them a chance to work there.

How about those companies? From where I am sitting, those are patriotic American companies that deserve a break in the Tax Code as much, if not more, than any other company.

I will bring that amendment to the floor and let my colleagues vote on it. I hope we can get a bipartisan consensus. We ought to create incentives for companies to stay in the United States, employ Americans, pay a good wage, provide health insurance and pensions, and give a break to veterans and people with disabilities who are applying for jobs.

Let's have some priorities that reflect the future of a growing, solid America—an America with a growing middle class.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 362

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I rise in very strong support of Senator MIKULSKI's amendment on equal pay for equal work for the women of our country. Senator MIKULSKI has been a tireless advocate for policies that bolster the American middle class and has been a champion for many years for pay equity for women, and I thank the Senator from Maryland for all she has done. I also concur with the strong remarks made by Senator MURRAY, who has also been a champion for pay equity.

To my mind, it is very hard to defend the current reality in which women continue to earn 78 cents on the dollar compared to men. We want to end that discrimination against women workers. This is not only an issue of justice, it is also an issue of economics because when we establish pay equity in this country—equal pay for equal work—millions of women will receive higher pay and many of them and their families will leave the ranks of the poor. This is an extraordinarily important amendment for justice, and it is an important amendment for economic rights.

The pay gap we see in this country is found at every level of education and at every stage of a career. No matter how hard women work, it is next to impossible to overcome it because they move up the ranks, but there is still pay inequity.

The pay equity gap has a significant bearing on the economic status of female-led households. Only 18 percent of families headed by single moms have economic security. Female-headed

households are twice as likely to live in poverty as male-headed households, and more than half of poor children live in female-headed households. It is no surprise that a lifetime of lower earnings results in less retirement savings and fewer Social Security benefits for women.

Senior women are twice as likely as senior men to live in poverty, and the average senior woman receives approximately $4,000 less a year than a senior man.

Senior women are more likely than senior men to rely on Social Security as their sole source of income, especially if they are unmarried.

My State of Vermont has done better than most in terms of pay equity and, in fact, is first in the Nation in making sure women get equal pay for equal work. But even in the State of Vermont, which leads the Nation in this area, women are still only earning 91 cents for every dollar men make. We have done better than the rest of the country, and we still have more to do, but the rest of the country has a whole lot more to do if we are going to fulfill the promise of equal pay for equal work.

I hope very much that we will all be supporting Senator MIKULSKI's very important amendment.

In terms of the overall Republican budget—and I say this with all due respect—one of the reasons I suspect that the media is not particularly interested in this budget is because when they look at it, they find it to be so preposterous, so unbelievable, and so unrealistic that nobody really takes it seriously, and certainly many of the major provisions in it are not going to be turned into law.

I will go out on a limb, but I think I am fairly safe in saying that President Obama is not going to sign legislation that abolishes ObamaCare. Maybe I am wrong, but I think it is fairly safe to say that. The Republican budget wastes a whole lot of time and energy by proposing the repeal of ObamaCare.

I will tell everyone what the repeal of the Affordable Care Act would mean in this country, and I know people will think I am exaggerating. I am not exaggerating, and if I am not telling the truth, I want my Republican friends to come down here—or when they get the floor—and say: Senator SANDERS was inaccurate. Please tell me that. We have read the legislation, and I am not inaccurate.

If they repeal the Affordable Care Act, it will eliminate health insurance coverage for 16 million people. Sixteen million people would lose the health insurance they currently have.

Today, we are the only major country on Earth that doesn't guarantee health care to all people. Today, despite the modest gains of the Affordable Care Act, 35 million Americans have no health insurance. So the Republicans say, 35 million without health insurance—that is not enough. Let's raise that number to 51 million by eliminating the Affordable Care Act.

They go further than that. The Republicans say we should cut Medicaid by $400 billion over the next decade. Medicaid is the program that provides health insurance for lower-income Americans as well as—very significantly, older people who are in nursing homes. So if people think this is just a low-income issue—if people think it is not a middle class issue—think again, because it just might be your mom who is 90 years of age who is in a nursing home which is being paid by Medicaid. It could be your dad who is dealing with Alzheimer's in a nursing home being paid for by Medicaid.

What the Republicans propose is a $400 billion cut over the next decade which would deny health insurance to an additional 11 million Americans, including millions of children.

My arithmetic might not be too good, but I think if we add 16 million who lose health insurance through the ending of the Affordable Care Act to 11 million who lose health insurance by a $400 billion cut in Medicaid, that means—16 plus 11 is 27—27 million Americans would lose health insurance, almost doubling the number of people who don't have health insurance.

Does anybody in their right mind take this proposal seriously? It is beyond comprehension. It would cause massive chaos and disruption in the United States of America.

This means that low-income, pregnant women who need to make sure—as Senator DURBIN mentioned a moment ago—that they get the health care they need when they are pregnant would lose their health insurance. A kid who is in a car who has an automobile accident would lose his or her health insurance. A worker who feels a pain in his chest and needs to go to the doctor—he doesn't have any health insurance, doesn't go to the doctor, dies. Well, that is a result of cutting 27 million people off of health insurance.

So in a certain sense we needn't discuss the issue terribly much because it is such an absurd proposal that I don't think there are too many people who would take it seriously.

We should also understand that when my Republican colleagues talk about ending the Affordable Care Act, what they are also doing is denying over 2 million young adults the right to stay on their parents' health insurance plan until the age of 26. As a result of the Affordable Care Act—previously children would be dropped from their parents' health insurance when they reached 21. The Affordable Care Act keeps them covered until they are 26. So suddenly, if one is 24 years of age and they have health insurance through their parents' health program, they are gone, they are out.

The Affordable Care Act would bring us back to a very dark age in America's medical history. That was the time not so many years ago, before the ACA, when if a person had a preexisting condition—can we imagine that? Now we think it is so crazy. It is hard to believe this existed 7 or 8 years ago. A woman walks into an insurance company looking for health insurance and she says: Yes, I had breast cancer 10 years ago, and I had an operation dealing with breast cancer.

The insurance company says: Oh, you had breast cancer? We can't cover you. That might recur.

Somebody else walks in and says: Well, I had a heart attract or I had a stroke 8 years ago.

Oh, that is a preexisting condition. You are discriminated against. We don't want you. You might get sick again.

Incredibly enough, then, the people who needed insurance the most are the people to whom insurance companies said: Sorry, we are not going to provide insurance to you. The Republican budget brings back those dark days.

The Republican budget will say to insurance companies again that being a woman is an illness, being pregnant is an illness. Insurance companies would be able to discriminate against women and charge them extra for the crime of being a woman. Does that make sense to anybody? I don't think so. But that is, in fact, what is in the Republican budget.

We have worked long and hard. This is an issue that has been dear to my heart for a very long time, and that is the knowledge that many of our seniors cannot afford the prescription drugs they need. Because of the power of the pharmaceutical companies in this country, our people are forced into paying the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. That is just the simple reality.

Another very serious problem is that generic drug prices are soaring. We have many seniors and many Americans who have a variety of illnesses. They go to the doctor, the doctor writes a prescription, and do we know what happens? I remember talking to a doctor in the northern part of Vermont who said her guess was that one out of four of her patients did not fill the prescriptions they wrote because they simply can't afford them. And when one is older, by definition, one is often sicker and one needs medicine.

The Republican budget resolution we are debating now would increase prescription drug prices for some 4 million seniors and persons with disabilities who are on the Medicare Part D Program by reopening the doughnut hole. For years we have tried to close that hole and make sure the elderly do not have to pay for prescription drug costs out of their own pockets. The Republican budget would undo the progress we have made.

The bottom line of the Republican budget suggests the huge philosophical divide that exists in this Chamber. But, interestingly enough, I don't think it exists within the American people. I think the more the American people

understand about the Republican budget, the more they will understand that something is fundamentally wrong with that budget.

Where many of us come from is we look at an America in which the wealthiest people are doing phenomenally well. I had a chart up yesterday which was, to me, really extraordinary. It pointed out that in the last 2 years, the 14 wealthiest people in this country—all multibillionaires—combined, saw an increase in their wealth in a 2-year period—14 people—of $157 billion. Fourteen people in a 2-year period saw a $157 billion increase in their wealth. That is literally beyond comprehension. That increase in wealth in a 2-year period is more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of the American people own in their entirety.

Some of us believe that when multibillionaires see a huge increase in their wealth such that the top one-tenth of 1 percent now own almost more wealth than the bottom 90 percent, maybe they should be asked to pay more in taxes. That is what we believe. Our Republican colleagues disagree. They have nothing of significance to say about income and wealth inequality, and their view is that if we want to deal with the deficit and we want to deal with the national debt, the only way to go forward is to make horrendous catastrophic cuts in programs that middle-income and working-class people desperately need—programs they desperately need.

So I have spoken a little bit about the Republican cuts in health care, but I also should mention that there are major cuts in education. I can tell my colleagues, because I have had a number of town meetings on this issue in my State of Vermont, almost all of the young people I talk to are extremely worried about the high cost of college and about the debts that are wrapped around their shoulders when they graduate from college.

What does the Republican budget do to address the crisis of the affordability of college and the deep debts millions of our young people face when they leave school? Well, instead of addressing the problem, they make it even worse. It is hard to believe, but it is true. The Republican budget would eliminate mandatory Pell grants. Pell grants are the Federal program that helps low-income and working-class students get help in going to college. So at a time when it is harder to afford college, the Republican proposal eliminates mandatory programs, cutting this program by nearly $90 billion over the next 10 years, which would increase the cost of a college education for more than 8 million Americans.

Now, what can we say about that? People today can't afford to go to college. Students are leaving school deeply in debt. And what the Republicans say is let's cut $90 billion in mandatory Pell grant funding and increase the cost of a college education for more than 8 million Americans.

I can tell my colleagues that in Vermont—and throughout this country, I know—working-class families have a very difficult time finding quality, affordable child care. The Republican budget addresses this problem by making a bad situation worse and by coming forward with a budget which would mean that 110,000 fewer young children would be able to enroll in Head Start over the next 10 years.

We need to expand Head Start. We need to expand preschool education. We need to expand child care. The most important years of a human being's life are 0 to 4 years old. Those little kids need the intellectual and emotional nourishment that good preschool education and child care provides them. What is the Republican proposal? Knock 110,000 kids off of Head Start.

Under the Republican budget, 1.9 million fewer students would receive the academic help they need to succeed in school by cutting about $12 billion in the title I education program which is focused on the needs of lower income kids. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act would be cut by $10 billion.

So here is the point. At the end of the day, what politics is about is which side are people on. Are people on the side of millionaires and billionaires and large campaign contributors or are people on the side of working families who are struggling to keep their heads above water economically, who are trying to figure out how they are going to send their kids to college. They are trying to figure out how they are going to help take care of their parents. They are trying to figure out how they are going to pay their rent or, in some cases, even pay for their groceries. That is what this debate is about.

What the Republicans are saying loudly and clearly is the rich are getting phenomenally richer; we are not going to ask them to pay a nickel more in taxes. Corporations are enjoying record-breaking profits, and we have major corporation after major corporation paying zero in Federal income tax because they stash their money in tax havens so they can avoid paying taxes to the U.S. Government, but we are not going to ask them to pay a nickel more in taxes.

That is what this debate is about. Which side are you on? I think the vast majority of the people in this country want the Senate to stand up for the middle class, for the working families of this country, and ask the billionaires and the large, multinational corporations to start paying their fair share of taxes.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last month President Obama released his fiscal year 2016 budget proposal. Americans could be forgiven for thinking it was created in a vacuum, since the proposal completely ignores our current fiscal reality. Six years ago, when the President took office, our massive debt was already a massive $10.6 trillion. For the past 6 years of the President's administration, our national debt has increased by more than $7.5 trillion, to a dangerously high $18.2 trillion. That kind of debt slows economic growth, threatens government programs such as Social Security and Medicare, and jeopardizes America's future. But apparently the President is not concerned because the President's budget proposal would increase our national debt to a staggering $25 trillion-plus over the next 10 years.

Let me repeat that. Over the next 10 years, the President's budget would increase our national debt to more than $25 trillion. Now, I don't need to tell the American people that kind of debt is unsustainable. American families know you can't keep racking up debt indefinitely, and they know the solution to being in debt is not increasing spending.

It is too bad nobody in the White House has that same kind of common sense. The President's budget would increase spending by 65 percent over the next 10 years. If a family already in debt tried increasing spending that way, they would very quickly end up bankrupt. They would lose their home, their cars, their credit. Well, the government works the same way. The government may be able to keep up appearances a little longer, but sooner or later unchecked government spending results in financial ruin. It has happened in other countries, and it will happen here if we don't take action.

If we keep racking up debt the way we have been going, we are not going to be able to pay for our priorities. Social Security, Medicare, national defense, national security, infrastructure—all these priorities could face huge cuts if we don't get our Nation on a sound fiscal footing.

Last week, Senate Republicans introduced a budget blueprint for fiscal year 2016 that would balance the budget in 10 years and put our Nation on a path to fiscal health. Instead of ignoring our Nation's fiscal problems, it promotes spending restraint, it creates a framework for Congress and the President to come together on long-term solutions. While it is not a perfect plan—it doesn't solve every one of our Nation's problems—it gets things moving in the right direction.

First, the Senate Republican budget balances. The President's budget never balances—not in 10 years, not in 75 years, not ever. The President may think we can keep spending more than we take in indefinitely, but the fact is we can't. We need to get to a place where balanced budgets—not deficits—are the new normal. Under the Senate

Republicans' budget, our Nation would achieve a $3 billion surplus by the year 2025, and our budget encourages honest accounting.

For example, our budget would provide for the Congressional Budget Office to score legislation increasing the deficit by $5 billion or more not just over 10 years but over 40 years. Typically, the Congressional Budget Office estimates the cost of legislation over a 10-year period. These estimates can be misleading because many pieces of legislation start out by costing relatively little but end up costing huge amounts in the long-term. By looking at the 40-year cost of legislation instead of the 10-year cost, we can get a much clearer view of a bill's true cost and the effect it will have on the debt.

Our budget also makes economic growth a priority. Almost 6 years after the recession ended, millions of Americans are still struggling and opportunities for advancement are still few and far between. A big reason for that is the oppressive, big government policies and deficit spending of the Obama administration. Our budget would help get the government off the back of the economy by limiting the growth of spending and reducing the debt.

On the jobs front, the Senate Republicans' budget would pave the way for the removal of inefficient and ineffective government regulations that are making it difficult and expensive for many businesses to hire new workers and create new opportunities. Our budget also lays the groundwork for an overhaul of our outdated Tax Code, which needs to be reformed to lessen the tax burden facing families and to encourage businesses to create American jobs.

Yesterday, we celebrated the fifth anniversary of the President's budget-busting health care law. Five years on, the President's health care law has resulted in higher costs, lost health care plans, reduced access to doctors, and new burdens on businesses, large and small. The health care law's latest disasters include incorrect tax forms dispatched to nearly 1 million Americans and surprise tax bills for tens of thousands of households in this country. It is no surprise that according to a recent poll, over 60 percent of voters have an unfavorable view of the Democrats' signature law. Senate Republicans promised the American people we would do our best to repeal ObamaCare and replace it with real health care reform, and our budget provides the framework for that process to move forward.

ObamaCare has failed to provide the health care solutions the President promised. It is time to replace this law with reforms that will actually make health care more affordable and accessible and that will not put government between patients and doctors.

Finally, our budget would start the process of putting major entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare on a sounder footing going forward. Right now the Social Security trust fund is headed toward bankruptcy. If we do not take action, Social Security recipients could be facing a 25-percent cut in benefits in 2033.

Medicare faces similar challenges to those faced by the Social Security Program. Under the worst-case scenario, the Medicare trust fund could become insolvent as early as in 2021. That is just 6 short years away. The Senate Republican budget would help preserve Medicare by extending the trust fund solvency by an additional 5 years, which would protect retiree benefits while giving policymakers additional time to ensure that this program provides support to seniors for decades to come.

Our country is not in the best fiscal shape, but it is not too late to do something about it. Senate Republicans have proposed and produced a responsible budget that will fund our Nation's priorities while restraining spending growth and driving down our Nation's deficit. This budget will give the American people a more efficient, a more effective, and a more accountable government. I look forward to passing it this week and to getting our Nation back on the path to fiscal health, which starts with a balanced budget.

We cannot continue down the path we are on. The American people deserve better. We should give them better. For the first time in most of the years I have been here, we are actually going to have a budget on the floor of the Senate that balances in 10 years. That is something I think the American people who sit around their household and sit around their kitchen tables trying to make these hard decisions for themselves and their families—that is what they deserve and that is what they expect. That is what we are going to deliver.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 409

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 409.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. FISCHER] proposes an amendment numbered 409.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to promoting equal pay, which may include preventing discrimination on the basis of sex and preventing retalition against employees for seeking or discussing wage information)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING EQUAL PAY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting equal pay, which may include preventing discrimination on the basis of sex and preventing retaliation against employees for seeking or discussing wage information, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, as a strong supporter of equal pay for equal work, I am pleased to offer this amendment to combat pay discrimination in the workplace. Our solution provides a reasonable, fact-based approach to equip Americans with the knowledge and the tools they need to fight discrimination. This amendment contains language similar to President Obama's April 2014 Executive order, clearly stating that employees cannot be punished for exercising their First Amendment rights by speaking with employers or coworkers about their wages.

Furthermore, this amendment does not authorize any new Federal regulations, nor does it compel employers to disclose salary information. It simply prevents punitive actions against employees seeking information.

Women want good-paying jobs. That means we need policies to promote economic growth and opportunities for all Americans. This is a simple amendment. This is an amendment that would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote equal pay by reinforcing a commitment to existing law. Every Senator in here supports equal pay for equal work. That is existing law.

This amendment is a chance to not just reaffirm support for the principles of equal pay for equal work, but also for free speech. This free speech includes the right to discuss wage information with coworkers. This amendment would prevent retaliation from employers against employees who discuss wages with other employees or seek such information from their employers. Importantly, this amendment does not authorize any new Federal regulations, nor does it compel employers to disclose that salary information. It simply prevents punitive action against employees who seek or share wage information.

I believe this amendment is something all of us in this Chamber can support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, budgets are all about priorities. It is about living within your means and not mortgaging our children's future by overspending money we do not have that we are going to have to ask them to repay. When it comes to priorities, I cannot think of a higher priority for the Federal Government—I am not

talking about State or local government, I am talking about the Federal Government—I cannot think of a higher priority for the Federal Government than national security.

That was one of the basic reasons the United States of America was originally created—for mutual defense and national security. This budget, importantly, helps set the course for the future security of not only this country but also of the world, by funding our military services. It is no secret—because we see it in the headlines every day, we see it on television, we see it online—we are living in an increasingly dangerous world. We would prefer that it be otherwise, but the truth is different.

All we need to do is take a look at the stories from—well, let's pick last week. Russia is threatening to point nuclear weapons at Danish military ships, trying to bully another European country into not playing a role in NATO and its missile defense shield, in particular.

In the Middle East, Yemen is on the brink of a civil war that would bring even more instability to an already unstable region.

Then there is Iran. Just this last weekend, the Supreme Leader of the regime that the Obama administration is so committed to working out a nuclear deal with called for ''death to America.''

The American people understand this is an increasingly dangerous world and we are not safer today than we were when this administration started. In fact, things are more tenuous, less stable.

Last month, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified before Congress that after the final analysis is complete, the year 2014 is likely to go down as ''the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled.'' That is a quote—''the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled.''

Preliminary data for the first 9 months of 2014 shows nearly 13,000 terrorist attacks across the world that have taken the lives of 31,000 people. That is just the first 9 months of 2014. With so many different threats out there, and untold twists and turns in global security in the coming months and years, we need a national defense that ensures our armed services are prepared not just to respond to today's threats but tomorrow's threats, whenever and wherever they occur.

The brave men and women who serve in the Armed Forces are, without a doubt, the best in the world. But they cannot fight wars and they cannot keep us safe, they cannot maintain the peace, without the backing from Congress to ensure they have the resources they need. This budget we will pass this week does just that. It keeps that sacred bond and commitment to our men and women in uniform, and it, in effect, says to them: If you are brave enough and you are patriotic enough to serve in the U.S. military, we will make sure you have the resources necessary to do your job.

The budget we are debating today provides $612 billion in defense spending for this year. Some people may say: That is too much money. Well, the fact is we know that the United States is the one irreplaceable national security force in the world, not just for us but also for our friends and allies.

A strong America, as Ronald Reagan demonstrated, means a more peaceful world. Ironically, those who want to slash our defense spending and say, we cannot afford it, are sending a signal that America is retreating from the world stage. When America retreats and its leadership recedes, then the bullies and thugs and pirates fill that gap. It is a law of nature.

This budget will provide certainty and stability in funding for our armed services, as they will not be required to make across-the-board spending cuts this year. In fact, under our budget, defense spending increases every year after fiscal year 2016. But the truth is, we do not have a crystal ball. We cannot forecast future world events that our armed services will need to respond to. That is why this budget also includes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow our military to react to a changing threat situation and make additional investments as necessary throughout the 10-year budget window. This fund could be used to further invest in world-class training for our armed services or otherwise enhance military readiness, or even modernize critical military platforms.

In other words, this fund will help Congress work together to increase defense spending further and to keep our commitment, not just to the brave volunteers who wear the uniform of the U.S. military, but our commitment as Members of Congress to do our job and to make sure the Federal Government does its job when it comes to national security. It does so while maintaining fiscal discipline.

I am committed to working with my colleagues to achieve both of these goals. It is so important for our military to stay prepared, because the problems facing our country have rarely been more significant. That is not just my assessment, that is the assessment of Dr. Henry Kissinger, the former Secretary of State.

Earlier this year at the Senate Armed Services Committee, Dr. Kissinger said, ''The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.''

Let me say that again. ''The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.''

The scale of the challenges we face is matched by the consequences of us handling these challenges poorly and failing to meet our responsibilities as Members of Congress to make sure our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to do the job we have asked them to do and which they have volunteered to do.

That is why it is so vitally important that we continue our commitment to our armed services, that we fund them fully and we give them the flexibility to react to changing conditions around the world. This budget does all of that. As threats continue to mount, this budget will ensure the U.S. military remains unrivaled and that it has the tools it needs to keep our country and the rest of the world peaceful and safe.

Mr. President, later on this afternoon, we are going to give all Members of the Senate a chance to vote on the President's proposed budget. I will vote no. That is probably no surprise to anyone, but I think everyone in this Chamber deserves the opportunity to express themselves by voting on the President's proposed budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

(Purpose: To raise taxes and spending by enacting President Obama's fiscal year 2016 budget)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 357.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. If the Senator from South Carolina comes to the floor, which I believe he will, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UKRAINE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on Sunday, I was in the city of Chicago. I had been invited by the Ukrainian-American community to speak to a large gathering. There are many Ukrainian Americans who have chosen the city of Chicago to live in and work. They have

made an enormous contribution to the city and to the State of Illinois.

I spoke to several hundred, some of whom had not that long ago been in Ukraine. It was very moving because these people who love America but also love the country of their birth or origin are now watching their country being dismembered by Vladimir Putin and the Russians and watching the United States of America fail to help them, literally, at all.

In case my colleagues have forgotten, the United States of America, this President, has refused to provide not only defensive weapons to Ukraine—I would remind you what we all know; that there are literally hundreds, if not thousands, of Russian troops inside of eastern Ukraine, Russian weapons. Remember, it was Russian equipment—if not Russians themselves—that shot down the Malaysian jetliner, and we have sat by and watched it on the delusionary view of the President of the United States that he doesn't want to ''provoke Vladimir Putin.''

The Senator from South Carolina and I predicted every single move Vladimir Putin has taken. By the way, I am pleased to be again sanctioned by Vladimir Putin. I wear it as a badge of honor.

So we have watched as they went into Crimea, in order that Vladimir Putin could have the naval base at Sevastopol, then into eastern Ukraine.

Then a Malaysian airliner was shot down. We all seem to have forgotten about that. Sanctions have been imposed on Vladimir Putin, none of which have had any significant effect, and the aggression continues.

Now there is a pause while more Russian equipment comes into eastern Ukraine, and his next target will be the city of Mariupol so he can complete his land bridge ambition to Crimea.

Right now, he is having to resupply Crimea from air and sea, which is very expensive, but Mariupol will be next. Then, depending on whether he gets away with it, the pressure will increase on Moldova, and pressures are already being exerted on the Baltic countries as well.

Our European friends, with the leadership of the United States of America, is conducting itself in the finest tradition of Neville Chamberlain. It was in the 1930s when we watched Hitler go into one area of another, usually in the name of ''German-speaking peoples.''

So I must say the people—the wonderful Ukrainian-American group I spoke to on Saturday—is puzzled, sad, and angry that the United States of America will not even give them weapons with which to defend themselves.

We have given them, my dear friends, MREs. We have gone from the West and democracy's arsenal to the West's linen closet.

So I say, again, this is a shameful chapter in American history. It is shameful. It is shameful we will not at least provide these people with weapons to defend themselves as they watch for the first time in 70 years a European nation being dismembered.

Have no doubt about Vladimir Putin's ambitions, it is the restoration of the Russian Empire, and no one should have any illusions about that. Unless a stand is taken, day after day, week after week, Vladimir Putin, diverting attention from his economic troubles, will continue to commit aggression until he feels he has restored the old Russian Empire.

We are writing a shameful chapter in American history, the nation that used to stand up for people who were struggling for freedom and assist them. I remind my colleagues that the Ukrainians are not asking for a single American boot on the ground, they are just asking for weapons to defend themselves. Isn't that shameful.

MIDDLE EAST

Mr. President, I wish to speak about the Middle East. First, let me remind you of a couple of comments in recent months that the President of the United States has made, one concerning ISIS, which has now moved into Africa, Libya, and Tunisia—recent attacks. Of course, we know about their caliphate that they have set up in Iraq and Syria. Boko Haram has declared their allegiance. They are spreading like an epidemic.

The President of the United States said, speaking of ISIS: ''The analogy we use around here sometimes, and I think is accurate, is if a jayvee team puts on Lakers uniforms that doesn't make them Kobe Bryant.''

I say to my colleagues, I am not making that up. That is what the President of the United States said about ISIS.

Then, he said recently:

> Over the last several years, we have consistently taken the fight to terrorists who threaten our country. We have targeted al Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen—

In Yemen—

> and recently eliminated the top commander of its affiliate in Somalia.

This strategy of taking out terrorists who threaten us, while supporting partners on the front lines, is one we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years.

Is one that we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years.

Again, I tell my colleagues, I am not making this up.

Then, of course, Iran. The White House has repeatedly slammed the Israeli Prime Minister for comments made during an election campaign, statements he has clarified or apologized for.

But the White House continues to threaten a reassessment of American policy toward Israel because ''words matter.'' That is what the White House spokesman said—''words matter.''

But when Iran's Ayatollah Khamenei chanted ''Death to America'' in a recent address, the White House dismissed the remarks as aimed at a domestic, political audience.

General Petraeus said on March 20: ''The Islamic State isn't our biggest problem in Iraq.''

Our biggest problem in Iraq, according to General Petraeus, is Iran. He is right.

ISIS is a terrible and awful disease that is afflicting the Middle East and may in Africa. But when you look at what the Iranians are doing, they are in Sanaa in Yemen, they are in Baghdad, they are in Beirut, and they are in Damascus.

Today, as we speak, Mr. Soleimani, the head of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, is leading the fight in Tikrit. This is the same head of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard who sent thousands of copper-tipped IEDs into Iraq while our troops were there fighting and killed hundreds—hundreds—of American soldiers and marines, while we watch them retake the city of Tikrit, and then we will get the credit with the Iraqi people.

So David Petraeus, in answer to the question, ''You have had some interaction with Qasem Soleimani in the past. Could you tell us about those,'' Petraeus talks about those he met with:

> When I met with the senior Iraqi, he conveyed the message: ''General Petraeus, you should be aware that I, Qasem Soleimani, control Iran's policy for Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Gaza, and Afghanistan.''

That is what Soleimani claimed. It was probably not true at the time, but there is very little doubt that Soleimani and the Iranians are on the move. Our Arab friends, whether they be the Saudis, the UAE or many others, are keenly aware of this movement and success of the Iranians.

Very frankly, they do not understand this Faustian bargain that is now being attempted to be concluded by this administration and the Iranians in the form of a nuclear agreement, somehow thinking that if there is this nuclear agreement—and I am not on the floor today to talk about it—that somehow there will be a whole new relationship with Iran, the same people who recently said: ''Death to Israel.''

So you can understand why our friends in the Middle East and the Sunni-Arab countries are finding their own way, developing their own strategy, and have no confidence in the United States of America.

ISRAEL

Lately, there has been a lot of pressure on Israel as a result of the only free and fair election that you will see take place in that entire part of the world. There has been a harsh criticism of the things Prime Minister Netanyahu said during that campaign.

I point out to my colleagues sometimes things are said in campaigns that maybe we say in the heat of the campaign and maybe it is OK if we apologize.

Today, one of the most astute observers, in my view, Bret Stephens of the Wall Street Journal, had some advice for the Israelis. From his article in this morning's Wall Street Journal entitled ''The Orwellian Obama Presidency'':

> Here is my advice to the Israeli government, along with every other country being

treated disdainfully by this crass administration: Repay contempt with contempt. Mr. Obama plays to classic bully type. He is abusive and surly only toward those he feels are either too weak, or too polite, to hit back. The Saudis figured that out in 2013, after Mr. Obama failed to honor his promises on Syria; they turned down a seat on the security council, spoke openly about acquiring nuclear weapons from Pakistan, and tanked the price of oil, mainly as a weapon against Iran. Now Mr. Obama is nothing if not solicitous of the Saudi Highnesses.

The Israelis will need to chart their own path of resistance. On the Iranian nuclear deal, they may have to go rogue. Let's hope their warnings have not been mere bluffs. Israel survived its first 19 years without meaningful U.S. patronage. For now, all it has to do is get through the next 22, admittedly long, months.

I note the presence of my colleague from South Carolina, and I guess my question to him is: How in the world do we justify this delusionary idea that somehow an agreement with Iran on nuclear weapons—and I am not asking to go into the details of it now, because my colleague and I are in agreement that it is an agreement, as Henry Kissinger described, that was once designed to eliminate nuclear weapons and is now designed to delay Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons—how do we translate that into believing that people who chant ''Death to America'' are going to be our friends, particularly in light of their aggression throughout the region and their successful movement in these parts of the world?

Mr. GRAHAM. If I could give my best answer to that, No. 1—and my colleague from Arizona has been more right than wrong for the last 4 years about what was going to happen in the Mideast if we made the choices the President made—No. 1, my colleague said if we don't leave any troops behind in Iraq, all our gains will come unraveled. At the end of the day, the sectarian rise in violence was a direct result of, I think, American troops leaving Iraq. We had a good thing going after the surge. It did work. After drawing the redline against Assad and doing nothing about it, ISIL was able to fill in that vacuum.

But here is the question: Given Iran's behavior today, what would they do with the extra money that would come into their coffers if sanctions were lifted? Let's say we got a nuclear deal tomorrow, and as a result of that deal sanctions would be lifted. Without a nuclear program, the Ayatollahs are wreaking havoc throughout the region. The pro-American government in Yemen has been taken down by Houthi militias funded by Iran. Assad in Syria has killed 220,000 of his own people and he is a puppet of Iran. John Kerry said that Assad was Iran's puppet. We have Lebanon, where Hezbollah is an agent of Iran that saved Assad and creating discontent all over the region. We have Shia militias on the ground in Iraq being led by the leader of the Revolutionary Guard in Iran.

So here is the answer to my colleague's question. How could anybody believe the money we would give them for sanction relief would go to hospitals and schools? Don't you think the best evidence of what they would do with money is what they are doing today? The administration has never tied behavior to sanctions relief. So my big fear, Senator MCCAIN, is that not only would the Arabs want a nuclear weapon of their own if we got a bad deal with Iran, but the money we gave the Iranians would go into their missile program to hit us, would go into further destabilizing the Middle East.

Does my colleague agree that given Iran's behavior there is not one ounce of moderation in this regime? Does my colleague agree there are no moderates in charge of Iran; that when President Obama speaks to the Iranian people, urging them to argue for this deal, they have no voice; that the last time the Iranian people rose up to petition their government they got gunned down? Does my colleague agree with me that President Obama has no idea what is going on inside Iran and no understanding what this regime is up to with the money they already have?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would respond to my friend, I wish the President of the United States, who issued some comment to the Iranian people about the necessity of a nuclear agreement, would have spoken up in 2009 when thousands and thousands of Iranians were on the streets in Tehran protesting a corrupt election and wanting freedom and he refused. They were chanting ''Obama, Obama, are you with us or are you with them?'' And he refused to speak out on their behalf. That is when he should have spoken up to the Iranian people.

I would also ask my friend: Is there anyone in Iran who is free to speak up? You either get killed or put in prison if you speak up. So my question is: Who was the President of the United States speaking to with those remarks?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, all I can say is it would be like telling a North Korean to speak up. That may be a bit of an extreme example, but not too much.

The point we are trying to make to President Obama is that if he believes there is a moderate element in Iran, who are they? Who is in charge of this government he is trying to empower at the expense of the hardliners?

The assembly of experts are the people who pick the next Ayatollah. On March 10, they had an election—I think it was 46 to 24. Ayatollah Yazdi—I don't want to mispronounce his name—won the election to be in charge of the assembly of experts. Their No. 1 goal is to pick the next Ayatollah. He is widely known to be the hardest of the hardliners.

So I want the administration to explain to us, the Congress, who the moderates are and how do you square that circle with the election of the most hardline Ayatollah to pick the next Ayatollah? What information does the President have that there is a moderate element that we can empower in Iran?

Can my colleague name one moderate voice that has a real say in the Iranian Government?

Mr. MCCAIN. Not any who are alive or out of prison. I am sure there are many moderate voices in the Ayatollah's prisons throughout Iran by the tens of thousands.

But I would also ask my colleague: Is it not true that every manifestation of Iranian behavior—whether it be in Baghdad, where they now have significant control; in Beirut, where Hezbollah basically has control of the country; in Damascus—Bashir Assad would not be alive today or in Syria today if it hadn't been for the Iranians flying in hundreds of tons of equipment, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, and bringing Hezbollah out of Lebanon and into Syria. And now we see Soleimani, the leader liberating Tikrit, getting all the publicity. And the people of Iraq, naturally, are thanking him for freeing Tikrit from the forces of ISIS.

One other comment. I know other colleagues are on the floor, but David Petraeus, probably the most brilliant military officer I have ever had the honor of knowing, made a very interesting comment in an interview the other day and I would like my colleague's comment on it. He said the major threat in the Middle East and in the world today is not ISIS. It is not ISIS. He said it was Iran.

I think when we look at a map and we see where the Iranians are now in control, we have to give great credence to General Petraeus's assessment. Would my colleague agree?

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me not only say why I agree, but here is what is about to happen in the Mideast. Because of our lack of leadership, the Iranians have gone on a rampage. My colleague had a very august group of people today—some of the smartest people in the Mideast and the country, leading think tank folks—come before the committee today, and I asked the question: Do you agree with me that Iran is wreaking havoc? Three out of four said yes. The one lady said seriously destabilizing.

Whatever adjective you want to use, it is commonly viewed that the Iranian regime is projecting power in the most disruptive manner in recent memory. They are backing people who took down the pro-Yemen Government, and now we have lost the ability to follow Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula that is responsible for the attack in Paris.

Assad wouldn't last, as my colleague said, 5 minutes, and the Assad regime, which has killed 220,000 people and driven over a million people out of Syria, is putting pressure on Lebanon and Jordan.

The Shia militia on the ground today are probably war criminals by any classic definition, and they are being led by Soleimani, the head of the Revolutionary Guard, the biggest exporter of terrorism in the world.

Mr. MCCAIN. And responsible for the deaths of hundreds and hundreds of

American marines and soldiers. What do we tell their mothers?

Mr. GRAHAM. Exactly. So the point we are trying to make to the President and the Members of this body is that Iran is on a rampage without a nuclear weapon. Clearly they are not a moderate regime trying to live peacefully with their neighbors. They are trying to disrupt the whole Mideast and have influence unlike at any other time.

Here is what is going to happen. The Arabs in the region are going to push back. They no longer trust us. Remember when the head of the Saudi Arabian intelligence community said it is better to be America's enemy than her friend? We heard this twice in the Mideast on our recent tour—that people believe Iran is getting a better deal from America being her enemy than the traditional friends of this country.

So here is what is going to happen. Turkey is going to align with the Sunni Arab world and go after Iran themselves, and we are going to have a Sunni-Shia war the likes of which we haven't seen in 1,000 years, because without American leadership the whole place is falling apart.

Here is the legacy of Barack Obama. He tried to change the Mideast by giving speeches. And every time he was told by military leaders you should do A, he did B. He has reached out to the Ayatollahs, not understanding who he is talking to. He has empowered the most brutal, vicious, murderers on the planet today in Iran.

This Ayatollah in Iran is not a good man. He has blood on his hands.

The President is talking to the people who killed our soldiers by the hundreds. He is giving them resources they wouldn't have otherwise, and he is making a deal with the devil. At the end of the day, this is blowing up in our face.

If the President doesn't self-correct, we are all in trouble. And if this Congress sits on the sidelines and allows this nuclear deal with Iran to go unchecked, and we don't look at it and vote on it, then we own the consequences of it.

To every Member of this body I say: We have an independent duty, as does the President of the United States, to make sure the deal we do with Iran is a good deal for America and not a nightmare for the world. So we are asking our colleagues to take their independent duty seriously. We have a check-and-balance responsibility. Do not let this administration do a deal with the Ayatollahs in Iran who go to the United Nations and bypass us. If it is a good deal, we will vote for it.

As strongly as I know how to say it, I am telling my colleagues that our policies in the Mideast are failing, Iran is the biggest winner of America leading from behind, all our traditional allies are in a world of hurt, and they are going to take matters in their own hands.

I thank Senator MCCAIN for his leadership and for telling America about the right choices, even though they are the hard choices. I will continue to work with my colleague as long as I can to speak truth to what I think is the biggest foreign policy disaster in my lifetime unfolding before our very eyes.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Wall Street Journal article entitled ''The Orwellian Obama Presidency,'' by Bret Stephens.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, March 23, 2015]

THE ORWELLIAN OBAMA PRESIDENCY

(By Bret Stephens)

Under Mr. Obama, friends are enemies, denial is wisdom, capitulation is victory.

The humiliating denouement to America's involvement in Yemen came over the weekend, when U.S. Special Forces were forced to evacuate a base from which they had operated against the local branch of al Qaeda. This is the same branch that claimed responsibility for the January attack on Charlie Hebdo and has long been considered to pose the most direct threat to Europe and the United States.

So who should Barack Obama be declaring war on in the Middle East other than the state of Israel?

There is an upside-down quality to this president's world view. His administration is now on better terms with Iran—whose Houthi proxies, with the slogan ''God is great, death to America, death to Israel, damn the Jews, power to Islam,'' just deposed Yemen's legitimate president—than it is with Israel. He claims we are winning the war against Islamic State even as the group continues to extend its reach into Libya, Yemen and Nigeria.

He treats Republicans in the Senate as an enemy when it comes to the Iranian nuclear negotiations, while treating the Russian foreign ministry as a diplomatic partner. He favors the moral legitimacy of the United Nations Security Council to that of the U.S. Congress. He is facilitating Bashar Assad's war on his own people by targeting ISIS so the Syrian dictator can train his fire on our ostensible allies in the Free Syrian Army.

He was prepared to embrace a Muslim Brother as president of Egypt but maintains an arm's-length relationship with his popular pro-American successor. He has no problem keeping company with Al Sharpton and tagging an American police department as comprehensively racist but is nothing if not adamant that the words ''Islamic'' and ''terrorism'' must on no account ever be conjoined. The deeper that Russian forces advance into Ukraine, the more they violate cease-fires, the weaker the Kiev government becomes, the more insistent he is that his response to Russia is working.

To adapt George Orwell's motto for Oceania: Under Mr. Obama, friends are enemies, denial is wisdom, capitulation is victory.

The current victim of Mr. Obama's moral inversions is the recently re-elected Israeli prime minister. Normally a sweeping democratic mandate reflects legitimacy, but not for Mr. Obama. Now we are treated to the astonishing spectacle in which Benjamin Netanyahu has become persona non grata for his comments doubting the current feasibility of a two-state solution. This, while his Palestinian counterpart Mahmoud Abbas is in the 11th year of his four-year term, without a murmur of protest from the White House.

It is true that Mr. Netanyahu made an ugly election-day remark about Israeli-Arab voters ''coming out in droves to the polls,'' thereby putting ''the right-wing government in danger.'' For this he has apologized, in person, to leaders of the Israeli-Arab community.

That's more than can be said for Mr. Abbas, who last year threatened Israel with a global religious war if Jews were allowed to pray in the Temple Mount's Al Aqsa mosque. ''We will not allow our holy places to be contaminated,'' the Palestinian Authority president said. The Obama administration insists that Mr. Abbas is ''the best interlocutor Israel is ever going to have.''

Maybe that's true, but if so it only underscores the point Mr. Netanyahu was making in the first place—and for which Mr. Obama now threatens a fundamental reassessment of U.S. relations with Israel. In 2014 Mr. Abbas agreed to a power-sharing agreement with Hamas, a deal breaker for any Israeli interested in peace. In 2010 he used the expiration of a 10-month Israeli settlement freeze as an excuse to abandon bilateral peace efforts. In 2008 he walked away from a statehood offer from then-Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert. In 2000 he was with Yasser Arafat at Camp David when the Palestinians turned down a deal from Israel's Ehud Barak.

And so on. For continuously rejecting good-faith Israeli offers, Mr. Abbas may be about to get his wish: a U.S. vote for Palestinian statehood at the United Nations. For tiring of constant Palestinian bad faith—and noting the fact—Israel will now be treated to pariah-nation status by Mr. Obama.

Here is my advice to the Israeli government, along with every other country being treated disdainfully by this crass administration: Repay contempt with contempt. Mr. Obama plays to classic bully type. He is abusive and surly only toward those he feels are either too weak, or too polite, to hit back.

The Saudis figured that out in 2013, after Mr. Obama failed to honor his promises on Syria; they turned down a seat on the Security Council, spoke openly about acquiring nuclear weapons from Pakistan and tanked the price of oil, mainly as a weapon against Iran. Now Mr. Obama is nothing if not solicitous of the Saudi highnesses.

The Israelis will need to chart their own path of resistance. On the Iranian nuclear deal, they may have to go rogue: Let's hope their warnings have not been mere bluffs. Israel survived its first 19 years without meaningful U.S. patronage. For now, all it has to do is get through the next 22, admittedly long, months.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleagues for their patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, before the Senators from Arizona and South Carolina leave the floor, I want to say a couple of words about their contribution to our collective efforts on the budget.

As I said a moment ago, the No. 1 priority for the Federal Government is national security. And while we are all concerned about runaway spending—and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has been quite determined to rein that in by producing a balanced budget over the next 10 years—it is due to the leadership of the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from South Carolina, along with our other colleagues on the Committee on the Budget, who also happen to serve on the

Committee on Armed Services, who I think have led us to a much better place—a place where we can all feel better that we are closer to making sure our military has the resources they need in order to meet the commitments we have asked them to make.

We maybe have a few things we need to still talk about, and we will keep talking until we get it right, but the fact is, without the leadership of the Senators from Arizona and South Carolina and others on the Committee on the Budget, we wouldn't be where we are today and able to hold our heads up high and say we believe in our duty to our men and women in uniform, we believe in America's leadership role in the world, and we will not shrink from that.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 471

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed on behalf of Senator WYDEN, Ranking Member SANDERS, and myself to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 471.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE], for Mr. WYDEN, for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN, proposes an amendment numbered 471.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would cut benefits, raise the retirement age, or privatize Social Security)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. ___. POINT OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction of benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) increase either the early or full retirement age for benefits described in paragraph (1); or

(3) privatize Social Security.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, for my colleagues, this is an amendment which relates to protecting Social Security.

Social Security is a program that has been an enormous success, that is at the heart of the American middle class, and that represents a solemn promise our seniors have earned over a lifetime of work. It makes a real difference in real people's lives. It is the difference between comfort and poverty for over 20 million Americans.

Rhode Island is a State where we count on Social Security. We value Social Security. We know how important it is. What I have heard firsthand from Rhode Island seniors over and over again is they want to make sure this program is solid and remains strong, not just for them but for their children and their grandchildren.

Sadly, for decades, the history of the Republican Party has been one of repeated attempts to undermine this bedrock of middle-class retirement security, proposing over and over again various types of security cuts and, believe it or not, even turning Social Security's assets over to Wall Street to manage.

This Democratic amendment establishes a point of order against any legislation that would reduce Social Security benefits, that would increase the Social Security retirement age, or that would privatize the program. This would help our moderate friends protect Social Security from rightwing attacks, and it would ensure that seniors, as a part of their American experience, can continue to count on benefits they have earned.

Social Security is at present projected to remain fully solvent through 2033. It does not drive our current budget deficits and should not be sacrificed to the quarrels over the budget. Ultimately, I think we will need to strengthen Social Security, and when we do, simply asking the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share into the system can make that difference. Simply asking the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share into the system can extend it another 50 years, while also making our tax system fairer to the middle class. So it is a true win-win. And we want to make sure we do not have to watch Rhode Island seniors and seniors across the country pay the price for a deficit they had no part in creating.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island not only for his important remarks but for the work he has been doing for years to protect and defend Social Security.

Let's be clear about a number of facts. When people jump up and say Social Security is going broke—not quite true. As Senator WHITEHOUSE indicated, Social Security can pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 18 years.

When people jump up and say Social Security is contributing to the deficit—also not quite accurate. As everybody knows, Social Security is funded by the payroll tax, an independent source of revenue for Social Security.

The fact is that for many, many years, in a variety of ways, my Republican colleagues have been attempting to either cut Social Security or, in the extreme case, privatize Social Security and allow—force—Americans to go to Wall Street for their retirement benefits.

While this budget does not include a provision to cut Social Security, what I will say is, if my memory is correct, in three out of the four hearings held by the Budget Committee, there were Republican representatives—people who were asked to testify—who did talk about various ways to cut Social Security.

So what this amendment does is it establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund—it establishes a budget point of order which prevents benefit cuts, a raise in the retirement age, or the privatization of Social Security benefits. That is what it does.

Now we are going to have a lot of people coming up here and saying: Well, we want to preserve Social Security.

What they really mean is that in order to preserve Social Security, they want to cut Social Security benefits—maybe not for the people on Social Security today but for future beneficiaries.

They say: Well, that is the only way we can protect Social Security.

Well, that is not accurate. I introduced legislation which, in fact, makes Social Security not only solvent until the year 2065—50 years from today—but also expands benefits. We do that by saying that it is currently very absurd that a multimillionaire is paying the same amount of money into the Social Security trust fund as somebody making $118,000. There are some very wealthy people who are paying all of their Social Security taxes in the first day or two of the year.

Right now, we have a situation where millions of people in this country depend upon Social Security, people who are getting benefits of $12,000, $13,000, $14,000 a year. That is how they are living. Those benefits should not be cut.

When we talk about a so-called chained CPI, which cuts COLAs for seniors and disabled vets, what we are talking about is cutting Social Security benefits for an average 65-year-old by more than $658 a year by the time that person reaches age 75 and a cut of more than $1,100 a year by the time that person reaches age 85. Those are very significant cuts for people who are

trying to live on $13,000 or $14,000 a year.

So here is the argument. Is Social Security important? Obviously, it is. As the middle class continues to decline, Social Security is enormously important for the elderly and the disabled people of this country.

Point No. 2: Do we have to cut benefits in order to save Social Security? The answer is, obviously, yes. But we are back to the same old question we debate all day here. Our Republican friends seem absolutely determined not to ask the wealthiest people in this country who are doing phenomenally well to contribute to the well-being of the American people. That is this overall budget. But on the issue of Social Security, what we have to do is raise the cap, which is now at $118,000, and start it at $250,000. Just doing that will enable us to expand Social Security to the year 2065 and expand benefits for lower income seniors.

This point of order is enormously important. It says there will be a need for 60 votes for any effort to cut Social Security, to raise the retirement—I don't know what world some people are living in. There are some who have come forward and said we should raise the Social Security retirement age to 70. Let's have people out there working at 68, 69, 70 years of age. Let's force them to keep working before they get their benefits. My God, that is a horrendous idea. They also say we should cut COLAs—cost-of-living adjustments—for disabled vets. What a terrible idea.

There is a way to extend Social Security for many decades and to expand benefits. This amendment says: Do not cut Social Security.

I think a number of my Republican friends will say: Well, we are not going to cut Social Security for anybody on Social Security today. That is not good enough. There are people out there who are 50, 55, 60, 63, 64, and they want to know that the benefits they will get are the benefits they will be able to live on. Don't cut benefits for working people, and that is what this very important amendment is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 4:40 p.m. today be equally divided between the managers or their designees and that at 4:40 p.m., the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Sanders amendment No. 474, a side-by-side to the Ayotte amendment; Ayotte amendment No. 400 on vets; Fischer amendment No. 409, a side-by-side to the Mikulski amendment; Mikulski amendment No. 362 on equal pay; a Hatch amendment, the text of which is at the desk; Wyden amendment No. 471 on Social Security; and Cornyn amendment No. 357, the President's budget.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between the managers or their designees prior to each vote, and that all votes after the first in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be up to four rollcall votes at 4:40 p.m.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 471

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont. I wish to add my support to our ranking member's remarks.

At present, somebody making $110 million a year—and there are people who make $110 million a year in this country—will make the same contribution or less to Social Security as somebody making $110,000 a year in salary. At best, they will pay the same despite the fact that they are making 1,000 times more. At worst, they will pay even less into it because they have treated their income as capital gains and they have dodged the payroll tax on it. To me, that makes no sense, particularly when more and more of our national income is moving up into the top 1 percent, the top 2 percent, the top one-tenth of 1 percent.

In fact, there has been a pronounced effect on Social Security's balances just from the increased income inequality. More and more of the income generated in the United States of America is moving to the wealthiest people, and that means the amount of income under $110,000 that is subject to taxation for Social Security is a smaller fraction of the total income package than it was before, which means there will be less income to support Social Security, and that is a significant part of why Social Security is underfunded and why it may only last for the next 18 years instead of longer.

First of all, I think Social Security is so important that even if there were not this fairness discrepancy, it is worth it to our country to have people know that they and their aunts and their uncles and their grandparents have the security of Social Security, and we should protect it at virtually all costs.

But even if that alone were not sufficient, the fact that everybody making under $110,000 supports Social Security and the billionaires make no greater contribution and perhaps less of a contribution than regular working folks is completely backward and completely wrong, but, unfortunately, that is the principle of primacy in this Republican budget. The principle of primacy in this Republican budget is that every tax loophole is sacred. Every tax loophole is nonnegotiable. Every tax loophole is to be defended at all costs. It doesn't matter what you have to cut, it doesn't matter what harm you have to do to Social Security or to other programs, nothing matters as much to this Republican budget as protecting every tax loophole.

When we consider who has the clout around here in this country to get tax loopholes, guess what—it is the corporations and it is the wealthy. Those are the guys who really do the mischief.

There are other tax protections for the middle class, and nobody wants to change those. But these tax loopholes that move jobs overseas and pay for that and allow companies to pretend their intellectual property is in another country when they only have half-a-dozen employees there and they are running big time across our country because they locate themselves for tax purposes in a tax haven—there is no benefit to that. We should fix that. But in this budget, all of that is kept sacred. It is the highest primary principle of this budget to defend every corporate tax loophole and every loophole that helps millionaires and billionaires, and I happen to think that is wrong.

We brought this up over and over again in the hearings in the Budget Committee. We have heard from experts—not only experts brought in by the Democrats, we even heard from experts brought in by the Republicans who said that revenue has to be part of the solution to our deficit and that many of these tax loopholes are—there is no justification for them. Even with this testimony and that support in the record, this budget still stands by its principle of Republican primacy, and that is that every tax loophole is sacred.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. How much time remains on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 6½ minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment, and I hope the American people are listening.

Social Security is probably the most important Federal program ever developed in the modern history of this country. It is an enormously popular program, and it has been an enormously effective program. The truth is that it has significantly reduced poverty among seniors. Before Social Security, about 50 percent of seniors lived in poverty. Today, while the number is too high, it is somewhere around 10 percent.

The extraordinary beauty of Social Security is that in good times and in bad times—in an economic boom, depression, or recession—Social Security has paid out every check owed to every eligible American without fail. No one has ever received a letter that said: You know, we are in the middle of a recession, so we have to cut your benefits in half. That has never been the case. We take it for granted, but that is an extraordinary record.

Because we have a number of Republicans who simply do not like government programs, there has been for

many years an effort to either cut or privatize Social Security and give it over to Wall Street. What we hear are a lot of misleading arguments. The argument is, well, Social Security is unsustainable, and it is not going to be there. And they throw out all of these reasons. But the answer is that Social Security is absolutely sustainable, but, as Senator WHITEHOUSE just indicated, we have to deal with issues such as income and wealth inequality, which has resulted in a significant reduction in the solvency of Social Security because people's incomes have not risen, and therefore they contribute less to the Social Security trust fund, or many other people have gone way above the cap and are still paying less than they should.

The Republicans' solution seems to be—and I think there will be a side-by-side amendment that will say: Well, we are not going to cut Social Security benefits for those who are in the program right now. But essentially their language says that they will cut benefits for future retirees, people who are 55, 60, and 63 years of age. When we have so many seniors and elderly people who are struggling right now to make ends meet, I think the last thing in the world we should do is cut Social Security.

Over half of all Americans have less than $10,000 in savings, and these people, when they reach Social Security age, do not want to see their benefits cut. Two-thirds of seniors depend on Social Security for more than half of their income, and one-third depend on Social Security for almost all of their income. These people do not want to see their benefits cut.

Just 2 weeks ago, Senator WHITEHOUSE and I accepted petitions from 2 million people which said loudly and clearly: Do not cut Social Security. And in the polling I have seen in these tough economic times, Republicans say do not cut Social Security, Democrats say do not cut Social Security, and Independents say do not cut Social Security. Yet what our Republican friends are saying is that if you are 55, 60, or 63 and are not yet on Social Security, beware because we are prepared to cut your Social Security. Maybe we will raise the retirement age or maybe we will cut your COLAs through a so-called chained CPI.

I will say as the former chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee that virtually every veterans organization has been loud and clear in opposition to the chained CPI because they understand that chained CPI does not just cut benefits for seniors, it cuts benefits for disabled veterans. Do we really want to be cutting benefits for disabled veterans? I hope we will not.

This is a very important amendment. It is an amendment that says: If you stand with the overwhelming majority of the American people who say we should not cut Social Security—yes, let's move forward to make it solvent beyond the 18 years that it is solvent, but do not cut benefits, do not cut COLAs, and do not raise the retirement age.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 400

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 400.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Ms. AYOTTE] proposes an amendment numbered 400.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to maintain and enhance access, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Choice Card program under section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE ACCESS, CHOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN VETERANS CARE THROUGH THE VETERANS CHOICE CARD PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining and enhancing access, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Choice Card program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, last year in this body, we heard and saw evidence about what was happening at some of our VA facilities—the manipulated wait lists, the delays our veterans had to endure—and, unfortunately, some of our veterans died waiting for care.

We passed a bipartisan bill, one on which we all worked together, and I appreciate that Senator SANDERS worked very hard on that bill. The Veterans Choice Program was part of that bipartisan bill, but this program has yet to be implemented in the way this body intended. The goal was to expedite care for veterans who had been waiting longer than 30 days or who live farther than 40 miles away from the VA hospital. In my home State of New Hampshire, we don't have a full-service veterans hospital, so too often our veterans are driving long distances—to Massachusetts or to other locations—to get the care they earned for having served and sacrificed so much for our country.

Recently, a study conducted by the VFW found that 92 percent of program-eligible veterans were interested in non-VA or private care options that they could go to. Yet that same survey found that 80 percent of eligible veterans were unable to access the Veterans Choice Program.

Barely 2 months after the program started—and we worked on it on a bipartisan basis in this Congress—the administration announced plans to divert money from this important program by saying it was underutilized. Let's be clear. It is underutilized because the VA is not implementing it properly. Veterans are not being told their rights, and we owe it to them to get this Veterans Choice Program right and give veterans the choice they want for private care options so they are not driving or waiting in line, given what they have done for our country.

Our veterans chose to fight on our behalf. We should honor the work we did together and ensure that this program is properly implemented by the VA, which is not happening right now. Our veterans want this choice. Let's get this veterans program right.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which, again, is an amendment designed to support what we intended in this body—to ensure that veterans don't have to wait in line, that they can exercise private care options when they want to, thereby giving them the choice for the sacrifices they have made for this country. They deserve nothing less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 481

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 481.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. COTTON] proposes an amendment numbered 481.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral fund relating to supporting Israel)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING ISRAEL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to United States policy toward Israel, which may include preventing the United Nations and other international institutions from taking unfair or discriminatory action against Israel, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, since its founding in 1948, Israel has been a strong and steadfast ally to the United States in the Middle East, a region characterized by instability and violence.

The U.S.-Israel relationship is built on mutual respect for common values, including a commitment to democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and ethnic and religious diversity.

Last week, President Obama and other administration officials suggested a fundamental rethinking of this alliance, citing Prime Minister Netanyahu's simple restatement of fact that there can be no Palestinian State until conditions change. The Palestinian Authority must, at a minimum, eject Hamas from its governing coalition, reclaim control of the Gaza Strip, accept a demilitarized eastern border, and recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State.

Further, Prime Minister Netanyahu recently reiterated these points and his support for a two-state solution in principle. In this light, any suggestion that the United States may reconsider our support for Israel—especially our support at the United Nations—is wrongheaded and shortsighted, because the United Nations, regrettably, has consistently employed a double standard in its treatment of Israel, making false allegations against Israel while, even worse, ignoring even worse behavior by other countries.

The U.N. has often questioned Israel's legitimacy——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COTTON. I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. The U.N. Human Rights Council has focused obsessively on Israel. The U.N. General Assembly has adopted 21 resolutions singling out Israel.

Because of this regrettable history, my amendment lays the groundwork for a restriction of funding to the United Nations should it take unfair and discriminatory action against Israel or attempt to impose a final settlement on Israel and the P.A.

My hope is this will not be necessary, but this Congress should be prepared to take actions to defend the U.S.-Israel alliance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 498

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up the Hatch amendment No. 498.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 498.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to legislation submitted to Congress by President Obama to protect and strengthen Social Security)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LEGISLATION SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to legislation submitted to Congress by the President of the United States to protect current beneficiaries of the Social Security program and prevent the insolvency of the program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 474

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 474.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] proposes an amendment numbered 474.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect and strengthen the Department of Veterans Affairs, hire more health care professionals for the Department, and ensure quality and timely access to health care for all veterans)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, HIRE MORE HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS FOR THE DEPARTMENT, AND ENSURE QUALITY AND TIMELY ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR ALL VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include legislation that strengthens quality and timely access to health care by hiring more health care professionals at facilities of the Department and making necessary improvements to infrastructure of the Department, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. SANDERS. This side-by-side is a simple and noncontroversial amendment. It creates a deficit-neutral reserve fund so the VA can have the health care professionals—the doctors and nurses—it needs to make sure the VA is providing quality care to all of our veterans in a timely manner. That is about it.

From what I heard—I will speak with Senator AYOTTE a little bit later—her amendment is simply making sure the VA implements the law we passed. I don't have any objection to that and I don't know that anyone should.

Our amendment simply says we want the VA to have the medical personnel—doctors, nurses, and staff—it needs to provide quality and timely health care to our veterans. I hope it will receive unanimous agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 474, offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, this is a pretty simple and straightforward amendment. Senator AYOTTE mentioned a moment ago we have had problems at the VA. No question about it; veterans have waited too long to get the timely and quality care they need. What this amendment does is establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect and strengthen the Department of Veterans Affairs, to hire more health care professionals for the Department, and ensure quality and timely access to health care for all veterans.

If we talk to veterans organizations, they think the care within the VA is good once people get in there. I want to make sure we have the doctors and nurses to provide the quality and timely care our veterans deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I don't think we have a problem with this amendment. Again, I ask the Senator if he would be willing to voice-vote it.

Mr. SANDERS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the amendment, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 474.

The amendment (No. 474) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 400

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 400.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Does the Chair wish to change places at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Thank you.

(Mr. ENZI assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I urge a ''yes'' vote on amendment No. 400.

Unfortunately, the bipartisan work we have done on the Veterans Choice Card has not been properly implemented by the VA. Our veterans want this choice of private care. The Senator from Vermont has worked very hard on this issue, which enjoys bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to make sure we get this right for our veterans. That is what my amendment does.

Mr. SANDERS. Would the Senator agree to a voice vote?

Ms. AYOTTE. I would.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from New Hampshire for her work on this amendment with my office. We have successfully completed language that I think moves us forward in the right direction.

I also wish to thank my colleague Senator SANDERS for his tireless efforts on behalf of veterans, indicated most recently by this amendment, which is fully compatible with the Ayotte amendment.

I urge support for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate?

All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 400) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 409

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 409, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, this amendment I think satisfies the desire for all of us to reassert and reaffirm our support for equal pay for equal work.

Senator MIKULSKI spoke earlier about an amendment that I questioned because it ends merit pay, which I think hurts workplace flexibility and truly limits career opportunities for women.

My amendment again reaffirms that support, equal pay for equal work. But it also affirms the course of free speech, because free speech includes the right to discuss wage information with fellow coworkers, and that reflects the President's action that he took in 2014 to prevent retaliation from employers against employees who discuss wages with other employees or seek such information from their employers.

This is an amendment I believe all of us can support. It again reaffirms equal pay for equal work and the nonretaliation clause.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I appreciate Senator FISCHER offering her side-by-side on equal pay. I am glad to see that this is, in fact, a stronger amendment than what my Republican colleagues have offered in the past. However, this amendment still does not go far enough.

In my view, Senator MIKULSKI's amendment is a far better alternative. It is not enough to ban retaliation about discussing salary information. This amendment would not allow women to act on any information they discovered. It would not give women their day in court and the opportunity to get money owed to them after sometimes months—sometimes years—of discrimination.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 81 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Sessions
Corker	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Boxer
Bennet	Booker	Brown
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cardin	Leahy	Schatz
Carper	Markey	Schumer
Casey	McCaskill	Shaheen
Coons	Menendez	Stabenow
Durbin	Merkley	Tester
Feinstein	Mikulski	Udall
Franken	Murphy	Warner
Gillibrand	Murray	Warren
Heinrich	Nelson	Whitehouse
Heitkamp	Peters	Wyden
Hirono	Reed	
Kaine	Reid	

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 409) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 362

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 362, offered by the Senator from Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to urge the Senate to agree to the Mikulski amendment on paycheck fairness. This finishes the job we started with Lilly Ledbetter. What it does is not wishful thinking, but the real deal, where employers would be prohibited from retaliation for sharing pay information. Punitive damages would be allowed. So it would be a real deterrent for discriminating on pay. It stops employers from using any reason to pay women less, where they fabricate: ''Oh, he is the head of the household,'' or whatever.

I also then remind my colleagues that in addition to what it does, I will tell you what it does not do. This bill would not require an employer to cut the salaries of male employees. This bill would not have any criminal penalties in it for refusing to disclose wage information. This bill does not require the government to set salaries for Federal employees or anybody.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Mikulski amendment. The specificity of it makes it corrosive to the privilege of the budget. The budget resolution is focused on expanding economic growth, and that growth comes from new jobs—over 1 million jobs, according to the CBO, if our budget takes full effect.

As the economy grows, putting more people to work is our best strategy to increase pay for women and men. We all want women and men to earn equivalent pay for the same job at the same firm. That is why Congress enacted the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which prohibits discrimination in pay on the basis of gender for substantially similar work. Congress also passed Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act to prohibit businesses from discriminating on the basis of sex. These laws empower women to demand equal pay, and they have. The gap has been narrowing.

I ask Senators to vote no on this amendment because of its specificity. It is corrosive to the privilege of the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 82 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—54

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Sessions
Corker	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 362) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 498

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 498, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for Mr. HATCH.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, saving Social Security will require Congress to work in a bipartisan fashion, but most of all it will require Presidential leadership.

In 2009, President Obama held a fiscal responsibility summit to talk about the need for entitlement reform. During the summit the President said:

> What we have done is kicked this can down the road. We are now at the end of the road and are not in a position to kick it any further. We have to signal seriousness in this by making sure some of the hard decisions are made under my watch, not someone else's.

I agree with what the President said then, even if he hasn't exactly followed his own advice. It is time to roll up our sleeves and get to work.

Every year we delay makes it more difficult to implement gradual reforms to Social Security that will allow us to avoid abrupt changes for future beneficiaries. Delay makes it more difficult for hard-working Americans to gradually adjust their plans and makes it more likely they will be hit with an uncertain blow to benefits or more taxes.

My amendment calls for a reserve fund to allow Congress to consider legislation submitted by President Obama to protect current beneficiaries and save Social Security for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Wyden amendment, which does not seem directed at bipartisan discussion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, this is a very important amendment, and I hope the American people listen carefully to what is in it. As Senator HATCH indicated, it protects current beneficiaries. In other words, they are not going to cut benefits for those currently on Social Security. But if you are 63 years of age, 64 years of age, 65 years of age, watch out. They are going after you.

I would suggest there is a way to extend the solvency of Social Security, and it deals with raising the cap and asking wealthy people to contribute more. We can make Social Security solvent for the next 50 years without cutting benefits for anybody. I urge a ''no'' vote on the Hatch amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 498.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Alexander	Daines	Kirk
Ayotte	Donnelly	Klobuchar
Barrasso	Durbin	Lankford
Bennet	Enzi	Lee
Blumenthal	Ernst	Manchin
Blunt	Feinstein	McCain
Boozman	Fischer	McCaskill
Burr	Flake	McConnell
Cantwell	Gardner	Moran
Capito	Graham	Murkowski
Carper	Grassley	Murphy
Cassidy	Hatch	Murray
Coats	Heitkamp	Paul
Cochran	Heller	Perdue
Collins	Hoeven	Portman
Coons	Inhofe	Reid
Corker	Isakson	Risch
Cornyn	Johnson	Roberts
Cotton	Kaine	Rounds
Crapo	King	Rubio
Sasse	Shelby	Tillis
Schumer	Stabenow	Toomey
Scott	Sullivan	Vitter
Sessions	Tester	Warner
Shaheen	Thune	Wicker

NAYS—24

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Leahy	Sanders
Brown	Markey	Schatz
Cardin	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Nelson	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 498) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 471

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 471, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, for the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, colleagues, Social Security is a promise between workers and seniors that should never be broken, and Social Security benefits ought to be protected and should not be cut.

The Congress needs to take steps to ensure that Social Security can pay full benefits for future generations and must avoid creating artificial roadblocks to the proper use of Social Security trust funds.

The House of Representatives has refused to do that even though Social Security trust funds today have a balance of $2.8 trillion, and should be able to pay all earned benefits until 2033.

Support this amendment. Don't privatize Social Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I know all my colleagues are committed to preserving Social Security. We all want Social Security to be there for today's and tomorrow's seniors. However, the Wyden amendment is not germane to the budget resolution.

The Finance Committee has jurisdiction over the Social Security program, both its benefits and finance structure. The Budget Committee has no purview over the Social Security program.

Moreover, the Wyden amendment instructs the Finance Committee how to write the legislation—language that is inappropriate for a budget resolution. In fact, it is corrosive. It damages the privilege of the budget.

For this reason, I am compelled, as chairman of the Budget Committee, to raise a point of order against the Wyden amendment. I make a point of order that this amendment violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment is very clear, unlike the

Hatch amendment. This amendment says we do not support cuts to Social Security—not for current beneficiaries, not for future beneficiaries. That is what this amendment is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of the act for purposes of this pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Murphy
Bennet	Heitkamp	Murray
Blumenthal	Heller	Nelson
Booker	Hirono	Peters
Boxer	Hoeven	Portman
Brown	Kaine	Reed
Cantwell	King	Reid
Cardin	Kirk	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Collins	Manchin	Shaheen
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Donnelly	McCain	Tester
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—48

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Ayotte	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Flake	Roberts
Blunt	Gardner	Rounds
Boozman	Graham	Rubio
Burr	Grassley	Sasse
Capito	Hatch	Scott
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Crapo	Moran	Vitter
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Paul	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 48.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 357, offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, President Obama's budget has gotten some pretty rough coverage in the media recently. For example, the Los Angeles Times called the President's annual budget ''. . . a strange, almost fictional document.''

An article in Politico said, ''As he prepares to deliver his budget on Monday, President Barack Obama is lurching to the left.''

Another Politico article said, ''It's a progressive's dream version of Obama, untethered from earlier centrist leanings. . . .''

The President's budget has not had a great voting history in the Senate. Since 2011, there were only 2 votes for the President's proposed budget and 1,023 votes against it. This is an opportunity for all Members of the Senate to express their views on President Obama's proposed budget.

I recommend and ask that my colleagues vote no on this budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I don't know whose budget Senator CORNYN is presenting, but it is certainly not the President's budget. The President's budget recommends raising the minimum wage, and that is not in Senator CORNYN's proposal.

The President's budget includes 2 years of free community college. That is what the American people want, and it is not in Senator CORNYN's proposal.

The President's budget talks about a fair tax proposal, not more tax breaks for billionaires, and that is not in Senator CORNYN's proposal.

I will vote no because I am not quite sure what is in Senator CORNYN's proposal, but it is certainly not what President Obama presented to the American people.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 seconds remaining.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I say to my friend that this is the President's proposed budget. Senators can vote yes or no. I am glad to hear the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Senator SANDERS, is going to vote no. I will vote no, and I encourage all Senators to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if Senator CORNYN wishes to bring a proposal that has 2 years of free community college to the floor, which is in the President's budget, I invite my friend to do that.

Is the Senator from Texas up for that?

If Senator CORNYN wants to bring a proposal to raise the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour, which is in the President's budget, I invite my friend to do that.

Will the Senator from Texas introduce that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 1, nays 98, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—1

Carper

NAYS—98

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Ayotte	Gardner	Paul
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Boxer	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Sessions
Coats	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cochran	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Corker	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Thune
Cotton	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Vitter
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Enzi	Mikulski	Warren
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden
Flake	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 357) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 545

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Kirk amendment No. 545.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for Mr. KIRK, proposes an amendment numbered 545.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to reimposing waived sanctions and imposing new sanctions against Iran for violations of the Joint Plan of Action or a comprehensive nuclear agreement)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REIMPOSING WAIVED SANCTIONS AND IMPOSING NEW SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE JOINT PLAN OF ACTION OR A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Iran, which may include efforts to immediately reimpose waived sanctions and impose new sanctions against the Government of Iran for violations of the Joint Plan of Action or a comprehensive agreement on Iran's nuclear program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 412

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 412.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. ROUNDS], for himself and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 412.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service from engaging in closed-door settlement agreements that ignore impacted States and counties)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT CERTAIN CLOSED-DOOR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to environmental laws and citizen suits, which may include prohibitions on the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entering into any closed-door settlement agreement without seeking approval from all State, county, and local governments that would be directly impacted by the agreement, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, my amendment aims to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from entering into settlement agreements without seeking approval from State, county, and local governments that would be affected by the settlement.

All too often, rather than writing and implementing environmental regulations in an open, transparent process, environmental regulations are implemented as the result of citizen suits that establish arbitrary timelines that force the agency to rush through the regulatory process. As a result, regulations that affect all sectors of the economy are implemented without following the proper administrative procedures.

It is unfortunate, but legislating by lawsuit has become commonplace as agencies repeatedly miss deadlines and are challenged by citizen suits alleging improper agency action.

A 2014 report by the Government Accountability Office found that legal mandates do influence an agency's selection of regulatory options. These lawsuits leave inadequate time for agencies to analyze the options available to them. As a result of this shortened timeline, agencies cannot do a proper analysis of proposed regulations. This leads to inadequate time for notice and comment. It keeps the citizens in the dark about economic impacts of significant regulations and does not allow for State and local governments to provide input regarding how these regulations will affect them.

For example, in 2011, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service entered into a settlement agreement with environmental groups that will lead to the potential listing of more than 250 species. Millions of acres across the United States will be impacted. Yet no State or local government was allowed to give input into the process.

Similarly, the Environmental Protection Agency has entered into settlement agreements on issues such as regional haze, which have no impact on public health but cost billions of dollars in impacted States. While the EPA is willing to talk to radical environmental groups in the settlement process, they did not consult with the impacted States or communities.

A vote for this amendment is a vote to say that we should fix this problem and that we make certain that our State and local governments are given a say in settlement agreements that will have impacts within their borders. A vote against this amendment is a vote against transparency and a vote to give radical environmental groups more say in the process than the States or local governments where the impacts actually occur.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor this afternoon to speak about our budget and how the choices we will make over the next few days will reflect our values and priorities.

As someone who has acted as a countywide elected official writing balanced budgets, I have long viewed them as not just a collection of numbers and programs but also really a statement about our basic values and a reflection of what we hold dear. We can say we believe in this or that, but at the end of the day, our budgets tell the true story. Over the last 2 years in this body, following the hard work and leadership of Democratic Senators PATTY MURRAY and BARBARA MIKULSKI, the previous chairs of Budget and Appropriations Committees, we have taken important strides to stabilize our government's finances, invest in our middle class, and protect the most vulnerable among us.

After a few really hard years, our economy has begun to heal and grow again. We are now in the longest period of uninterrupted private sector job growth in our Nation's history—a period in which our businesses have created 12 million new jobs. Today, our national unemployment rate stands at 5.5 percent, and the deficit has fallen nearly two-thirds since the depths of the great recession. At a time when the economies around the world are slowing down, ours remains, relatively speaking, a global bright spot.

We need to continue on this path. We need to invest in this growth. And in my view, it is the wrong time to hit the brakes on our economy's resurgence.

Unfortunately, the budget proposed by Senate Republicans misses the mark and would, I fear, reverse these gains. It denies our basic values by balancing the budget on the backs of the poor and middle class while cutting investments essential for our Nation's competitiveness and future.

It relies on some budget gimmicks to actually increase defense spending while making broad cuts elsewhere, and it uses overly rosy predictions about growth and our debt that has time and again proven false. It does all this while protecting tax breaks for the very wealthiest and corporations at the expense of working families.

It is my hope that we can reach a budget that is responsible, balanced, and fair, that takes stock of our needs today and what the future will demand of us. So I would like to take a few minutes and outline broadly what I think our budget priorities should be.

First, we need a budget that preserves our social safety net by building a circle of protection around the most vulnerable among us and protecting the promises we have made to our seniors. Part of the basic bargain we make in this country is that when one of our neighbors falls on truly hard times,

their country offers a hand up. We need to ensure these basic protections to health care, food, and a home are there for those of our neighbors in deepest need. It is also part of that same bargain that after a lifetime of work, you will be able to retire with dignity and some security. As workers, we all pay in to Medicare and Social Security, and we need to ensure that as future generations of Americans grow up, raise their families, and contribute to our economy, the benefits they have spent their lives paying into will be there for them, just as they were for previous generations.

Yes, we should have a conversation about how to responsibly bring our long-term health care costs under control, but we can't do it the way this budget does, by irresponsibly shifting costs to seniors and the poor.

For retired Delawareans, for instance, the Republican budget would reverse an important reform in the Affordable Care Act and would raise prescription drug costs by an average of $1,100 a year.

Second, just as we are there for each other when times are hard, we must rebound and grow together by making specific and thoughtful investments in our future. We need a budget that understands that without critical investments in infrastructure, research, and science, our economy will struggle to grow and support a strong middle class. We need a budget that invests in our middle class and gives working families a fair shot—an economy that is built on growth and opportunity. These investments in growth are the basic building blocks of our economy. They make up our economic backbone and help create an environment for our Nation's drive and dynamism to flourish.

Growth, however, requires infrastructure. We have a roughly $3.6 trillion infrastructure debt—investments in infrastructure that are due by 2020. Every year we put off investing in our roads, bridges, tunnels, and ports. Every year we fall behind our competitors, and we make it harder for our businesses to grow and create jobs. Growth also requires investing in research and development. Our long-term competitiveness depends on our ability to innovate faster than our competitors. Although businesses already invest a huge amount in R&D, the Federal Government plays a critical role through our national labs, through the manufacturing extension partnership, and other grant programs that either directly invest in or incentivize the research that leads to innovation.

Finally, growth in our country requires ensuring that every child has access to a quality education. It requires making it easier for families to send their kids to college and easier for young people to manage the costs of their college through managing student loans after school, and it requires strengthening the real connection between the classroom and workplace so education can be a sturdier rung to a longer ladder of opportunity.

Throughout our history our middle class has thrived and our economy has been strong when we made these sorts of investments in our economy and middle class. We need a budget that continues those investments.

Finally, we need a budget that lowers our deficit responsibly, in a way that is fair and forward-looking—not on the backs of the middle class and poor and not done in a way that kills jobs and stifles growth. Over the last few years we have done a lot to get our deficit under control, using about three-quarters of spending cuts and about a quarter of increased revenue. We have also benefitted from a steadily growing economy which has lowered our deficit.

As we move forward, we need balanced deficit reduction that preserves our investments in our future and our promises to each other. That will mean raising some revenues by asking the wealthy and corporations to pay a bit more, just as it will mean making hard choices over the long run about the true causes of our deficits and debt.

But let's be clear. We can do this while investing in our future and keeping our promises to our seniors, to our veterans, and to each other. The best way to lower our deficit is to grow our economy. So we need to invest in that growth. After all, an airplane needs an engine to take off, even in strong headwinds.

Over the coming days we will be voting on a wide series of amendments that will say a lot about our values and priorities. I would urge my colleagues to keep in mind that which has always powered our economy and will continue to into the future—an economy that gives families a fair shot and invests in the strength and opportunity of the middle class and those fighting to get into the middle class. That is how we build an economy. I hope we will dedicate ourselves to a budget that will help us do so, far into the future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 423, AS MODIFIED

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 423, as modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. RUBIO] proposes an amendment numbered 423, as modified.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase new budget authority fiscal years 2016 and 2017 and modify outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2022 for National Defense (budget function 050))

On page 14, line 2, strike ''$620,263,000,000'' and insert ''$696,776,000,000''.

On page 14, line 3, strike ''$605,189,000,000'' and insert ''$658,021,000,000''.

On page 14, line 6, strike ''$544,506,000,000'' and insert ''$657,496,000,000''.

On page 14, line 7, strike ''$576,934,000,000'' and insert ''$659,073,000,000''.

On page 14, line 11, strike ''$588,049,000,000'' and insert ''$588,239,000,000''.

On page 14, line 15, strike ''$546,685,000,000'' and insert ''$577,154,000,000''.

On page 14, line 19, strike ''$573,614,000,000'' and insert ''$580,468,000,000''.

On page 14, line 23, strike ''$586,038,000,000'' and insert ''$588,936,000,000''.

On page 15, line 3, strike ''$596,103,000,000'' and insert ''$596,065,000,000''.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, let me begin by saying that I believe defense spending is the most important obligation of the Federal Government. That doesn't mean we throw money away or we put money in places where it doesn't belong or we fund projects that have no utility. But it does mean the most important thing the Federal Government does for America is to defend it.

We have benefitted from the fact that for the last 100 years, America has had the most powerful military force on the planet. This is especially true since the end of the Second World War. There have been times in our history when we tried to save money by cutting back on defense spending, and each and every time, it has forced us to come back later and spend even more to make up for it.

It is interesting to point out that in times in the past when we have taken a peace dividend—this idea that the world is no longer unstable or unsafe and we can now spend less on defense—each and every time, we have had to come back and make up for it later as a new threat emerged. I don't think we can make the argument that this is a time when the world is stable or peaceful. Yet this is a time of dramatic reductions in defense spending.

During this administration, first came the defense cuts of $480 billion over 10 years. Adding insult to injury, by the way, was that the savings found in the defense budget were redirected to already bloated domestic programs.

Secretary Gates wrote in his memoirs about the extent to which he was forced to cut costs, saying: ''[N]o other department had done anything comparable—even proportionally.''

This was then followed by tens of billions more in defense cuts each year through sequestration, which will add up to a total of a trillion dollars over the next decade, despite the warnings of three secretaries of defense and our entire military leadership.

All in all, inflation-adjusted defense spending has declined 21 percent since

2010. Even if we discount the drawdowns in Iraq and Afghanistan, it has still declined by a dangerous 12 percent. This is happening at the same time that China is undergoing the most expansive, most aggressive defense increase in modern history; at a time when Russia, despite being eviscerated by economic sanctions, has held their defense spending largely harmless; at a time when radical Islam around the world—both the rise of ISIS and the existence of Al Qaeda and other groups such as al-Nusra and the Khorasan group and others—poses an ongoing threat to the United States. This at a time when many of our potential adversaries and adversaries, such as North Korea and Iran, are developing long-range rocket capabilities that could reach the continental United States. This is the worst possible time to be reducing our defense spending, and yet that is what we are doing. We are setting ourselves up for danger.

I would recognize that people who have worked hard on this budget have tried to find new ways to address this through contingency funding. I respect the work they have done, and ultimately that may be where we end up. But before we do, it is important for this body to have a serious debate about how we are underfunding defense spending in this country and the dangers it poses for our future.

That is the purpose of this amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to replace the defense numbers in this budget with the projected fiscal year 2016 number from the fiscal 2012 Gates budget. This was the last defense budget, the Gates budget, that was put together solely on the assessment of the threats we face and the requisite military needs to deal with it. It is the budget that the bipartisan congressionally mandated National Defense Panel stated was the minimum required to reverse course and set the military on more stable footing.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from Arkansas, Senator COTTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. I would ask Senator COTTON, who has extensive experience both serving in uniform and here in the Senate as well as in the House, his views on the dangers this poses, the rates that we are reducing military spending, and what it means to the long-term security of the United States.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. I am pleased to offer this amendment with him. I do agree that it is critical we have this debate on what we should be spending on our military. While I respect the work of the Budget Committee, I also call attention to the views of the chairman and the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee on which I sit, that they would spend $577 billion on defense next year, which would eliminate sequestration.

I suggest, as the Senator from Florida did, that we need to look to the views of the National Defense Panel, which did draw from Secretary Gates' fiscal year 2012 budget, projecting into fiscal year 2016. While Secretary Gates had a reputation as a reformer, he had already found $450 billion of savings in the Department of Defense at that time. It is hard to say there is much fat left.

Second, as the Senator from Florida pointed out, that was the last time the Department of Defense engaged in what we should do in this body, which is the budgeting for the military based on the threats we face and the strategy we need, not having a strategy that is driven by the budget.

But that is not enough. As the National Defense Panel said itself, at $611 billion, that projection is not enough. Why is it not enough? Some of the threats the Senator from Florida identified. In the last 4 years, what have we seen? The Islamic State on the rise, rampaging across Iraq and Syria. Iran racing toward a nuclear weapon even as it asserts greater control and dominance over Baghdad, Damascus, Beirut, and now Sanaa.

We have seen Russian revisionism, invading a sovereign country in the heart of Europe, shooting a civilian airliner out of the sky in the heart of Europe, and China on the rise, developing military capabilities that are quite clearly directed against the United States and our allies in the first island chain. That is why we need this debate. That is why we need the military budget the Senator from Florida and I are proposing, because the eyes of the world are upon us, not just our enemies, but our allies as well, wondering if America will not only have the resolve to stand by its commitment but if it will have the capabilities to stand by those commitments, whoever the Commander in Chief may be.

But there is one final important group whose eyes are on this institution this week. It is our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen, and our marines, who are wondering if the elected representatives of the people will stand with them, will provide them the resources they need to be ready, to be trained, equipped, and ready to fight our Nation's wars so they do not have to fight them in the first place.

Earlier today, I had the great benefit of being able to meet with a group of Army majors and captains, the mid-career officers, just like the mid-career noncommissioned officers who are the backbone of our military. Two of those men I started officer candidate school with at Fort Benning 10 years ago this coming Friday, one of whom has been seriously injured.

To a person, they all said that training is down, families are strained, operations are stressed, equipment is overused, and they wanted to know, will the Congress of the United States give them the tools they need to fight and win our country's wars? That is why I am proud to stand here with the Senator from Florida to offer this amendment and say that, yes, we will stand by them. Yes, we will make sure they are ready to fight and win our wars so they do not have to fight them in the first place.

I yield back.

Mr. RUBIO. I would say there is not much to add to what the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out. As he well knows, the importance that we have made to the men and women of our armed services, that is, that we will never put them in a fair fight. It will always be an unfair fight to their advantage. They will be the best trained, best equipped, and best-taken-care of fighting men and women on the planet.

We cannot keep that commitment if we continue to reduce spending on the military and on defense at the rate we are going today.

I would add one more point, that is, that much of the world security today is based upon American military alliances that are built upon American military assurances, so, for example, in the Asia-Pacific region, where the Japanese, the South Koreans, and other allies in the region look to an American umbrella of defense to provide them certainty in the face of real risk, whether it is territorial claims made by China that are illegitimate, or the nuclear threat of North Korea.

Why haven't the South Koreans developed their own nuclear weapons? Because they believe the United States will be there to help them defend themselves. Why have the Japanese never felt compelled to use their technological know-how to build a nuclear program? Because they believe the United States is their ally and will come to their collective self-defense.

These countries do their own spending. The Japanese have a very capable military force and a great force multiplier in the region, despite not being called a military force.

The South Koreans are a very impressive fighting force and have a very courageous history. But that American security alliance in the region is critical to the long-term stability and security of that region, a region where a lot of global growth is happening on the economic front, where 50, 60, 70 percent of global trade and commerce transits through the South and East China Seas.

The U.S. Navy's presence in the region, along with our other branches, is critical for the defense of the region. The same is true with the NATO Alliance in Europe. It relies on American security guarantees. The same is true—if a terrible deal, God forbid, is arrived at by this administration with Iran, our partners and allies in the region, particularly Saudi Arabia and others, are going to look to the United States and say: Well, what are you going to do to help us be protected from an Iranian nuclear weapon, with the missiles they are able to acquire?

So what is going to happen when they turn and we say to them: We are

with you; we are going to be there; We are going to continue to work with you; we are going to continue to live up to our defense capabilities, but we do not have the capabilities to meet our obligations? In essence, you can talk pivoting to Asia, but you have to have something to pivot with. If we have eviscerated our military, we have eviscerated our naval capacity, if we are on pace, as we are now, to have the smallest Air Force and the smallest Navy we have had in a very long time, we can say whatever we want, but our allies will not believe us because we will not have the capabilities to meet it.

The other challenge we have is when we talk about modernization, we are not talking about the Commander in Chief today. When we decide how much money we are going to spend on modernizing our military capabilities, what we are deciding is what are the technologies and tools that are going to be available to a future Commander in Chief in 5, 10, or 15 years.

These innovative systems that we use today that have cut down on civilian casualties, that allow us to improve our targeting, our intelligence-gathering capabilities, that have made the United States the premier fighting force in all of human history—all of those things were developed a decade ago or longer, through years of experimentation and testing, through innovation.

So if we cut back on that now, in 10 years a future Commander in Chief will be faced with a threat to our national security, and will not have the latest, greatest technology on the planet to address it.

What about the asymmetrical capabilities that China and others are developing? Instead of trying to out-aircraft-carrier us, they build weapons to destroy aircraft carriers. As we try to adjust to that threat, what is going to happen in a few years if we do not keep pace?

The absence of a long-range bomber, the need to replace an aging submarine fleet, a Navy that is headed for a catastrophic low number of ships, all of these things need to be confronted, not to mention the fact that we are not modernizing at an efficient and effective rate our nuclear arsenal, which is a key part of our deterrence, in a world where China, Russia, and others have significant stockpiles of weapons, particularly the Russians.

All of those things are important. These are long-range, long-term decisions that will have an impact on a future Congress, on a future Commander in Chief, and on our children and grandchildren, who will be the ones who have to live in that world. I promise you that a world where America is no longer the most capable fighting force on the planet is a world that is more chaotic and less safe.

I look forward to having a debate on this. I encourage my colleagues to rally around these numbers. This is what we should be funding defense at. As my colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, accurately pointed out, and I am honored to work with him on this, strategy should not be driven by defense spending, the defense spending should be driving the strategy. In essence, to put it succinctly, we should not have a strategy that is based on limited resources. We are going to have to do the best we can with limited resources. We should first outline a strategy. This is what the strategy should be for the future of our country to keep us safe. Then we should fund that strategy, not the other way around. That is not what we are doing now. We are setting a dangerous precedent. More importantly, we are putting at risk the national security of this country. Once you have made that decision, it is very difficult to reverse it in a timely way. We have learned this lesson the hard way multiple times in our history. I hope we do not have to it learn it again.

I look forward to working with the Senator from Arkansas on this amendment, and with my colleagues. There is great respect for the work that has gone into this budget, and the work of many others who are equally committed to the national defense of our country. I acknowledge the hard work they have put into finding a solution to get more money into defense, but it is not enough. Everyone knows that. The sooner we deal with this, the safer our country is going to be.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in response to the colloquy that just transpired, I would simply say that for all of the earnest and I am sure sincere spirit behind it, there is no willingness to even close one corporate tax loophole to support our Nation's defense, which I think puts into some context the priority in which that is held as a practical matter, as opposed to a theoretical matter.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to urge this Chamber to wake up to the urgent threat of climate change. I have done this every week the Senate has been in session for nearly 3 years. Today is my 94th time. I have asked my colleagues to heed the warnings from our scientists, from our military and national security professionals, from many of our leading American corporations and executives, from their own home-State universities, and from so many of our faith leaders.

Since it is budget week, we would do well to also consider that for years the Government Accountability Office has placed climate change on its biannual high-risk list of the greatest fiscal challenges facing the Federal Government. But even so, there is no attention from the other side.

This risk is particularly great in coastal areas, such as in my home State of Rhode Island, where sea levels rise ever closer to infrastructure and property, and extreme weather exacts an ever heavier toll. Secretary of the Treasury Lew put it pretty plainly: If the fiscal burden from climate change continues to rise, it will create budgetary pressures that will force hard tradeoffs—larger deficits or higher taxes. And these tradeoffs would make it more challenging to invest in growth, to meet the needs of an aging population, and to provide for our national defense.

My Republican colleagues want to slash spending. Indeed, they have almost a fixation on slashing spending. They say they do not want to leave a financial mess for future generations to bear, but they ignore the need to slash our carbon emissions and don't care a bit about leaving an environmental mess for future generations to bear. They refuse because the polluters and their allies have built a fearsome political machine in Citizens United, and the polluters demand that the Republicans follow their denier script.

Well, unfortunately, nature won't wait for our politics to sort themselves out, and nowhere are these changes occurring more clearly than in our oceans. The changes in our oceans are real, and they are measurable. They follow the laws of biology, of chemistry, and of physics. Our steady flood of carbon pollution has real consequences.

Scientists from the University of California, Stanford, and Rutgers recently published a peer-reviewed paper in Science magazine on marine defaunation. ''Defaunation'' is a big word for the widespread loss of animal life in the ocean. Human activities, they argue, including overfishing, pollution, and carbon emissions, are wiping out sea life. Populations of marine vertebrates, including sea birds, mammals, and turtles, have decreased by an average of 22 percent over the last 40 years. Fish have declined by nearly 40 percent. Major fish species have crashed 90 percent. Coral is having massive bleaching and die-off. We are living, the authors say, in a time of ''empty reefs,'' ''empty estuaries,'' and ''empty bays.''

How is it that carbon pollution changes the ocean environment? Pretty simply, greenhouse gases in the atmosphere trap heat. That is not news. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. Much of that heat goes right into the ocean. Globally, oceans absorb 90 percent of the heat captured by greenhouse gases.

Well, all that heat disrupts marine life. Corals, for example, will expel the algae living in their tissues when water is too warm, causing the coral to turn completely white and die in what is known as coral bleaching.

Other species that aren't stuck in one place like coral are literally swimming away. We have seen fish, accustomed to specific temperatures, migrating to cooler waters. Along the entire Northeast seaboard, the movement

of fish farther north and into deeper waters is well documented. NOAA has even developed tools to allow fisheries managers and scientists to go online and track the movement of different species through time.

I have had fishermen back home tell me they are catching fish their fathers and grandfathers never saw come up in their nets. One Rhode Island fisherman told me: ''Sheldon, it's getting weird out there.'' Forty percent of fishermen in the Northeast reported catching new fish species in places where they wouldn't expect to find them.

In a recent Center for American Progress survey, those who believe climate change is happening outnumber deniers four to one.

Just last week, the Providence Journal, my own home State paper, reported on the continuing loss of ice smelt from the waters of the Northeast. The smelt live in estuaries and bays in the wintertime, once making it a favorite for ice fishermen. But now where the ice-fishing cottages used to cover the ice, there are very few. That fishery has crashed. In Narragansett Bay, the winter flounder fishery has crashed.

From Maine comes a recent news article from our former Republican colleague, Olympia Snowe. It is titled, rather bluntly, ''Lack of Action on Climate Change is Costing Fishing Jobs.'' Senator Snowe reports that the shrimp fishery in the Gulf of Maine was closed this winter for the second year in a row because the shrimp are nowhere to be found.

The shrimp fishery has crashed, and the crash has been precipitous. As recently as 2010, shrimpers in the Gulf of Maine hauled in 12 million pounds of northern shrimp. By the time they had to close the fishery, the catch was down to less than 600,000 pounds. One likely culprit is warming seas. The Gulf of Maine is at the southern end of the shrimp's range, and the Gulf of Maine is warming exceptionally fast. An estimate from the Gulf of Maine Research Institute shows that water temperatures in the gulf rose eight times faster than the global average in recent years.

The rapid changes in the Gulf of Maine are causing things to get strange for the other fisheries as well. Our colleague ANGUS KING has come to the floor repeatedly to describe the northward march of the iconic Maine lobster.

Cod populations in the Gulf of Maine suffered for years from overfishing. Now the cod are struggling to recover as temperatures in the gulf increase. The cod might not return, instead seeking out cooler water elsewhere.

Another scientific fact: Warmer temperatures make oxygen less soluble in water. When oxygen is too low for marine life to flourish, that creates dead zones, which are growing around our oceans in size and in number. If carbon pollution continues at pace, global oxygen levels in the ocean are predicted to drop by more than 3 percent over the century. Do we tell the fish to hold their breath while we wait to wake up?

Carbon pollution also makes the oceans more acidic—another scientific fact. Ocean water has absorbed roughly a quarter of all historic carbon dioxide emissions, driving up the pH level of the oceans at rates not seen in perhaps the last 300 million years. To put 300 million years in context, that is more than 1,000 times as long as our species has been on this planet. We are gambling with very big changes that we have never seen in human time and that are a long way back in geologic time.

Acidifying waters make it harder for animals such as oysters or even the humble pteropod—a main component of the salmon diet—and a lot of other creatures at the base of the oceanic food chain to make their shells and develop properly from juveniles to adults.

Increasingly, those acidic oceans are hurting U.S. shellfish, and shellfish are a $1 billion American industry. More acidic waters have already cost the oyster industry in the Pacific Northwest nearly $110 million, putting 3,200 jobs at risk. The Pacific Northwest is being hit first by ocean acidification, but the effects are expected to be felt hardest in the Northeast—my home—according to a recent article in the journal Nature Climate Change. Conditions in the Northeast will jeopardize the $14 million annual mollusk harvest in my State of Rhode Island, putting my home State's coastal communities at real risk of economic harm.

Bill Mook, president of Mook Sea Farm in Maine, testified before the Environment and Public Works Committee last summer about the decline in oyster larva that he has linked to more acidic water. As he said, delicate shellfish hatcheries are ''canaries in the coal mine,'' the first victims of a growing menace.

Yet we still don't listen. From coast to coast and pole to pole, the oceans are warning us, and we still do not listen. The authors of the Science magazine paper warned that we are headed into ''an era of global chemical warfare'' on the oceans—and we don't listen.

We must wake up to the warnings that are coming from our oceans. The evidence is there for everyone to see. It is a matter of measurement, basic measurements of temperature, of pH, of sea level—real high school science class stuff—that are showing us these changes. Yet we won't listen.

Fishermen in Rhode Island and across the country are already feeling these changes. They see them around them.

Colleagues, if you are not a scientist, go ask the coastal and ocean scientists at your home State university. They will give you the answer.

I conclude by going back to what Senator Snowe wrote:

The loss of Maine's $5 million shrimp fishery should serve as a warning. A similar blow to our $300 million lobster fishery must be avoided at all costs. That will require honest, fact-based discussion and a genuine bipartisan commitment to solutions.

Well, we have had neither around here for a long time. There has been no honest, fact-based discussion, and there has been no bipartisan commitment to solutions. That has to change.

I hope Senator Snowe's fellow Republicans in the Senate will join with us Democrats in that honest, fact-based discussion and in a genuine bipartisan commitment to solutions. I hope our colleagues will unshackle themselves from the fossil fuel industry—which is an industry riddled with appalling conflicts of interest on this subject—and wake the heck up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 388

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 388.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the designation of national monuments)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that State and local governments support designations of national monuments under section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, as a fifth-generation Montanan and avid sportsman, I know firsthand how important Montana's lands and resources are to our economy and our way of life. I also know how important it is for Montanans to play a strong role in the management of these precious parts of our State. In Montana, we understand that our resource use must be done responsibly. We understand the importance of protecting our State's treasures so that future generations may continue to have the same experiences and job opportunities we have today.

We also know that the Montanans who use and live on the land every day best understand how to best protect those resources. But, unfortunately, the Obama administration's persistent efforts to stretch the true intent of the Antiquities Act threatens Montana's ability to manage our State's resources, and it is a trend we are seeing across other States as well.

Too often these unilateral designations completely ignore the needs of the local community—the farmers and ranchers, the sportsmen and small business owners directly impacted by these new designations. My amendment will establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation to ensure States and local governments support national monument designations.

This amendment in no way precludes the President from proposing a national monument. However, any bill or designation that has a potential to impact land management must be locally driven, not spearheaded in Washington, and must have local government and State support as well. This amendment ensures the people affected most by these designations have a seat at the table and their voices are heard.

AMENDMENT NO. 389

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 389.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 389.

Mr. DAINES. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOLDING MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ACCOUNTABLE FOR FAILING TO PASS A BALANCED BUDGET.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I offer amendment No. 389 to the budget resolution to establish a deficit-neutral reserve to hold Members of Congress accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget.

Washington has balanced its budget only five times in the last five decades. Let me say that again. Washington has only balanced its budget five times in the last 50 years. This is completely unacceptable, and it threatens the prosperity of future generations. By strengthening accountability and demanding results, my amendment will help restore fiscal responsibility—I would call it fiscal sanity—in Washington.

I have introduced related legislation—the Balanced Budget Accountability Act—which would terminate the salaries of Members of the House and Senate if their respective Chamber does not pass a balanced budget. Simply put, no balanced budget, no pay. It is time to hold Congress accountable to the taxpayer. It is time to hit the Members of Congress in their pocketbooks if they can't pass a balanced budget.

Chairman ENZI's budget meets this commonsense principle, and by passing my amendment to the budget resolution we will reinforce our commitment to passing similar balanced budgets in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from West Virginia.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, before turning to the budget resolution pending before the Senate this week, I would like to first discuss the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General. Last week, I met with Loretta Lynch to discuss the legality of President Obama's Executive actions and her views concerned me.

President Obama and his administration have a record of overstepping legal authority on immigration, implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and imposing anti-energy regulations. Despite her qualifications, I am not confident that Loretta Lynch will exercise the independence needed to stand up for the proper separation of powers, and I will not support her nomination.

THE BUDGET

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, turning to the budget, I rise in strong support of this resolution that delivers on the promise to balance our budget without increasing taxes. West Virginia families and families across our country understand they cannot continually spend more money than they take in. Each month families have to balance their budgets and decide how to spend their limited resources, make tough choices, set priorities, and account for unexpected expenses.

Unfortunately, annual deficits are routine for the Federal Government, but we have recently endured 4 straight years with an annual deficit of at least $1 trillion. Despite recent drops, our national debt now stands at $18 trillion. That totals more than $56,000 for every American.

American families cannot withstand spending more than they earn from month to month and neither should the Federal Government.

The debate on this budget resolution brings the Senate to an important crossroads. We can choose the President's path, which increases taxes and adds another $6 trillion to our national debt, or we can choose to support the responsible budget on the Senate floor this week. If we fail to make the tough decisions to reduce our Federal spending, we will leave mountains of debt to our children and our grandchildren.

Our first responsibility as leaders should be to leave our country better and stronger for the next generation of Americans. That starts by taking steps to balance our budget, and this budget balances in 10 years.

This budget provides us with the flexibility to address many of the important issues confronting our Nation, including evolving threats from terrorists. When West Virginians hear about ISIS, instability in Yemen, the failing state of Iraq, the first thing we think about is the safety and security of our own families. Terrorism hits close to home, and we must ensure we have the flexibility to fund a strong national defense. Like American families, we must have flexibility to account for unexpected expenses and unexpected threats as they arise.

This budget resolution gives us the ability to pass a long-term highway bill that is paid for. We must invest in our Nation's roads and bridges and do so in a fiscally responsible way.

This budget resolution paves the way for an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program—a bipartisan initiative which will, hopefully, be considered by the Senate in short order. This budget facilitates changes that help our rural hospitals continue to provide critical medical services in their communities.

Our Nation's priorities are reflected in this Nation's budget. I want to draw special attention to the energy provisions in this budget. I have said many times an energy economy is a jobs economy. Energy is at the forefront of many West Virginians' minds, whether we are paying for our monthly energy bill or checking the gas prices.

The production of coal and natural gas accounts for tens of thousands of

jobs in West Virginia. In recent years, we have seen what advances in energy technology can do to broaden energy production and benefit the broader economy. The shale boom has made the United States a leading producer of both oil and natural gas. The benefits are felt by Americans every time they fill their tank and balance their budgets at the end of the month.

In my State of West Virginia, Marcellus shale natural gas production is creating jobs and providing the opportunity to expand downstream manufacturing, but Federal Government policies can hamstring our energy economy by slowing the production and the use of our resources.

West Virginia, unfortunately, has seen that firsthand in our State's coal mining industry, where thousands of jobs have been lost. Just last week, AEP issued layoff notices to employees at three West Virginia powerplants. These closures are years ahead of schedule and the early closures are solely because of the Federal Government's MATS rule.

Yesterday, Patriot Coal announced it was temporarily idling the Paint Creek Complex, which employs 400 workers in West Virginia. Coal-fired plant closures driven by EPA emission regulations were cited as part of the problem.

The upcoming EPA regulations for carbon emissions from powerplants will have an even more devastating impact. Findings from reports by well-respected economic analysis firms show costs could get up to $479 billion over a 15-year period while causing double-digit electricity price increases in 43 States.

Over half of the country's power comes from coal. Yet EPA is predicting that by effectively eliminating one-half of our energy production we will reduce average electricity prices by 8 percent. Well, somehow that just doesn't add up. How does this impact our Federal budget?

An energy economy that works will provide the low-cost, reliable electricity to power our broader economy. By contrast, excessive regulation means fewer people working in my State's energy sector. Higher cost, less-reliable energy is a tax against manufacturing and job growth across the country. That means fewer individuals working, fewer businesses providing jobs, and, ultimately, fewer government revenues.

The budget resolution before us this week recognizes the importance of American energy production. The reserve funds in this budget will improve our energy infrastructure, reform environmental regulations and promote job growth. To supplement the strong energy provisions already in the budget, I have filed several amendments to strengthen our energy security.

Last year, the administration reached a climate agreement with China. That agreement requires short-term carbon emission reductions in the United States, but China is allowed to continue increasing its carbon emissions until 2030. That disparity could place the United States at a significant economic disadvantage.

My amendment would block any international environmental agreement that would result in serious harm to the U.S. economy.

I have also filed an amendment that would block EPA from finalizing, proposing or issuing any regulation that would reduce the reliability of the electricity grid. Our economy relies on electricity being available. Families expect the lights will come on when they flip the switch. They expect to have heat in the winter and air-conditioning in the summer. This simple amendment says no regulation from EPA can imperil access to reliable electricity. That makes sense to me.

I urge my colleagues to support the balanced budget that is before the Senate this week, including these amendments, and to support policies that will allow our economy to benefit from America's vast energy resources. The jobs and the revenues that come from energy production can play a significant role in a responsible Federal budget.

The American people elected us to make government more efficient, effective, and accountable. American families must live within a budget, States must adhere to a budget, and it is time for the Federal Government to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

THE BUDGET AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to talk tonight about one issue: the issue of children. But I wish to speak about that one issue in two separate contexts: One is the budget we are debating now and will continue to vote on all week and the second is with regard to the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Let me start with the premise that I believe those of us who were elected to both Houses of the Congress and in both parties are charged with a basic responsibility to our children. It doesn't matter where we live or what State we represent or what district, in the case of the House, I believe we are charged with that responsibility.

A long time ago, Hubert Humphrey, who served in this Chamber for many years and was well known across the country, set forth a moral test for government. He talked about the moral test being how government treats those in the dawn of life, those in the shadow of life, and those in the twilight of life. Of course, in speaking of the dawn of life, we are talking about children. That test is still appropriate and we should try our best to adhere to it in terms of public policy, especially when it comes to the budget.

The budget, of course, is a reflection of who we are as a country and what our values are. It is in a sense a mirror into which we look or should be looking to see who we are. And if we are not setting forth policy and being strong advocates for our children, we may as well not be here. So I think there is a test that each one of us must face when it comes to what we are doing on behalf of children.

I also believe in a very real sense that the programs, the strategies, the expenditures we make on behalf of children are in fact an investment—an investment in the long-term economy of the United States. This isn't just the right thing to do; it is also the best thing we could do for a growing economy and for our fiscal situation years from now. If kids are healthier, they will get better jobs. If they learn more when they are younger, they are going to earn more when they are older. That is not just a rhyme, it is true, and all the studies show it. So I believe this budget debate is a time to reflect upon what will happen to our children. I have real concerns about the budget as it relates to children.

Again, these are in our society the folks who are powerless and in many cases voiceless. They are not voting, they don't have a lobbyist, they don't have a high-paid strategist or voice for their needs. Because they are powerless and because they are in a sense voiceless, it is up to us to speak on their behalf—and we speak with our votes, we speak with our work.

So what is the proposal in this budget? Let me work through some of the numbers.

According to one of the leading advocacy organizations in the United States, First Focus, discretionary investments make up nearly one-third of all Federal investments that go to children. So what we do on the discretionary part of the budget—which, by definition, because it is discretionary, we have decisions to make about it year after year. Because of that, we have to be very careful when it comes to these decisions—whether it is the budget resolution, whether it is the authorization process, or whether it is in fact the appropriations process. This funding, this so-called discretionary, nonmandatory—if I can call it that—part of the budget includes programs such as Head Start, childcare assistance, housing support, special education, to name a few examples that have a direct and substantial impact upon our children.

The Republican budget we are debating this week cuts $236 billion over 10 years in the nondefense discretionary part of the budget. Nondefense discretionary is a long way of saying the part of the budget that we vote on and we will have votes on that relate to the appropriations. So $236 billion over 10 years is the cut. That cut, I would argue, falls disproportionately in a substantial way upon children.

What do these cuts mean for children and for families? Of course, we cannot separate one from the other. We will

look at Head Start, and 35,000 children will be cut from Head Start—some 1,250 fewer children in a State like Pennsylvania, just by example for one State. What are we going to gain? How better off would the country be with 35,000 fewer kids in Head Start? I don't think we are going to be better off. I think we are worse off if we do that. It makes no sense. This is a program that has been in existence for 50 years. It has helped a lot of children succeed.

The State director from my office in Pennsylvania, who just left our staff recently and served with distinction, Ed Williams, was a Head Start kid. I meet people all the time in our State who are leading very successful lives in the private sector or public sector. Ed is just one example of having had the benefit of Head Start to get a head start in life because of disadvantages that certain children face.

How about students with disabilities, a $347 million cut to funding for students with disabilities, which means a little more than $12 million less for Pennsylvania children with disabilities.

How about housing, 133,000 nationwide fewer housing vouchers. In Pennsylvania, that adds up to 620 families who, if they had those vouchers, would be able to afford decent and safe housing. What are we getting for fewer families who have access to housing vouchers? Again, it is not an experimental program. It is a program that we know works, a program that has been in existence for a long time to help folks.

We know when we invest early in a child's life, we see a great return on investment. All the studies show this. It is irrefutable: If you spend a buck, you get a lot more than a buck back. By some estimates, the bang for the buck is in the double figures. In one study on early learning, we get $17 back for the $1 spent.

I mentioned before that if we make investments in children in terms of their early learning, they will in fact learn more now and earn more later. That is what we should be focused on when it comes to our children, when it comes to their ability to succeed in school and, of course, when it comes to their ability to get a good job and be part of a growing economy.

The budget proposal makes deep cuts in many other investments to protect our most vulnerable children, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the so-called SNAP program that we used to call food stamps. That, of course, provides nutrition aid. If we were doing the right thing as a nation—and we are not there yet, even though we have made some progress on some fronts—we would make sure children have enough to eat. That would be one pillar of our protection for children. We are not there yet, but the SNAP program helps substantially on that. We would make sure they have early learning opportunities. I talked about that and will talk about it more. We would make sure they have access to health care. That is why we have Medicaid for poor children, that is why we have the Children's Health Insurance Program for others, and that is why so many private sector companies provide health care that, of course, covers children of their employees. But if we are doing at least those three things—early learning, food security or food and nutrition, as well as health care—we are going to be doing what is right for our children.

I would argue we have to examine this budget and apply a kids' test—not a special interest test, not a lobbyist test, not a who-is-powerful test, not a test about who has the most to gain from this budget, but who might have to most to lose, and one of those groups, I would argue, is our children.

When it comes to the SNAP program, according to Feeding America—another great advocacy group—nearly half of all SNAP participants are children. And according to another organization we rely upon for analysis, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, investments in SNAP lifted 2.1 million children out of poverty in 2013.

So why would we cut a program like that, that would disproportionately and adversely impact our children? What do we gain from that as a country? What do we gain when fewer and fewer children are helped with a nutrition program that will make sure they have enough to eat?

In addition to SNAP, the Republican budget would roll back significant progress we have made for children who qualify for the child tax credit or the earned-income tax credit. If the improvements to these credits are allowed to lapse, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that 1 million children will fall back into poverty. I think people in both parties would argue that these two—and maybe especially the earned-income tax credit—are one of the best, some would argue the best—the best—poverty reduction strategies we have ever had in place in our policy.

I think if the earned-income tax credit is keeping children out of poverty, we should make sure it remains in place and remains a tax strategy that can help prevent 1 million children from falling back into poverty.

We should also be using the Tax Code to help working families rise into the middle class, those families who may not be there yet but can rise into the middle class. But instead, the Republican budget does nothing to prevent tax increases, averaging $1,100 for 12 million families and students paying for college, and $9,000 for 16 million working families with children. That makes no sense for those families or for those children.

As many as 486,000 Pennsylvania families could benefit from the earned-income tax credit, the child tax credit and the opportunity tax credit of 2015—all good ideas, all impacted adversely by the budget.

Finally, I will conclude with Medicaid. Medicaid for some people is some program far away that they don't think affects their lives. A lot of families—lower income families, middle-class families, even—benefit from the long-term care part of Medicaid. A lot of families may not know that Medicaid is the reason that their mother, father, or loved one could be in a nursing home.

What does it mean for kids? Medicaid for so many children, millions of them, is the only health care they have. The good news is that it is very good health care for a lot of children. They get access to early periodic screening and diagnostic testing. So they get the screening and the testing they need so we can provide the kind of health care that child needs, but we cannot provide unless we do that screening for those children. It provides quality health care for millions of children in the country. We should remember that when people make proposals around here to slash Medicaid, some by hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade, that it is a direct hit—a direct hit on children.

Based on calculations from the White House, the Republican budget proposal would block-grant Medicaid funding to Pennsylvania by more than $41 billion over 10 years. I don't know how the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or any State is going is to be better off when Medicaid is block-granted, sent back to the States, hoping—just hoping—that maybe the States can pick up the cost. That makes no sense. Our State is going to be worse off if we lose $40 billion, or even a number lower than that, over the next 10 years on Medicaid.

By one estimate last fall, 47 percent of children who live in rural areas are the beneficiaries of either Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program. So when those folks talk about cutting Medicaid or not doing what I hope we can do—which is to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program for the next 4 years, not only 2—they should remember that 47 percent of rural children benefit from those programs.

When it comes to Medicaid, children may only make up 20 percent of the cost of Medicaid, but half of the enrollees in Medicaid are children. So they might only be 20 percent of the cost, but they are half of the enrollees.

We know that Medicaid was created 50 years ago. The government put forth a promise, which is somewhat of the test I started with about children in the dawn of their life. The promise was to ensure that the most vulnerable members of society had access to health care, a pretty simple promise and pretty easy to understand our obligation when we recite that promise.

So whether it is our kids, whether it is older Americans who need to get nursing home care, or whether it is Americans and many of them children with disabilities, Medicaid ensures that access to health care. Medicaid is the promise we must keep to folks who need nursing home care, to children

who are poor and may not have health insurance without Medicaid, and of course to individuals with disabilities. So we have a long way to go to prove that we are keeping that promise.

Mr. President, I will conclude with some thoughts about the Children's Health Insurance Program. We all know this is not only a bipartisan program but a very successful program. From 1997, when it was enacted, to the year 2012, the uninsured rate for children fell by half—from 14 percent to 7 percent—across the country, a remarkable achievement. It means we are not there yet because we still have 7 percent who are uninsured, but that is a substantial step forward and a substantial measure of progress for the country.

This program, the Children's Health Insurance Program, along with Medicaid, is helping to reduce disparity in health coverage affecting low-income children across the country. Without legislative action to extend funding beyond September 30 of this year, over 10 million children across America are at risk of losing their comprehensive, affordable—I will say that again, comprehensive and affordable quality care, including, by one estimate, 270,000 children in Pennsylvania. About 2 million of the children currently enrolled in CHIP would likely end up uninsured while the others would face higher premiums and higher out-of-pocket costs. We should do the right thing and make sure we have funding in place for 4 years for the Children's Health Insurance Program, not just 2 years.

Unfortunately, what we are hearing from the proposal sent to us from the House is that the 4-year commitment is only 2 years. So we have a lot of work to do. I believe the right thing to do on CHIP is to enact what Senate Democrats have proposed—a 4-year so-called clean extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program as soon as possible, and that is S. 522. That would be the right thing to do.

We can give speeches and talk a lot about how we all support kids, and it is nice to say that and it is nice to vote once in a while for programs and strategies that help kids, but I believe the test is a lot tougher than that. The test will come on this budget vote—a test on whether we support children. If we are cutting Medicaid by hundreds of billions of dollars over the next 10 years, if we are cutting the SNAP program by tens of billions of dollars or more, maybe even higher than that over the next 10 years, and if we are not doing the right thing on children's health insurance—and I could go down a longer list—then we are not doing what we need to do for children. They don't have lobbyists, they don't give campaign contributions, they don't have power, and they may be voiceless, but we have an obligation in both parties and in both Houses to be their voice. But I am afraid we are headed down a road with a budget that harms children substantially, and I hope that over the next couple of days we will make the right decisions for our children.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. CASEY. I will.

F–35 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I support the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter. I believe this is a critical defense acquisition program which will greatly strengthen not only our national security, but that of our closest allies and partners.

The F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Program began more than 20 years ago. In an age where emerging technologies are introduced daily and where we have become accustomed to instant gratification, we sometimes grow impatient with how long it takes to achieve war-winning capabilities—and we should. Yet today, the F–35 stands on the threshold of being used effectively and decisively in operational missions.

During its journey, the Joint Strike Fighter Program Office has encountered its fair share of setbacks, and—at times—faulty leadership decisions by those in government as well as those in the private sector. From the Pentagon itself, we heard the accusation of ''acquisition malpractice.''

The senior Senator from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, has repeatedly pointed out these shortfalls and missteps. I echo his frustrations.

In response to the accusations and grievances about the F–35 program, one could have just thrown one's hands up in frustration. Yet through the renewed determination of the F–35's Joint Strike Program Office under the leadership of Lt. Gen. Christopher Bogdan, what once was the poster child for acquisition reform has reached vital milestones and will soon be used by our combat forces.

During his tenure, General Bogdan has demanded and achieved greater performance and accountability among his own staff and his industry partners. He has established and is executing a corrective plan. With that said, there is still much more to do. The problems General Bogdan and the collective F–35 team are overcoming did not occur in an instant, nor will they be fixed in an instant.

Accordingly, today, I call on my colleagues to support the F–35 and provide the F–35 Program Office with the backing it needs to achieve critical future milestones.

In addition, the Congress must continue to challenge the Department, the F–35 Program Office, and the program's industrial partners to reduce not only each aircraft's initial purchase price, but the cost of using and maintaining this strike fighter in the decades that follow. As history teaches us, upwards of 80 percent of the total ownership costs of a weapon system resides not in the purchase price, but in its use and resulting maintenance. This means the Department must pay critical attention now to the development and execution of a robust F–35 sustainment strategy to ensure long term costs are reduced.

We must also not forget the current purchase price of the F–35 exceeds $110 million per aircraft. It is inevitable that the price of the F–35 will come down as the numbers of aircraft produced goes up. But the quest for price reduction must be central to our current and future efforts if we are to be able to procure the number of aircraft required to properly execute our deterrent strategies and, if necessary, war plans. Indeed, price will have a dramatic effect on the ability of our allies to purchase the F–35. Therefore, I challenge both the Department and our defense contractors to work toward achieving what many experts agree is an obtainable goal: a procurement price of less than $80 million per aircraft, and as close to $60 million per aircraft as possible. If we do this, the current program of record for more than 3,000 aircraft will naturally increase. My personal desire would be to see over 6,000 of these aircraft safeguarding our precious liberties and those of our allies.

This is an ambitious objective, but it is based upon achieving what is best for America and its allies. And I believe everyone in the Department of Defense, the F–35 Program Office, and, yes, the employees of our Nation's defense contractors have this as their central goal.

Therefore, I am reminded of a story from our history about the industrialist Collis Potter Huntington. He was one of the so-called ''Big Four'' of the western railroads during the late 1800s and built the Central Pacific Railroad as part of the first transcontinental railroad. He also led and developed other interstate lines such as the Southern Pacific Railroad and the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, known simply as the C&O. As Huntington furthered the C&O's extension through the Virginia peninsula, he opened the pathway for West Virginia's coal industry to reach the coal piers in the harbor of Hampton Roads. Seeing a need for export shipping, he started the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company in 1886.

Huntington started a long tradition of superb shipbuilding, and he is also credited with giving the shipyard its motto. The motto simply states: ''We will build good ships here. At a profit if we can. At a loss if we must. But always good ships.'' This motto is emblazoned on a plaque and fixed to a granite monument at one of the entrances to the yard. This motto defined the mindset of generations of ship builders at the yard.

In 1968, the privately held Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company merged with another company. Thereafter, the ''Good Ship'' monument was removed due to its misalignment with the ''new'' company's goals.

As a testament to the character of the workers who built many of our Nation's great warships, the shipyard almost came to a standstill, leading to the monument's eventual return.

The ''Good Ship'' motto is a lesson for us all, but especially for the F–35 Program Office and its industry partners. We should all rally around a ''Good Strike Fighter'' motto. After all, these jets are being built for our men and women in uniform, to protect our rights and liberties as well as those of our allies.

The fighting spirit of the United States and her allies can enable the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter to emerge from its challenges like the mythical phoenix: reborn, regenerated and renewed. But for this to succeed, we must commit ourselves to excellence—in essence, the ''Good Strike Fighter'' motto. The war fighter, the American people, our allies and partners, and the whole free world are depending on it.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

We're here today to review the president's fiscal year 2016 budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration, which is a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy that is responsible for managing our nuclear weapons stockpile, reducing global dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction, and providing the Navy with safe and effective nuclear propulsion.

This is the subcommittee's third hearing this year on the president's budget request, and I look forward to hearing our witnesses' testimony.

The NNSA, has an important national security mission, but faces many challenges. That's why we need to do what we were sent here to do—to govern.

Governing is about setting priorities, and we are going to have to make some hard decisions this year to make sure the highest priorities are funded.

The president's 2016 budget request for defense spending is about $38 billion higher than what is allowed under the spending caps in the Budget Control Act.

In fact, if spending this year is consistent with the Budget Control Act, fully funding NNSA's budget request alone would require almost the entire increase in defense spending for all defense programs—including the Department of Defense.

We will work with Senator Cochran and Senator Mikulski to increase the subcommittee's defense spending allocation, but we're going to need your help to understand the NNSA's most urgent priorities, and that is why we are holding this hearing.

I'd like to focus my questions on three main areas, all with an eye toward setting priorities:

Keeping large construction projects on time and on budget; Senator Feinstein and I have worked pretty hard on that.

Effectively maintaining our nuclear weapons stockpile; and

Supporting our nuclear Navy.

The NNSA is responsible for three of the largest construction projects in the federal government: the Uranium Processing Facility in Tennessee; the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility in South Carolina; and the Plutonium Facility in New Mexico.

Combined, these projects could cost as much as $20 billion dollars to build, and over the past four years, Senator Feinstein and I have worked hard with the NNSA to keep costs from skyrocketing and to make sure hard-earned taxpayer dollars are spent wisely. We need to make sure these projects are on time and on budget.

Senator Feinstein and I have focused much of our oversight on the Uranium Processing Facility, because costs had increased every time we would get a status update.

Three years ago, we began holding regular meetings with the NNSA administrator and his team.

We said we wanted 90 percent design completed before we began construction and urged the NNSA to take aggressive steps to get costs under control.

The administrator asked Thom Mason, the laboratory director for Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee to head a Red Team to review the project. The result of that review may be a model for how to keep these kinds of projects on time and on budget.

The Red Team's report included 17 recommendations, nearly all of which the NNSA has now adopted, to keep the uranium facility within a $6.5 billion budget with completion by 2025.

Based on these recommendations, the Uranium Facility will now consist of at least two buildings—one with high security and one with less security—with construction of these buildings to begin once their design is at 90 percent.

As I understand it, NNSA recently completed a portion of the site preparation for this project under budget by $10 million. That's a good start, but there's a lot more work to be done.

I'm going to ask you more today about the uranium facility, particularly about your schedule for completing the design and when you anticipate construction can begin.

I also want to ask you about how you are applying the lessons we learned from the Red Team Review Team and to the other big construction projects, and look forward to any updates you can provide.

General Klotz, I know you plan to go to Tennessee tomorrow to see the progress on this project. I appreciate your hands-on approach to making sure this important project is delivered on time and on budget.

Another large portion of the budget request is the work NNSA is doing to maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile, and I want to make sure we are spending taxpayer dollars effectively.

The budget request includes $1.3 billion to continue the four ongoing life extension programs, which fix or replace components in weapons systems to make sure they're safe and reliable.

These life extension programs are needed but they are very expensive, and I will ask you today whether you will be able to meet your production deadlines on time and on budget.

Naval Reactors is responsible for all aspects of the nuclear reactors that power submarines and aircraft carriers. Naval Reactors is currently designing a new reactor core that will not need to be refueled during the life of the ship.

This work will save taxpayers billions of dollars because we won't have to build two extra submarines to make up for those that are not in service when they are being refueled.

The small nuclear reactors that Naval Reactors designs have had an impeccable safety record for more than 60 years; there has never been a reactor accident.

I also want to hear more about your plans for storing the Navy's used nuclear fuel.

We talked a lot in our hearing last week with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission about Yucca Mountain and storing used nuclear fuel from commercial reactors, and I'd like to hear from you how this issue impacts your operations.

With that, I would recognize Senator Feinstein to make her opening statement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LINDA HODGDON

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I congratulate New Hampshire commissioner of administrative services Linda Hodgdon on her retirement and to recognize her nearly 30 years of dedicated public service to New Hampshire and our Nation.

Commissioner Hodgdon has distinguished herself as an extraordinary public servant. Linda's administrative and analytic talent, commitment to the prudent use of tax dollars, and her exceptional work ethic resulted in her holding increasingly challenging and responsible positions throughout New Hampshire's State government. She started her service in 1985 as a financial analyst in the Governor's office, and has since served in various positions with the Department of Transportation, Department of Health and Human Services, as well as the Department of Justice. In 2008 she was appointed to serve as the commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services. Throughout her career serving the people of New Hampshire, Linda has earned a reputation for her exemplary commitment to fulfilling the fiduciary duty we all have to spend tax dollars wisely, and she has worked to boost efficiency and increase accountability.

On a personal note, I had the opportunity to work with Linda when she served as the director of administration for the New Hampshire Department of Justice from 2004 to 2006. During my tenure as attorney general I came to value and greatly appreciate Linda's work managing our budget and many other administrative functions within the office. Her skill, dedication, and hard work played an integral role in the success the office enjoyed. When Linda took on a task you knew it would be done thoroughly, professionally, and on time. Linda was a trusted member of my leadership team, who was greatly appreciated by all of the members of the office.

As Commissioner Hodgdon retires from public service, I commend her on a job well done. The government of the State of New Hampshire and the lives of the people of our State are better off because of her exemplary service. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking

Linda for her service and wishing Linda, her husband Mark, and their daughter well in all future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN ANDY BLOMME, COMMANDER DANIEL WALSH, AND LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ROBERT POTTER

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize CAPT Andy Blomme, Chief of Congressional Affairs for the U.S. Coast Guard; CDR Daniel Walsh, U.S. Coast Guard Senate Liaison; and LCDR Robert Potter, U.S. Coast Guard Deputy Senate Liaison, for all of the hard work they have done for me, my staff, and other members of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee over the past several years.

Captain Blomme graduated from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1985. His illustrious, 30-year career includes nearly 12 years of sea duty and command of three Coast Guard cutters, command of Coast Guard Sector Jacksonville, FL, and service as Military Assistant to the Secretary of Homeland Security during the terms of Secretary Chertoff and Secretary Napolitano.

Commander Walsh graduated from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1993. His distinguished career includes service aboard U.S. and allied vessels, multiple assignments as a Coast Guard aviator, and service as Military Aide to the President of the United States during the terms of President George W. Bush and President Barack Obama. Commander Walsh will next assume the Coast Guard Service Chair at the National War College in Washington, DC where he will serve as a service representative and instructor.

Lieutenant Commander Potter graduated from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1999. His noteworthy career includes 2 years aboard the Coast Guard Cutter Hamilton, operational assignments at two air stations, and service as an MH–60T flight examiner at the U.S. Coast Guard Aviation Training Center in Mobile, AL. Lieutenant Commander Potter will be assigned to U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Diego where he will serve as the sector response chief.

I congratulate Captain Blomme and thank him for his selfless and dedicated service to our Nation. I wish him and his family all the best in their future endeavors following his retirement from the Coast Guard this spring.

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Commander Walsh and Lieutenant Commander Potter for all of the fine work they have done and for their continued service to our Nation. I wish them further success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:46 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 233. An act to allow reviews of certain families' incomes every 3 years for purposes of determining eligibility for certain Federal assisted housing programs.

H.R. 360. An act to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended by Public Law 114–6, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate jointly reappoint the following individuals on March 23, 2015, each to a 2-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Mr. Alan V. Friedman of Los Angeles, California, Ms. Susan S. Robfogel of Rochester, New York, and Ms. Barbara Childs Wallace of Ridgefield, Mississippi.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 233. An act to allow reviews of certain families' incomes every 3 years for purposes of determining eligibility for certain Federal assisted housing programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 360. An act to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–995. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2-Propenoic Acid, Polymer with Ethenyl Acetate, Ethenylbenzene, 2-ethylhexyl 2-propenoate and ethyl 2-propenoate; Tolerance Exemption'' (FRL No. 9923–63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–996. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Sodium L-lactate and Sodium DL-Lactate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9924–24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–997. A communication from the Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's biennial strategic plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–998. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department of Defense 2015 Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Annual Reports (MARs) and an index of the 39 MARs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–999. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Housing Trust Fund'' (RIN2590–AA73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1000. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules'' (FCC 15–28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1001. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Significant New Uses of Metal Salts of Complex Inorganic Oxyacids'' ((RIN2070–AB27) (FRL No. 9924–09)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1002. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California; Regional Haze Progress Report'' (FRL No. 9924–64–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1003. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9924–99–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1004. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Reporting Emission Data, Emission Fees and Process Information'' (FRL No. 9924–44–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1005. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Preconstruction Requirements—Nonattainment New Source Review'' (FRL No. 9924–57–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1006. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Laboratory Investigations of Soils and Rocks for Engineering Analysis and Design of Nuclear Power Plants'' (Regulatory Guide 1.138, Revision 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1007. A joint communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and

the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1008. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 report of the Department of Health and Human Services' Federal Coordinated Health Care Office; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1009. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Submission of Evidence in Disability Claims'' (RIN0960–AH53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1010. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–153); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1011. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–151); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1012. A communication from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas'' (RIN3206–AN10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1013. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes to Implement the Hague Agreement Concerning International Registration of Industrial Designs'' (RIN0651–AC87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1014. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report relative to the Conference's Article III judgeship recommendations and corresponding draft legislation for the 114th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1015. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report relative to bankruptcy judgeship recommendations and corresponding draft legislation for the 114th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1016. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Amendments to Regulation Listing Substances Temporarily Controlled under Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act'' (Docket No. DEA–406) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nomination of Col. Randall Reed, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Brian J. Mennes, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Mark A. Ediger, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Gen. Robin Rand, to be General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Jeffrey B. Clark, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Ronald J. Place, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nomination of Brig. Gen. Burke W. Whitman, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. Michael F. Fahey III, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Craig C. Crenshaw and ending with Brig. Gen. Craig Q. Timberlake, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. Paul K. Hurley, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Timothy J. Kadavy, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Stephen J. Townsend, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Tammy L. Miracle, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Maria C. Powers, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Capt. John G. Hannink, to be Rear Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Arnold W. Bunch, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Stephen W. Wilson, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr., to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Michael T. Franken, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Joseph P. DiSalvo, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. John W. Baker and ending with Brig. Gen. Flem B. Walker, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 19, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. Ronald P. Clark, to be Brigadier General.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Korey E. Amundson and ending with Christopher L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2015. (minus 1 nominee: Rhys William Hunt)

Air Force nominations beginning with Christopher M. Abbott and ending with Christopher G. Zummo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Nicole H. Armitage and ending with Shannon G. Womble, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Army nomination of Jacinto Zambrano, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Cheryl D. Anderson and ending with Carlton G. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Eugene S. Alkire and ending with Patrick R. Staresina, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2015.

Army nomination of Jacob A. Johnson, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Patrick Mascarenhas, to be Major.

Army nomination of Debra Mayers, to be Major.

Army nomination of Dwaipayan Chakraborti, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Eric B. Hintz and ending with Bart D. Wilkison, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Army nomination of Kathryn A. Spletstoser, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Rachel S. Theisen, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Robert A. Blessing and ending with Paul L. Minor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 19, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Joanne S. Martindale and ending with Charles Yost, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 19, 2015.

Army nomination of James L. Boggess, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Andrew J. Copeland and ending with Brian A. Lionbarger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sean M. Miller and ending with Joseph B. Powell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2015.

By Mr. BARRASSO for the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. McCAIN):

S. 842. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to extend Interstate Route 11; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. NELSON, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 843. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 844. A bill to repeal the medical device excise tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 845. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to implement security measures in the electronic tax return filing process to prevent tax refund fraud from being perpetrated with electronic identity theft; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 846. A bill to require Federal agencies to review certain rules and regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 847. A bill to prohibit the intentional hindering of immigration, border, and customs controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 848. A bill to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 849. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 850. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 851. A bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 852. A bill to provide that employment-related arbitration agreements shall not be enforceable with respect to any claim related to a tort arising out of rape; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 853. A bill to improve the efficiency and reliability of rail transportation by reforming the Surface Transportation Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 854. A bill to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 855. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to permit Governors of States to regulate intrastate endangered species and intrastate threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 856. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require criminal background checks for school employees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 108. A resolution commemorating the discovery of the polio vaccine and supporting efforts to eradicate the disease; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 109. A resolution acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 110. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate about a strategy for the Internet of Things to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 182

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) 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. 194

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 194, a bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies.

S. 226

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 483

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 483, a bill to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 614

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 614, a bill to provide access to and use of information by Federal agencies in order to reduce improper payments, and for other purposes.

S. 615

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 646

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 646, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health screening before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 665, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 694

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S.

694, a bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old children employed in logging or mechanized operations from child labor laws.

S. 698

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 698, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 753

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 802, a bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes.

S. 811

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 811, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require States to develop policies on positive school climates and school discipline.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 828, a bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 323

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 323 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 329

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 329 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 331

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 331 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 334

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 334 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 342

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 342 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 344

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 344 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 346

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 346 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 347

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 347 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 347 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 348

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 348 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 854. A bill to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in introducing the Nuclear Waste Administration Act, a bill to establish a national nuclear waste policy.

This bipartisan legislation, which has been years in the making, is also cosponsored by Senators MARIA CANTWELL, LISA MURKOWSKI, and LAMAR ALEXANDER.

This legislation represents our best attempt to establish a workable, long term nuclear waste policy for the United States, something our Nation lacks today. It does so by implementing the unanimous recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.

First, the bill would create a new independent entity, the Nuclear Waste Administration, with the sole purpose of managing nuclear waste.

Second, the bill would authorize the siting and construction of two types of waste facilities: permanent repositories for disposal and interim facilities for storage, including a pilot facility prioritizing waste from shut down reactors.

Third, the bill creates a consent-based siting process for both storage facilities and repositories, based on other countries' successful efforts.

The legislation requires that local, tribal, and State governments must consent to host waste facilities by signing incentive agreements, assuring that waste is only stored in the States and communities that want and welcome it.

Fourth, the bill would resume collection of the nuclear waste management fees from nuclear power ratepayers at a rate of 1/10 of a cent per kilowatt-hour, or about $750 million annually, and would rededicate these revenues to the Nuclear Waste Administration to fund construction of waste facilities.

Finally, the legislation ensures the Nuclear Waste Administration will be held accountable for meeting Federal responsibilities and stewarding Federal dollars.

The Nuclear Waste Administrator will be appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate. The administration will be overseen by a five-member Nuclear Waste Oversight Board, modeled on the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and will have an Inspector General. The administration will collect fees from nuclear utilities to pay for the development of storage and disposal facilities; those fees will be immediately available without appropriation, unless otherwise limited in an appropriations or authorization act. The current balance of the Nuclear Waste Fund, now valued at $32 billion, will be available by appropriation only. Finally, if the agency fails to open a nuclear waste facility by 2025, fees paid by utilities will cease to be collected.

The United States has 99 operating commercial nuclear power reactors that supply 1/5 of our electricity and 3/5 of our emissions-free power.

However, production of this nuclear power has a significant downside: it produces nuclear waste that will take hundreds of thousands of years to decay. Unlike most nuclear nations, the United States has no program to consolidate waste in centralized facilities.

Instead, we leave the waste next to operating and shut down reactors sitting in pools of water or in cement and steel dry casks. Today, nearly 74,000 metric tons of nuclear waste is stored at commercial reactor sites. This total grows by about 2,000 metric tons each year.

In addition to commercial nuclear waste, we must also address waste generated from having created our nuclear weapons stockpile and from powering our Navy.

The byproducts of nuclear energy represent some of the nation's most hazardous materials, but for decades we have failed to find a solution for their safe storage and permanent disposal. Most experts agree that this failure is not a scientific problem or an engineering impossibility; it is a failure of government.

Although the Federal Government signed contracts committing to pick up commercial waste beginning in 1998, this waste program has failed to take possession of a single fuel assembly.

Our government has not honored its contractual obligations. We are routinely sued, and we routinely lose. So today, the taxpayer is paying power plants to store the waste at reactor sites all over the Nation. This has cost us $4.5 billion so far, and our liability continues to grow each day. The lack of action is estimated to cost taxpayers another $22.6 billion between now and 2065 if the government can start taking possession of waste in 2021. Further delays will only increase these costs.

We simply cannot tolerate continued inaction.

In January 2012, the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future completed a 2-year comprehensive study and published unanimous recommendations for fixing our Nation's broken nuclear waste management program.

The commission found that the only long-term, technically feasible solution for this waste is to dispose of it in a permanent underground repository. Until such a facility is opened, which will take many decades, spent nuclear fuel will continue to be an expensive, dangerous burden.

That is why the commission also recommended that we establish an interim storage facility program to begin consolidating this dangerous waste, in addition to working on a permanent repository.

Finally, after studying the experience of all nuclear nations, the commission found that siting these facilities is most likely to succeed if the host States and communities are welcome and willing partners, not adversaries. The commission recommended that we adopt a consent based nuclear facility siting process.

Senators ALEXANDER, MURKOWSKI, CANTWELL, and I introduce this legislation in order to begin implementing those recommendations, putting us on a dual track toward interim and permanent storage facilities. The bipartisan bill is the product of thoughtful collaboration, building on our work last Congress with Senator WYDEN and before that with former Senator Bingaman in the 112th Congress.

In my view, one of the most important provisions in this legislation is the pilot program to immediately begin consolidating nuclear waste at safer, more cost-efficient centralized facilities on an interim basis. The legislation will facilitate interim storage of nuclear waste in above-ground canisters called dry casks. These facilities would be located in willing communities, away from population centers, and on thoroughly assessed sites.

Some members of Congress argue that we should ignore the need for interim storage sites and instead push forward with a plan to open Yucca Mountain as a permanent storage site.

Others argue that we should push forward only with repository plans in new locations.

But the debate over Yucca Mountain, a controversial waste repository proposed in the Nevada desert, which lacks State approval, is unlikely to be settled any time soon.

I believe the debate over a permanent repository does not need to be settled in order to recognize the need for interim storage. Even if Congress and a future president reverse course and move forward with Yucca Mountain, interim storage facilities would still be an essential component of a badly needed national nuclear waste strategy.

By creating interim storage sites, a top recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission, we would begin reducing the federal liability while providing

breathing room to site and build a permanent repository.

Interim storage facilities are of particular importance for the sites of decommissioned power plants that are maintained solely to store the spent nuclear fuel. In the last fourteen months alone, four nuclear power plants have been taken out of service: the Crystal River plant in Florida, the Kewaunee plant in Wisconsin, the San Onofre plant in California, and the Vermont Yankee plant in Vermont.

Until there is an interim storage facility for this waste, these sites will join the likes of Rancho Seco and Humboldt Bay, which stopped operating in the 1980s but continue to store spent nuclear fuel. All told, there are more than 6,500 metric tons of nuclear waste stored at sites that no longer have operating reactors.

Interim storage facilities could also provide alternative storage locations in emergency situations, if spent nuclear fuel ever needs to be moved quickly from a reactor site.

Both short- and long-term storage programs are vital.

Because of the long timeline for permanent facilities, interim storage facilities allow us to achieve significant cost savings for taxpayers and utility ratepayers and finally start the process of securing waste from decommissioned plants by finally removing waste from the sites of decommissioned power plants.

One thing is certain: inaction is the most costly and least safe option.

Our longstanding stalemate is costly to taxpayers, utility ratepayers and communities that are involuntarily saddled with waste after local nuclear power plants have shut down.

It leaves nuclear waste all over the country, stored in all different ways.

It is long overdue for the government to honor its obligation to safely dispose of the nation's nuclear waste—and this bipartisan bill is the way to do that.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 108—COMMEMORATING THE DISCOVERY OF THE POLIO VACCINE AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO ERADICATE THE DISEASE

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 108

Whereas April 12, 2015, is the 60th anniversary of the announcement of the discovery of the first safe and effective polio vaccine;

Whereas the vaccine was developed by Jonas Salk with the support of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, now known as the March of Dimes Foundation;

Whereas the vaccine developed by Jonas Salk was proven safe and effective in a massive nationwide field trial organized by the March of Dimes Foundation, relying on the largest peacetime mobilization of volunteers in the history of the United States;

Whereas polio is a crippling and potentially fatal infectious disease for which there is no cure, which means that vaccination is the only viable pathway for eradication of the disease;

Whereas nearly 60,000 children in the United States were reported to have polio in 1952 alone, with more than 20,000 cases of paralysis;

Whereas, due to vaccination, polio was eliminated from the United States in 1979;

Whereas the use of the inactivated polio vaccine developed by Jonas Salk and the oral polio vaccine developed by Albert Sabin has dramatically reduced the incidence of polio worldwide;

Whereas the fight against polio has been part of the mission of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this preamble as the ''CDC'') since the 1950s;

Whereas, as part of the fight against polio, the CDC established a national polio surveillance unit and worked with Jonas Salk and Albert Sabin to widely distribute vaccines;

Whereas, through the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (referred to in this preamble as the ''Initiative''), the Federal Government, Rotary International, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund (commonly known as ''UNICEF''), the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the United Nations Foundation have joined together with governments around the world to successfully reduce cases of polio by more than 99 percent since the launch of global polio eradication efforts;

Whereas Rotary International, a global association founded in Illinois, has contributed more than $1,000,000,000 alone to, and volunteered countless hours in, the global fight against polio;

Whereas October 24 of each year is recognized internationally as World Polio Day to commemorate the fight against the disease;

Whereas, according to the CDC, polio vaccination has prevented over 13,000,000 paralytic polio cases and 650,000 deaths since 1988;

Whereas only 3 countries (Afghanistan, Nigeria and Pakistan) remained polio-endemic in 2014, which is a decrease from more than 125 countries in 1988;

Whereas there is a global push to eradicate polio by 2018;

Whereas investments in polio eradication are helping improve routine immunization systems and creating lasting infrastructure to support other health priorities;

Whereas the Initiative is finding and reaching the most vulnerable children in the world with the polio vaccine and combining those efforts with other health care resources;

Whereas, in December 2011, the CDC activated Emergency Operations Center of the CDC to ''support the final push for polio eradication'';

Whereas the eradication of polio would be the only time in history aside from the eradication of smallpox that a disease affecting humans has been eradicated, and the eradication of polio would be a ''once-in-a-generation opportunity for global public health''; and

Whereas the success of the polio vaccine has shown the public what sustained medical research can accomplish and should encourage support for future Federal funding for biomedical research and public health prevention and control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the work of Jonas Salk and Albert Sabin in developing effective, safe vaccines for polio;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative;

(3) encourages and supports the international community of governments and nongovernmental organizations in remaining committed to the eradication of polio; and

(4) encourages the Federal Government to continue committing funding to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative and for biomedical and basic scientific research so that more life-saving discoveries can be made.

SENATE RESOLUTION 109—ACKNOWLEDGING AND HONORING BRAVE YOUNG MEN FROM HAWAII WHO ENABLED THE UNITED STATES TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN JURISDICTION IN REMOTE EQUATORIAL ISLANDS AS PROLONGED CONFLICT IN THE PACIFIC LED TO WORLD WAR II

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 109

Whereas in the mid-19th century, the Guano Islands Act (48 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) enabled companies from the United States to mine guano from a number of islands in the Equatorial Pacific;

Whereas after several decades, when the guano was depleted, the companies abandoned mining activities, and the control of the islands by the United States diminished and left the islands vulnerable to exploitation by other nations;

Whereas the Far East during the late 19th century and early 20th century was characterized by colonial conflicts and Japanese expansionism;

Whereas the 1930s marked the apex of the sphere of influence of Imperial Japan in the Far East;

Whereas military and commercial interest in Central Pacific air routes between Australia and California led to a desire by the United States to claim the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, although the ownership of the islands was unclear;

Whereas in 1935, a secret Department of Commerce colonization plan was instituted, aimed at placing citizens of the United States as colonists on the remote islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis;

Whereas to avoid conflicts with international law, which prevented colonization by active military personnel, the United States sought the participation of furloughed military personnel and Native Hawaiian civilians in the colonization project;

Whereas William T. Miller, Superintendent of Airways at the Department of Commerce, was appointed to lead the colonization project, traveled to Hawaii in February 1935, met with Albert F. Judd, Trustee of Kamehameha Schools and the Bishop Museum, and agreed that recent graduates and students of the Kamehameha School for Boys would make ideal colonists for the project;

Whereas the ideal Hawaiian candidates were candidates who could ''fish in the native manner, swim excellently, handle a boat, be disciplined, friendly, and unattached'';

Whereas on March 30, 1935, the United States Coast Guard Cutter *Itasca* departed from Honolulu Harbor in great secrecy with 6 young Hawaiian men aboard, all recent graduates of Kamehameha Schools, and 12 furloughed Army personnel, whose purpose

was to occupy the barren islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis in teams of 5 for 3 months;

Whereas in June 1935, after a successful first tour, the furloughed Army personnel were ordered off the islands and replaced with additional Kamehameha Schools alumni, thus leaving the islands under the exclusive occupation of the 4 Native Hawaiians on each island;

Whereas the duties of the colonists while on the island were to record weather conditions, cultivate plants, maintain a daily log, record the types of fish that were caught, observe bird life, and collect specimens for the Bishop Museum;

Whereas the successful year-long occupation by the colonists directly enabled President Franklin D. Roosevelt to issue Executive Order 7368 on May 13, 1936, which proclaimed that the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis were under the jurisdiction of the United States;

Whereas multiple Federal agencies vied for the right to administer the colonization project, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, and the Navy Department, but jurisdiction was ultimately granted to the Department of the Interior;

Whereas under the Department of the Interior, the colonization project emphasized weather data and radio communication, which brought about the recruitment of a number of Asian radiomen and aerologists;

Whereas under the Department of the Interior, the colonization project also expanded beyond the Kamehameha Schools to include Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians from other schools in Hawaii;

Whereas in March of 1938 the United States also claimed and colonized the islands of Canton and Enderbury, maintaining that the colonization was in furtherance of commercial aviation and not for military purposes;

Whereas the risk of living on the remote islands meant that emergency medical care was not less than 5 days away, and the distance proved fatal for Carl Kahalewai, who died on October 8, 1938, en route to Honolulu after his appendix ruptured on Jarvis island;

Whereas other life-threatening injuries occurred, including in 1939, when Manuel Pires had appendicitis, and in 1941, when an explosion severely burned Henry Knell and Dominic Zagara;

Whereas in 1940, when the issue of discontinuing the colonization project was raised, the Navy acknowledged that the islands were ''probably worthless to commercial aviation'' but advocated for ''continued occupation'' because the islands could serve as ''bases from a military standpoint'';

Whereas although military interests justified continued occupation of the islands, the colonists were never informed of the true nature of the project, nor were the colonists provided with weapons or any other means of self-defense;

Whereas in June of 1941, when much of Europe was engaged in World War II and Imperial Japan was establishing itself in the Pacific, the Commandant of the 14th Naval District recognized the ''tension in the Western Pacific'' and recommended the evacuation of the colonists, but his request was denied;

Whereas on December 8, 1941, Howland Island was attacked by a fleet of Japanese twin-engine bombers, and the attack killed Hawaiian colonists Joseph Keliihananui and Richard Whaley;

Whereas in the ensuing weeks, Japanese submarine and military aircraft continued to target the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, jeopardizing the lives of the remaining colonists;

Whereas the United States Government was unaware of the attacks on the islands, and was distracted by the entry of the United States into World War II;

Whereas the colonists demonstrated great valor while awaiting retrieval;

Whereas the 4 colonists from Baker and the 2 remaining colonists from Howland were rescued on January 31, 1942, and the 8 colonists from Jarvis and Enderbury were rescued on February 9, 1942, 2 months after the initial attacks on Howland Island;

Whereas on March 20, 1942, Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, sent letters of condolence to the Keliihananui and Whaley families stating that ''[i]n your bereavement it must be considerable satisfaction to know that your brother died in the service of his country'';

Whereas during the 7 years of colonization, more than 130 young men participated in the project, the majority of whom were Hawaiian, and all of whom made numerous sacrifices, endured hardships, and risked their lives to secure and maintain the islands of Howland, Baker, Jarvis, Canton, and Enderbury on behalf of the United States, and 3 young Hawaiian men made the ultimate sacrifice;

Whereas none of the islands, except for Canton, were ever used for commercial aviation, but the islands were used for military purposes;

Whereas in July 1943, a military base was established on Baker Island, and its forces, which numbered over 2,000 members, participated in the Tarawa-Makin operation;

Whereas in 1956, participants of the colonization project established an organization called ''Hui Panala'au'', which was established to preserve the fellowship of the group, to provide scholarship assistance, and ''to honor and esteem those who died as colonists of the Equatorial Islands'';

Whereas in 1979, Canton and Enderbury became part of the republic of Kiribati, but the islands of Jarvis, Howland, and Baker remain possessions of the United States, having been designated as National Wildlife Refuges in 1974;

Whereas the islands of Jarvis, Howland, and Baker are now part of the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument;

Whereas May 13, 2015, marks the 79th anniversary of the issuance of the Executive Order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaiming United States jurisdiction over the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, islands that remain possessions of the United States; and

Whereas the Federal Government has never fully recognized the contributions and sacrifices of the colonists, less than a handful of whom are still alive today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the accomplishments and commends the service of the Hui Panala'au colonists;

(2) acknowledges the local, national, and international significance of the 7-year colonization project, which resulted in the United States extending sovereignty into the Equatorial Pacific;

(3) recognizes the dedication to the United States and self-reliance demonstrated by the young men, the majority of whom were Native Hawaiian, who left their homes and families in Hawaii to participate in the Equatorial Pacific colonization project;

(4) extends condolences on behalf of the United States to the families of Carl Kahalewai, Joseph Keliihananui, and Richard Whaley for the loss of their loved ones in the service of the United States;

(5) honors the young men whose actions, sacrifices, and valor helped secure and maintain the jurisdiction of the United States over equatorial islands in the Pacific Ocean during the years leading up to and the months immediately following the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the entry of the United States into World War II; and

(6) extends to all of the colonists, and to the families of these exceptional young men, the deep appreciation of the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 110—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ABOUT A STRATEGY FOR THE INTERNET OF THINGS TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT

Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 110

Whereas the Internet of Things currently connects tens of billions of devices worldwide and has the potential to generate trillions of dollars in economic opportunity;

Whereas increased connectivity can empower consumers in nearly every aspect of their daily lives, including in the fields of agriculture, education, energy, healthcare, public safety, security, and transportation, to name just a few;

Whereas businesses across our economy can simplify logistics, cut costs in supply chains, and pass savings on to consumers because of the Internet of Things and innovations derived from it;

Whereas the United States should strive to be a world leader in smart cities and smart infrastructure to ensure its citizens and businesses, in both rural and urban parts of the country, have access to the safest and most resilient communities in the world;

Whereas the United States is the world leader in developing the Internet of Things technology, and with a strategy guiding both public and private entities, the United States will continue to produce breakthrough technologies and lead the world in innovation;

Whereas the evolution of the Internet of Things is a nascent market, the future direction of which holds much promise;

Whereas the Internet of Things represents a wide range of technologies that are governed by various laws, policies, and governmental entities; and

Whereas coordination between all stakeholders of the Internet of Things on relevant developments, impediments, and achievements is a vital ingredient to the continued advancement of pioneering technology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should develop a strategy to incentivize the development of the Internet of Things in a way that maximizes the promise connected technologies hold to empower consumers, foster future economic growth, and improve our collective social well-being;

(2) the United States should prioritize accelerating the development and deployment of the Internet of Things in a way that recognizes its benefits, allows for future innovation, and responsibly protects against misuse;

(3) the United States should recognize the importance of consensus-based best practices and communication among stakeholders, with the understanding that businesses can play an important role in the future development of the Internet of Things;

(4) the United States Government should commit itself to using the Internet of Things to improve its efficiency and effectiveness

and cut waste, fraud, and abuse whenever possible; and

(5) using the Internet of Things, innovators in the United States should commit to improving the quality of life for future generations by developing safe, new technologies aimed at tackling the most challenging societal issues facing the world.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 349. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

SA 350. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 351. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 352. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 353. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 354. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 355. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 356. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 357. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 358. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 359. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 360. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 361. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 362. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 363. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 364. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 365. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 366. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 367. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 368. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 369. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 370. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 371. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 372. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 373. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 374. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 375. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 376. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 377. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 378. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 379. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 380. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 381. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 382. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 383. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 384. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 385. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 386. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 387. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 388. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 389. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 390. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 391. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 392. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 393. Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 394. Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 395. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 396. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 397. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 398. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 399. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 400. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 401. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 402. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 403. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 404. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 405. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 406. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to

be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 407. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 408. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 409. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 410. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 411. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 412. Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 413. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 414. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 415. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 416. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 417. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 418. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 419. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 420. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 421. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 422. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 423. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 424. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 425. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 426. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 427. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 428. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 429. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 430. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 431. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 432. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 433. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 434. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 435. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 436. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 437. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 438. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 439. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 440. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 441. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 442. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 443. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 444. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 445. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 446. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 447. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 448. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 449. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 450. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 451. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 452. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 453. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 454. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 455. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 456. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 457. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 458. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 459. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 460. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 461. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 462. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 463. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 464. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 465. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 466. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 467. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 468. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 469. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 470. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 471. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 472. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 473. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 474. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 475. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 476. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 477. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 478. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 479. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 480. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 481. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 482. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 483. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 484. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 485. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 486. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 487. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 488. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 489. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 490. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 491. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 492. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 493. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 494. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 495. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 496. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 497. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 498. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 499. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 500. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 501. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 502. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 503. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 504. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 505. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 506. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 507. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 508. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 509. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 510. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 511. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 512. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 513. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. KING, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 514. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 515. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 516. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 517. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 518. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 519. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 520. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 521. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 522. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 523. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 524. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 525. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 526. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 527. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 528. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 529. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 530. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 531. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 532. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 533. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 534. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 535. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 536. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 537. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 538. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 539. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 540. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 541. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 542. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 543. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 544. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 545. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 546. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 547. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 548. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 549. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 550. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 551. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 552. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 553. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 554. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 555. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 556. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 557. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 558. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 559. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 560. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 561. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 562. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 563. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 564. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 565. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 566. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 567. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 568. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 569. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 570. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 571. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 572. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 573. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 574. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 575. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 576. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 577. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 578. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 579. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 580. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 581. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 582. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 583. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 584. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 585. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 586. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 587. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 588. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 589. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 590. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 591. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 592. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 593. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 594. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 595. Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 596. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 597. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 598. Mrs. CAPITO (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 72, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine.

SA 599. Mrs. CAPITO (for Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 72, supra.

SA 600. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 601. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 602. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 603. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 604. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 605. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 606. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 349. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE HEALTH OUTCOMES AND LOWER THE COSTS OF CARING FOR MEDICALLY COMPLEX CHILDREN IN MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the health outcomes and lowering the costs of caring for medically complex children in Medicaid, which may include creating or expanding integrated delivery models or improving care coordination, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 350. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A TAX OR FEE ON CARBON EMISSIONS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) would result in revenues that would be greater than the level of revenues set forth for the first fiscal year or the total of that fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years under the concurrent resolution on the budget then in effect for which allocations are provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) for any year covered by such resolution, includes a Federal tax or fee imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of the emissions.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 351. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DREDGING OF SHALLOW DRAFT PORTS ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding the regular dredging of shallow draft ports located on the inland Mississippi River to the respective authorized widths and depths of those inland ports, in a manner that treats the ports as 1 system serving as the on- and off-ramps to the Mississippi River, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 352. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AWARDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reform of Federal employee performance award and bonus programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 353. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING LETHAL AID TO UKRAINE IN OPPOSITION TO RUSSIAN AGGRESSION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the defense capabilities of the Government of Ukraine by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 354. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MILITARY READINESS, TRAINING, AND MODERNIZATION WHILE DECREASING RISK OF CASUALTIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to troop levels capable of meeting global threats without undue risk to warfighters by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 355. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT ADDITIONAL PREMIUM INCREASES FOR TWO YEARS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that delays by 2 years any annual fee on health insurers that will result in higher premiums for individuals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 356. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING HEALTH CARE TO VETERANS WHO HAVE GEOGRAPHIC INACCESSIBILITY TO CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing health care to veterans who reside more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provides the care sought by the veteran, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 357. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025:

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 104. Major functional categories.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: $2,782,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,911,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,154,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,032,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,283,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,384,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,547,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,723,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,906,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $4,101,653,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: $106,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $136,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $163,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $172,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $176,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $137,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $154,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $169,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $182,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $195,747,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: $3,255,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,327,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,499,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,671,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,842,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,002,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,137,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,331,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,525,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $4,698,213,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: $3,176,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,313,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,453,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,629,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,794,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,958,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,125,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,295,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,472,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $4,658,696,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: -$393,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$402,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$420,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$475,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$511,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$574,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$578,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$572,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -$566,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: -$557,043,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: $19,073,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,710,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,376,934,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,086,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,829,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,636,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,426,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,229,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $25,047,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $25,828,001,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: $13,843,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,331,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,843,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,431,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,077,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,813,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,582,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,380,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $19,212,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $20,078,436,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: $795,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $830,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $871,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $908,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $945,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $984,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,025,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,067,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $1,110,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,157,956,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: $776,949,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: $823,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $879,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $938,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $1,002,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,071,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,144,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,223,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $1,306,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,395,254,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $5,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $5,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $5,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $5,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $5,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $6,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $6,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,226,000,000.

SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $312,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $621,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $581,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $589,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $592,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $600,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $607,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $619,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $631,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $644,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $629,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $657,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $637,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $670,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $654,427,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $54,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $48,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $50,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $50,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $51,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $54,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $55,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $56,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,206,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $32,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $32,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $33,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $34,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $34,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $35,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $36,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,667,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $5,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $5,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $5,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $5,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $5,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $6,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $6,698,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,043,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $44,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $41,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $42,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $43,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $43,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $44,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $44,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $45,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $46,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,078,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $21,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,342,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $21,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $21,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,075,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $16,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$1,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $12,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $11,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $15,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$1,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $9,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $10,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $10,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$7,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $11,049,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$7,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $11,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,289,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $107,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $108,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $109,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $110,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $111,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $113,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $94,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $96,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $97,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $99,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,793,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $13,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $13,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $13,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $13,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $13,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,979,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $128,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $122,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,075,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $129,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $138,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $143,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $146,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $152,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $157,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $160,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $162,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,212,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $528,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $540,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $571,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $596,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $619,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $623,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $651,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $643,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $670,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $671,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $704,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $703,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $738,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $737,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $773,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $772,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $808,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $808,859,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $582,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $580,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $576,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $576,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $640,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $640,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $681,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $681,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $729,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $729,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $820,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $819,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $838,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $837,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $848,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $847,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $935,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $940,432,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $541,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $551,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $556,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $545,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $576,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $590,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $603,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $623,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $620,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $634,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $647,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $633,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $670,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,899,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,116,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $39,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $42,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,651,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $49,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $57,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $61,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $65,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,961,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $168,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $169,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $167,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $177,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $181,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $185,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $197,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $196,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $193,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $192,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $189,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $203,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $202,560,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $58,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $61,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $60,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $61,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $61,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $64,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $65,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $66,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $71,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,371,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $27,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $28,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $29,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $30,382,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $30,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $31,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $31,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,294,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $368,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $368,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $421,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $421,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $494,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $560,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $621,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $671,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $671,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $721,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $721,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $769,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $769,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $814,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $814,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $850,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $850,543,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$33,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$33,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $10,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $59,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $24,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $29,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$49,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$39,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $9,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $82,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $30,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,780,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$77,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$77,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$87,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$87,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$87,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$87,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$88,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$95,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$95,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -$98,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$98,194,000,000.

SA 358. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENHANCING TRADE ACROSS THE SOUTHWEST BORDER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving, increasing, and enhancing legal trade and commerce across the border between the United States and Mexico, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 359. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECURING THE SOUTHWEST BORDER.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving effective control of the Southwest border and detecting and eliminating illegal activity across the border between the United States and Mexico, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 360. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DETERRING THE MIGRATION OF UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN FROM EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, AND HONDURAS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to deterring the attempted migration of unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras into the United States, which may include the expedited removal of unlawful entrants from noncontiguous countries and for providing in-county consulate processing of refugee applications, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 361. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING PROHIBITING THE CONSIDERATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to consideration of greenhouse gas emissions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), which may include a prohibition on the consideration of greenhouse gas emissions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 362. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to ensure equal pay policies and practices and to reform section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) (commonly known as the ''Equal Pay Act of 1963'') to allow for punitive damages, limit the exception for unequal pay described in paragraph (1) of such section to business necessity rather than any factor ''other than sex'', and prevent retaliation against employees for sharing salary information by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 363. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MODERNIZING AND UPDATING FOOD SAFETY OVERSIGHT WITHIN THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modernizing and updating food safety oversight within the Food and Drug Administration, which may include increased investments in inspection modernization and training, education and technical assistance for industry stakeholders, implementing a National Integrated Food Safety System to strengthen collaboration and improve coordination with State and local food safety regulators, expanded activities to improve the safety and reliability of imported foods, and other crucial investments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 364. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN AND PREGNANT WOMEN UNDER MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to initiatives that would improve oral health care for children and pregnant women under the Medicaid program by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 365. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING AND ENFORCEMENT RELATED TO DOJ PROFILING GUIDANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding to State and local law enforcement agencies that receive Federal funds to be used for training and enforcement related to the profiling guidance established by the Department of Justice by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 366. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO BE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO PROFILING BY THE DOJ.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for State and local law enforcement agencies that receive Federal funds to be used for data collection related to profiling by the Department of Justice by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 367. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING PROVIDING A FUNDING STREAM FOR A VOTER REINFRANCHISEMENT INITIATIVE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing a funding stream for a voter reinfranchisement initiative, which may include Bureau of Prisons notifications for released inmates of voting rights, notifications by United States attorneys of voting rights restrictions during plea agreements, and a Department of Justice report on the disproportionate impact of criminal disenfranchisement laws on minority populations, including data on disfranchisement rates by race and ethnicity, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 368. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING STATES THE MEDICAID FLEXIBILITY THEY NEED IMPLEMENT INNOVATIVE REFORMS TO IMPROVE CARE AND ENHANCE ACCESS FOR OUR NATION'S MOST VULNERABLE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Medicaid that allows States the flexibility to build off of successful State innovations to ensure our Nation's most vulnerable Americans have improved access to quality care while reducing taxpayer costs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 369. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BIPARTISAN COMMISSIONS TO GOVERN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the establishment of bipartisan commissions to govern independent agencies, which may include structural changes to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 370. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING GREATER DISCRETION TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION IN SPENDING HIGHWAY TRUST FUND ALLOCATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing State departments of transportation greater discretion in spending Highway Trust Fund allocations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 371. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR BUDGET FUNCTION 050 ARE SPENT EXCLUSIVELY ON NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that funds available for budget function 050 are spent exclusively on national defense by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 372. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING STATES TO IMPLEMENT DRUG TESTING AND WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS FOR APPLICANTS AND RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF) PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring States to operate a drug testing program and establish work requirements for applicants and recipients of assistance as part of their Federal welfare programs including, but not limited to, the temporary assistance for needy families (TANF) program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 373. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING ADEQUATE IMPACT AID FUNDING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring adequate funding for impact aid payments under sections 8002 and 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S. C. 7702, 7703) in order to enable local educational agencies to provide a level of service that is not less than the level provided to students during the 2014–2015 school year by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not

raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 374. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING COVERAGE OF VIRTUAL COLONOSCOPIES AS A COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING TEST UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing coverage of virtual colonoscopies as a colorectal cancer screening test under the Medicare program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 375. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RETURNING THE AUTHORITY OVER SCHOOL NUTRITION BACK TO THE STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to returning the authority over school nutrition back to the States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 376. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 422. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION IMPOSING USER FEES WITH RESPECT TO GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would impose a user fee with respect to general aviation during any of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 377. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING GREATER TRADE BETWEEN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging greater trade between Africa and the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 378. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING THE STATUS OF QUALIFIED MORTGAGES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing qualified mortgage status to mortgages held in portfolio by financial institutions by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 379. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RELIEVING FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FROM REDUNDANT ANNUAL PRIVACY NOTICE MAILINGS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing relief from redundant annual privacy notice mailings required to be provided by financial institutions when there have been no changes to the privacy policies of the financial institution by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 380. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT STATE DROUGHT PREVENTION PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to assisting the States in carrying out drought prevention plans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 381. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PREVENTION OF GOVERNMENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDIVIDUALS, BUSINESSES, AND ORGANIZATIONS DUE TO SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal agencies do not discriminate against an individual, business, or organization, with sincerely held religious beliefs against abortion that marriage is the union of one man and one woman, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 382. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE CONTINUED EXCEPTION OF CERTAIN POPULAR AMMUNITIONS TRADITIONALLY AND PRIMARILY USED FOR SPORTING PURPOSES AS INTENDED UNDER THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROTECTION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 99–408).

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the protection of the Second Amendment by preventing Federal agencies from banning popular forms of ammunition by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 383. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO UPHOLD SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND PROHIBIT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL FIREARM REGISTRY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include a prohibition on the establishment of a national firearm registry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 384. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT BY PREVENTING FEDERAL AGENCIES FROM TARGETING LAW-ABIDING FIREARMS DEALERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring Federal agencies under certain banking programs, including Operation Choke Point, do not pressure banks to stop servicing the accounts of law-abiding firearms businesses by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 385. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY PRIOR TO SENATE RATIFICATION AND ADOPTION OF IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would make funds available to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty Secretariat or any other international organization created to support the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Treaty and the House and Senate adopt implementing legislation for the Treaty.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 386. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES FROM BENEFIT CUTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Medicaid, which may include protecting children, pregnant women, individuals with disabilities, low-income adults, and Americans that need long-term services and supports, including nursing home care, who are guaranteed benefits under Medicaid, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 387. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the United States Postal Service, which may include measures addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 388. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that State and local governments support designations of national monuments under section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 389. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOLDING MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ACCOUNTABLE FOR FAILING TO PASS A BALANCED BUDGET.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 390. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REGULATORY REVIEW.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to regulatory review, which may include requiring a Federal agency to review each regulation issued by the Federal agency every 10 years, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 391. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANSION OF ACCESS TO THE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES OF SMALL EMPLOYERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expansion of access to the income tax credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 392. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE USE OF COLLEGE SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the use of college savings accounts while students are in elementary school and secondary school, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 393. Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EMPHASIZING MANUFACTURING IN ENGINEERING PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to emphasizing manufacturing in engineering programs, which may include directing the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies including the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and National Science Foundation, to designate United States manufacturing universities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 394. Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SPECIAL TREATMENT OF THE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR RESEARCH EXPENDITURES FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to special treatment of the income tax credit for research expenditures for startup companies by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 395. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REVERSING CUTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to support for the International Affairs Budget, which may include urgently needed reversal of cuts to nonwar-related

programs, a robust investment in exports and economic development, a focus on key security challenges and global hot spots, such as Syria, Yemen, Ukraine, and West Africa, and greater accountability transparency, and results, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 396. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EMPOWERMENT OF STATES TO PROTECT CITIZENS OF THE STATE FROM DAMAGING REGULATIONS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY PURSUANT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing any State the option of opting out of the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)) if a Governor or legislative body of a State determines that the requirements of that section would increase retail electricity prices with a disproportionate impact on low-income or fixed-income households, or present a risk to electric reliability, or impair investments in existing electric generating capacity, or impair manufacturing and other important sectors of the economy of the State, or decrease employment, or decrease State and local revenues, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 397. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING MENTAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving mental health care services for veterans, including expanding the availability of services and choices from outside the Department of Veterans Affairs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 398. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FUNDING COAST GUARD AIR FACILITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding Coast Guard air facilities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 399. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. ____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE NET DIRECT SPENDING IF THE NATIONAL DEBT IS GREATER THAN THE SIZE OF THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the net level of direct spending, excluding net interest, relative to the most recent Congressional Budget Office baseline during any period in which the gross Federal debt is greater than 100 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States in the prior year.

(2) DETERMINATION OF GROSS FEDERAL DEBT AS A PERCENT OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT.—For purposes of this section, the percent of total gross Federal debt as a percent of gross domestic product shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate on the basis of the most recently published Congressional Budget Office estimate of nominal gross domestic product in the prior calendar year.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 400. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE ACCESS, CHOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN VETERANS CARE THROUGH THE VETERANS CHOICE CARD PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining and enhancing access, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Choice Card program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 401. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT SENTENCING REFORM LEGISLATION THAT DOES NOT IMPOSE COSTS ON CRIME VICTIMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to sentencing reform without imposing costs on crime victims by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 402. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING INFORMATION SHARING BY THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS WITH RESPECT TO INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO SUBSTANDARD HEALTH CARE, DELAYED AND DENIED HEALTH CARE, PATIENT DEATHS, OTHER FINDINGS THAT DIRECTLY RELATE TO PATIENT CARE, AND OTHER MANAGEMENT ISSUES OF THE DEPARTMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving information sharing by the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to investigations relating to substandard health care, delayed and denied health care, patient deaths, other findings that directly relate to patient care, and other management issues of the Department by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 403. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE ANNUAL CONTRIBUTION LIMIT FOR COVERDELL EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the annual contribution limit for Coverdell education savings accounts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 404. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE MODERNIZATION OF THE NUCLEAR COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS ARCHITECTURE OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modernizing the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems, the nuclear command and control system, and the nuclear weapons stockpile, and supporting related infrastructure, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 405. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE EFFORTS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to sexual assault prevention and response efforts by the Department of Defense, which may improve and prioritize initiatives designed to reduce instances of retaliation against victims of sexual assault who report unwanted contact, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 406. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LIMITING CERTAIN RESEARCH CONDUCTED OR CONTRACTED BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Federal Communications Commission from—

(1) conducting or contracting for research studies that categorize or analyze media content, journalism, or editorial decision making; or

(2) actively soliciting non-public information about news and content;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 407. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTIGATING SERVICE DISRUPTIONS AT WEST COAST PORTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requesting the Government Accountability Office to investigate the impact of service disruptions at West Coast ports during 2014 and 2015 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 408. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to ensure more transparency and stakeholder participation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 409. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING EQUAL PAY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting equal pay, which may include preventing discrimination on the basis of sex and preventing retaliation against employees for seeking or discussing wage information, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 410. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX CREDITS FOR EMPLOYERS PROVIDING PAID FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the allowance of tax credits to employers who provide paid family and medical leave by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 411. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE MAXIMUM LOAN LIMITS UNDER THE MICROLOAN PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the maximum loan limits under the program established under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 412. Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT CERTAIN CLOSED-DOOR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to environmental laws and citizen suits, which may include prohibitions on the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entering into any closed-door settlement agreement without seeking approval from all State, county, and local governments that would be directly impacted by the agreement, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 413. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS ON GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to any international agreements on greenhouse gas emissions, which may include requiring congressional advice and consent before any agreement may be binding, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 414. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to hydraulic fracturing regulations of the Department of the Interior, which may include a prohibition on any preemption of any States' laws regulating hydraulic fracturing, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 415. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A REQUIREMENT THAT ANY NEW ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT SIGNED WITH ANY FOREIGN COUNTRY NOT RESULT IN SERIOUS HARM TO THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a requirement that any new environmental agreement signed by the United States with any foreign country or countries not result in serious harm to the economy of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 416. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE RELIABILITY OF THE ELECTRICITY GRID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or issuing any regulation that would reduce the reliability of the electricity grid by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 417. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO ADVISE ALL VETERANS OF THEIR POTENTIAL ELIGIBILITY FOR PRIVATE HEALTH CARE BENEFITS PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to advise all veterans of their potential eligibility for private health care benefits provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 418. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring sufficient funds are provided to the Department of Energy to support research on and development of clean coal technologies (including carbon capture and sequestration activities) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while continuing to make use of domestic energy resources by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 419. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE SAFETY OF TANK CARS CARRYING CRUDE OIL BY RAIL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that require the Department of Transportation to finalize a regulation to improve the safety of tank cars carrying crude oil by rail, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 420. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE HEROIN AND METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE EPIDEMIC IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding efforts to combat heroin and methamphetamine abuse in the United States without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase spending over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 421. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF HIGH-SPEED BROADBAND IN RURAL AREAS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring the Federal Communications Commission to focus efforts of the Federal Communications Commission on expanding high-speed broadband access to rural communities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 422. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE CONSERVATION OF NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT POPULATIONS AND LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ARE COMPATIBLE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), which may include requirements that State conservation plans relating to the northern long-eared bat are given maximum flexibility to be successful so as to preserve and protect local and rural economies before any Federal listing decision is made with respect to the northern long-eared bat, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 423. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 14, line 2, strike ''$620,263,000,000'' and insert ''$696,776,000,000''.

On page 14, line 3, strike ''$605,189,000,000'' and insert ''$658,021,000,000''.

On page 14, line 6, strike ''$544,506,000,000'' and insert ''$657,496,000,000''.

On page 14, line 7, strike ''$576,934,000,000'' and insert ''$659,073,000,000''.

SA 424. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. 105. ELIMINATION OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE INITIATIVES.

Notwithstanding section 104(2), the new budget authority and outlays set forth for fiscal year 2016 under the heading International Affairs (150) shall each be reduced by $1,289,600,000.

SA 425. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING RETIREMENT SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving retirement security by making it easier for small businesses to provide retirement plans for their employees by easing the administrative burden and by encouraging individuals to increase their savings by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 426. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting economic growth and job creation by making it easier for small businesses to plan their capital investments and reducing the uncertainty of taxation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 427. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTMENT IN ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient investment in Alzheimer's disease research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 428. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXTENDING THE EXCEPTION FOR THE TAX TREATMENT OF PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIPS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY POWER GENERATION PROJECTS AND TRANSPORTATION FUELS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extending the exception for the tax treatment of publicly traded partnerships for other forms of renewable energy, including energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 429. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RELIEVE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FROM ANNUAL PRIVACY NOTICE MAILINGS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to providing relief from annual privacy notice mailings required to be provided by financial institutions when there have been no changes to the privacy policy of the financial institution, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 430. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAINTAINING ACCESS TO HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS IN RURAL COMMUNITIES UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining access to hospitals and health care providers in rural communities under the Medicare program, which includes preserving and strengthening access to critical access hospitals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 431. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MEDICAL TREATMENT AND COMPENSATION FOR FIRST RESPONDERS, SURVIVORS, AND THEIR FAMILIES INJURED AND MADE ILL BY THE 9/11 ATTACKS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to the September 11th terrorism attacks at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the Shanksville Crash site, which may include legislation that extends medical monitoring and treatment services and compensation for first responders, survivors, and their families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 432. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $17,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $4,400,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $5,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $6,300,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $6,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $7,300,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $7,700,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $8,200,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $8,600,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $9,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $17,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $4,400,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $5,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $6,300,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $6,900,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $7,300,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $7,700,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $8,200,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $8,600,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $9,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by $1,151,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by $2,729,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $3,453,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by $4,821,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by $6,358,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by $7,282,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by $9,311,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by $12,123,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by $12,736,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by $13,422,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $172,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $660,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $2,903,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by $4,119,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by $5,605,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by $6,783,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by $8,548,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $11,067,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $12,427,000,000.
On page 7, line 7, decrease the amount by $17,272,000,000.
On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by $5,060,000,000.
On page 7, line 9, decrease the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 7, line 10, decrease the amount by $3,397,000,000.
On page 7, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,781,000,000.
On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,695,000,000.
On page 7, line 13, decrease the amount by $917,000,000.
On page 7, line 14, increase the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 7, line 15, increase the amount by $2,467,000,000.
On page 7, line 16, increase the amount by $3,427,000,000.
On page 7, line 21, decrease the amount by $17,272,000,000.
On page 7, line 22, decrease the amount by $12,212,000,000.
On page 7, line 23, decrease the amount by $16,012,000,000.
On page 7, line 24, decrease the amount by $19,409,000,000.
On page 7, line 25, decrease the amount by $22,190,000,000.
On page 8, line 1, decrease the amount by $23,885,000,000.
On page 8, line 2, decrease the amount by $24,802,000,000.
On page 8, line 3, decrease the amount by $24,454,000,000.
On page 8, line 4, decrease the amount by $21,987,000,000.
On page 8, line 5, decrease the amount by $18,560,000,000.
On page 8, line 8, decrease the amount by $17,272,000,000.
On page 8, line 9, decrease the amount by $12,212,000,000.
On page 8, line 10, decrease the amount by $16,012,000,000.
On page 8, line 11, decrease the amount by $19,409,000,000.
On page 8, line 12, decrease the amount by $22,190,000,000.
On page 8, line 13, decrease the amount by $23,885,000,000.
On page 8, line 14, decrease the amount by $24,802,000,000.
On page 8, line 15, decrease the amount by $24,454,000,000.
On page 8, line 16, decrease the amount by $21,987,000,000.
On page 8, line 17, decrease the amount by $18,560,000,000.
On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by $1,365,000,000.
On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by $41,000,000.
On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by $3,020,000,000.
On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by $951,000,000.
On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by $3,854,000,000.
On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by $2,401,000,000.
On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by $5,395,000,000.
On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by $3,477,000,000.
On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by $7,061,000,000.
On page 29, line 12, increase the amount by $4,822,000,000.
On page 29, line 15, increase the amount by $8,085,000,000.
On page 29, line 16, increase the amount by $6,408,000,000.
On page 29, line 19, increase the amount by $10,182,000,000.
On page 29, line 20, increase the amount by $7,653,000,000.
On page 29, line 23, increase the amount by $13,018,000,000.
On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by $9,443,000,000.
On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by $13,583,000,000.
On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by $11,914,000,000.
On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by $14,171,000,000.
On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by $13,175,000,000.
On page 42, line 2, decrease the amount by $213,000,000.
On page 42, line 3, decrease the amount by $213,000,000.
On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $291,000,000.
On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $291,000,000.
On page 42, line 10, decrease the amount by $401,000,000.
On page 42, line 11, decrease the amount by $401,000,000.
On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $574,000,000.
On page 42, line 15, decrease the amount by $574,000,000.
On page 42, line 18, decrease the amount by $703,000,000.
On page 42, line 19, decrease the amount by $703,000,000.
On page 42, line 22, decrease the amount by $803,000,000.
On page 42, line 23, decrease the amount by $803,000,000.
On page 43, line 2, decrease the amount by $870,000,000.
On page 43, line 3, decrease the amount by $870,000,000.
On page 43, line 6, decrease the amount by $895,000,000.
On page 43, line 7, decrease the amount by $895,000,000.
On page 43, line 10, decrease the amount by $847,000,000.
On page 43, line 11, decrease the amount by $847,000,000.
On page 43, line 14, decrease the amount by $748,000,000.
On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by $748,000,000.

SA 433. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONTINUING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FUNDING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to continuing funding for all agricultural research through fiscal year 2025 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 434. Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.

If a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) for wildfire suppression funding, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

SA 435. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORT FOR UKRAINE, WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE THE PROVISION OF LETHAL DEFENSIVE ARTICLES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding to support the Government of Ukraine in reestablishing its sovereignty and territorial integrity, which should include the provision of lethal defensive articles, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 436. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 405.

SA 437. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENHANCING AND IMPROVING THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE APPLICATION BACKLOG.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing and improving the United States Patent and Trademark Office in order to reduce the patent application backlog by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 438. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION ON FINANCIAL PRODUCTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which may include directing the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to implement the reporting requirements established by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–203), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 439. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE GUARANTEE THRESHOLD FOR THE SURETY BOND GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Surety Bond Guarantee Program of the Small Business Administration, which may include exploring or raising the range for surety bonds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 440. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RAISING THE FAMILY OF FUNDS LIMIT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Small Business Investment Company Program of the Small Business Administration, which may include raising the Family of Funds limit of the Small Business Investment Company Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 441. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to oil spill liability, which may include changes to current law to equalize the per barrel Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund taxes for all oil sources, a permanent extension of such taxes, or elimination of tax deductions for settlements or judgments relating to oil spills, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 442. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the employer penalties under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), which may include changes to the definition of ''full time employee'' under that Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 443. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING PRIVATELY HELD WATER RIGHTS AND PERMITS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting communities, businesses, recreationists, farmers, ranchers, or other groups that rely on privately held water rights and permits from Federal takings by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 444. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM AND EXPAND THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming and expanding the earned income tax credit by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 445. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT ECONOMIC DISRUPTIONS AT SEAPORTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing economic disruptions at ports in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 446. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORT PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting public-private partnerships of the Armed Forces of the United States with institutions of higher education in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 447. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAKE HIGHER EDUCATION MORE AFFORDABLE AND EXPAND ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITY TO OUR NATION'S STUDENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making higher education more affordable and expanding access and opportunity to our Nation's students by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 448. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS EXPORT APPLICATIONS BY DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging approval of liquefied natural gas export applications, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 449. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016

and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING EFFICIENT RESOURCING FOR THE ASIA REBALANCE POLICY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding related to supporting efficient resourcing for the Asia rebalance policy by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 450. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENHANCE AND ENCOURAGE BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT AND ADOPTION IN RURAL AMERICA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing and encouraging broadband deployment and adoption in rural America, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 451. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PAY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IF THE BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS ARE NOT COMPLETED IN A TIMELY MANNER.

It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) both Houses of Congress should approve a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills before October 1 of each fiscal year;

(2) if a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills are not approved by October 1 of each fiscal year then no funds should be appropriated or otherwise be made available from the Treasury of the United States for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period after October 1 that a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills are not completed; and

(3) no retroactive pay for any Member of Congress should be made during a period after October 1 when the concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills are not completed.

SA 452. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ENTERS INTO CERTAIN CANDIDATE CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS WITH WESTERN STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) determinations, which may include determining whether the greater sage-grouse warrants protection, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 453. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRIORITIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS THAT ARE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE AND PROJECTS IN HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prioritization of the Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States on projects that are of national and regional significance and projects in high priority corridors of the National Highway System by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 454. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY PREVENTING THE BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES FROM RECLASSIFYING AMMUNITION PRIMARILY INTENDED FOR SPORTING PURPOSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Second Amendment rights, which may include the rights of individuals and retention of the right to manufacture, import, and sell ammunition previously granted an exemption from prohibition or restriction by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 455. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PRIORITIZE THE ELIMINATION OF THE RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prioritization of the elimination of the rape kit backlog by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 456. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEET THE NEEDS OF WOMEN VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs meet the needs of women veterans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 457. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN BONUSES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to bonuses paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include prohibitions on awards to employees responsible for eliminating the backlog of claims, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 458. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BARDA AND THE BIOSHIELD SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening our national security, which may include fully funding the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority and the BioShield Special Reserve Fund, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 459. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING THE QUANTITY OF FEDERAL LAND AVAILABLE FOR NATURAL RESOURCE EXTRACTION TO FUND INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to infrastructure financing, which may include expanding the Federal land available for natural resource extraction and using the receipts to fund infrastructure maintenance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 460. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COST AND FEASIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS AND ALLOWING STATES REASONABLE TIME TO CURE REJECTED STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to environmental laws requiring State implementation plans, which may include requiring the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to consider the costs, direct benefits, and feasibility of control measures when assessing the adequacy of State implementation plans rather than a Federal implementation plan or requiring the Administrator to allow States reasonable time to cure a rejected State implementation plan before imposing a Federal implementation plan on the States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 461. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MILITARY READINESS, TRAINING, AND MODERNIZATION WHILE DECREASING RISK OF CASUALTIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to troop levels capable of meeting global threats without undue risk to warfighters by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 462. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE ACCESS TO MEDICATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to over-the-counter medications, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 463. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT MARKETING MATERIALS RELATING TO THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal spending on health care promotional and marketing activities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 464. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING AN ENFORCEABLE TREATY FROM TOP 10 MAJOR GREENHOUSE GAS EMITTERS BEFORE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM EXISTING POWER PLANTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing for the continued competitiveness of the United States economy, which may include requiring an enforceable treaty ratified by the top 10 major emitting countries before regulation of greenhouse gas emissions from existing power plants may be implemented, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 465. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include preventing the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives from impinging upon those rights, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 466. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES THROUGH INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC TRAVEL AND TOURISM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) making aviation security more efficient and effective;

(2) improving the United States visa system;

(3) strengthening travel infrastructure; or

(4) attracting foreign travel and commerce;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 467. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DIRECT PROVISION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES, DEFENSE SERVICES, AND RELATED TRAINING TO THE KURDISTAN REGIONAL GOVERNMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the direct provision of defense articles, defense services, and related training to the Kurdistan Regional Government by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 468. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MILITARY AID TO ISRAEL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing grants only in Israel for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development to assist Israel in maintaining its qualitative military edge, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 469. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN ALIENS WITHOUT LEGAL STATUS IN THE UNITED STATES FROM RETROACTIVELY CLAIMING THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to benefits for certain aliens without legal status in the United States, which may include prohibiting qualification for certain tax benefits on a retroactive basis, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 470. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND TO SUPPORT UNACCOMPANIED WOMAN IN INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for unaccompanied women to secure access to vital services, including water, sanitation facilities, food, and health care, in emergency situations, including humanitarian crises or natural disasters, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 471. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. ___. POINT OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction of benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) increase either the early or full retirement age for benefits described in paragraph (1); or

(3) privatize Social Security.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 472. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING CYPRIOT-ISRAELI COOPERATION IN ENERGY EXPLORATION IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for programs to support the development of growing Cypriot-Israeli cooperation in natural resource exploration and extraction in the Eastern Mediterranean, which may contribute to European energy security, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 473. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING TO COMBAT ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for programs to counter anti-Semitic activity in Europe, which may include efforts to empower civil society, including diverse religious and ethnic groups, civil and human rights organizations, and the business community, to fight anti-Semitism and discrimination and convening regular consultations with Jewish community organizations and non-Jewish civil and human rights organizations to demonstrate visible support, listen to concerns, and solicit recommendations on improving security and supporting victims, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 474. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, HIRE MORE HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS FOR THE DEPARTMENT, AND ENSURE QUALITY AND TIMELY ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR ALL VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include legislation that strengthens quality and timely access to health care by hiring more health care professionals at facilities of the Department and making necessary improvements to infrastructure of the Department, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 475. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening the United States Postal Service, which may include imposing a moratorium to prevent mail processing plants from closing, reestablishing overnight delivery standards, recognizing the importance of rural delivery, allowing the Postal Service to innovate and adapt to compete in a digital age, or improving the financial condition of the Postal Service by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 476. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXEMPTING CERTAIN SCHOOLS FROM OBAMACARE'S EMPLOYER MANDATE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to exempting elementary schools, secondary schools, and institutions of higher education from the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 477. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INTEROPERABILITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving health information technology interoperability, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 478. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPRIORITIZING EDUCATION SPENDING TOWARD IMPACT AID OR OTHER FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS TO STATES AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, AND AWAY FROM ADMINISTRATIVE EARMARK PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reprioritizing education spending toward formula grant programs to States and local educational agencies, such as the impact aid program under title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), and away from administrative earmark programs like the Race to the Top program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 479. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD NEGATIVELY AFFECT RURAL HEALTH CARE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would negatively affect rural health care.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 480. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 13, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 20, line 21, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 20, line 25, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 1, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 4, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 5, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 8, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 9, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 12, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 13, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 38, line 19, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 38, line 20, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 38, line 23, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 38, line 24, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 2, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 3, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 6, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 7, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 10, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 11, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 14, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 15, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 18, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 19, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 22, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 39, line 23, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 40, line 2, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 40, line 3, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 43, line 19, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 43, line 20, decrease the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 43, line 23, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 43, line 24, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 2, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 3, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 6, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 7, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 10, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 11, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 14, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 15, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 18, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 19, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 22, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 44, line 23, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 45, line 2, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 45, line 3, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 45, line 6, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 45, line 7, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

SA 481. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING ISRAEL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to United States policy toward Israel, which may include preventing the United Nations and other international institutions from taking unfair or discriminatory action against Israel, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 482. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE INCREASED USE OF PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING IN FEDERAL FACILITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 483. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COMBATING SEXUAL ASSAULT, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that—

(1) provide resources for programs administered through the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13701 et seq.) and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.), and other related programs;

(2) address trafficking in the welfare system;

(3) provide safe shelter and services for runaway and homeless youth, including counseling and mental health services; or

(4) combat sexual assault on college and university campuses,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 484. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING LETHAL AID TO UKRAINE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing lethal aid to Ukraine by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 485. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE EQUITY IN THE TAX TREATMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER DEATH BENEFITS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing tax equity for death benefits paid to the families of public safety officers who lose their lives in the line of duty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 486. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN MENTAL HEALTH EFFORTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to mental health education, awareness and access to treatment, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 487. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REIN IN FISHING REGULATIONS AND PROVIDE DISASTER RELIEF FOR FISHERIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reining in onerous regulations on the United States fishing industry or providing assistance for fishery disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce during 2014 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 488. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPAND BROADBAND IN RURAL AREAS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting investments in rural broadband infrastructure, including changes to the Connect America Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 489. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY RELIEF, PROTECTING STATE-REGULATED INSURERS FROM GLOBAL REGULATORS, AND PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE REGULATIONS FOR INVESTMENT ADVISORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating regulatory burdens on small businesses, fostering small business export growth, protecting State-regulated insurers from international capital standards, and preventing duplicative regulations for investment advisors by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 490. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE DISPROPORTIONATE REGULATORY BURDENS ON COMMUNITY BANKS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 491. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Corporation for National and Community Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 492. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADVANCE WORKPLACE EQUALITY BY ENDING PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION AND CONFRONTING SEX-BASED WAGE DISCRIMINATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to ensure workplace equality policies and practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 493. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING MISSILE DEFENSE COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening missile defense cooperation with Israel by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 494. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EFFECTS OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS ON DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the validity of international agreements on reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, which may include assurances that any agreements do not impede economic growth and development of developing nations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 495. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ACHIEVING DOMESTIC ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reform of statutes governing domestic energy production, which may include increasing production to levels eliminating the need for energy imports from abroad, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 496. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH LITIGATION SETTLEMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring Executive branch agencies to make publicly available and keep current on the website of the agency deadlines for promulgating rules established pursuant to a litigation settlement or court order by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 497. Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING JOBS BY PREVENTING FEDERAL AGENCIES FROM OVERRIDING EFFORTS BY STATES TO CONSERVE SPECIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to amending any statute governing the protection of any species from extinction, which may include deferring conservation planning and implementation to States and units of local government, unless the efforts of the States and units of local government are determined to be inadequate for species conservation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 498. Mr. ENZI (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LEGISLATION SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to legislation submitted to Congress by the President of the United States to protect current beneficiaries of the Social Security program and prevent the insolvency of the program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 499. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE AVAILABILITY TO THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF FULLY MODERNIZED AND MISSION-CAPABLE AIRCRAFT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring the availability to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of fully modernized and mission-capable aircraft by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 500. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING FEDERAL FUNDS FROM BEING USED TO CREATE A FEDERAL COLLEGE RATINGS SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing Federal funds from being used to create a Federal college ratings system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 501. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE BIOMEDICAL INNOVATION FOR PATIENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the research, development, and regulation of innovative, safe and effective drugs, diagnostics, and medical devices to help American patients, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 502. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PRESERVE EMPLOYEE WELLNESS PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving employee wellness programs that provide financial incentives for employees who take steps to improve their health and reduce health care costs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 503. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING AN EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ROUTINE MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing, for certain routine maintenance activities relating to transportation infrastructure, an exemption from the permitting requirements of section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 504. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DISARMING THE EPA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to limiting the ability of Environmental Protection Agency personnel to carry firearms, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 505. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE AND THE LONG-RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting programs related to the ground-based midcourse defense and the long-range discrimination radar programs of the Department of Defense by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 506. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING VULNERABLE FAMILIES FROM JOB KILLING REGULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal agencies consider the full cost of regulations, including indirect job losses, prior to enacting or amending any regulation or rule, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 507. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING OBAMACARE SUBSIDIES FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ending health care subsidies for immigrants illegally residing in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 508. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO TERMINATE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WITH SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX LIABILITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal employees, which may include measures addressing Federal employees with seriously delinquent tax liability, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 509. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING THE STATE DNA ANALYSIS KIT BACKLOG.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to DNA analysis, which may include measures addressing the serious backlog of DNA analysis kits that in the possession of State and local governments and are awaiting testing, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 510. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING HEALTH CARE TO VETERANS WHO HAVE GEOGRAPHIC INACCESSIBILITY TO CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing health care to veterans who reside more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provides the care sought by the veteran, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 511. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND PREVENTING THE BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES FROM CLASSIFYING M855 OR ANY .223/5.56MM CARTRIDGE OR PROJECTILE AS ARMOR PIERCING AMMUNITION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to classifying any .223/5.56mm cartridge or projectile as armor piercing ammunition by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,

Firearms, and Explosives, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 512. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 105, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 106, line 8.

SA 513. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. KING, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING MEDICARE BENEFICIARY ACCESS TO EYE TRACKING ACCESSORIES AND SPEECH GENERATING DEVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing Medicare beneficiaries access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 514. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ALLOWING STATES TO ADOPT WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR ABLE-BODIED MEDICAID RECIPIENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Federal Government allowing States to adopt work requirements for able-bodied Medicaid recipients by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 515. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ALLOW STATES TO OPT OUT OF COMMON CORE WITHOUT PENALTY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or coercing States to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other specific academic standards, instructional content, curricula, assessments, or programs of instruction and allowing States to opt out of the Common Core State Standards without penalty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 516. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AGREEMENTS MADE BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES TO ARBITRATE DISPUTES THAT ARE MADE UNENFORCEABLE WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS RELATED TO TORTS ARISING OUT OF RAPE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to any agreement made between an employer and an employee to arbitrate a dispute that is made unenforceable with respect to any claim related to a tort arising out of rape by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 517. Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING CONGRESS'S AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S EXEMPTION FROM PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ending Congress's, the President's, the Vice President's, and political appointee's exemption from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) without raising revenues, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 518. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RECOUPING GRANTS FROM STATES WITH FAILED STATE-BASED EXCHANGES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to recouping grants given to States pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) to establish State-based exchanges that subsequently failed, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 519. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPAND BENEFITS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO SAILORS EXPOSED TO AGENT ORANGE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for exposure to Agent Orange, which may include legislation that expands presumptive coverage to Vietnam War veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange while serving in bays, harbors, or territorial seas, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 520. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO SEXUAL ASSAULT AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to sexual assault at institutions of higher education, which may include the implementation of an independent and standardized online survey tool developed and administered by the Department of Education, in consultation with the Department of Justice, to measure the prevalence of sexual assault at institutions of higher education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 521. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND BASIC RESEARCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to investment in science, technology, and basic research in the United States, which may include educational or research and development initiatives, public-private partnerships, or other programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 522. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESERVING THE RIGHT TO CONNECT DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES TO THE ELECTRICITY GRID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving the right of access of distributed energy units to the electrical grid, such as combined heat and power systems, residential- or commercial-scale photovoltaic systems, residential wind turbines, or other renewable or fossil-fueled electric generation systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 523. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BRINGING JOBS BACK TO AMERICA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to tax provisions to encourage United States enterprises to relocate operations from overseas to within the United States, closing offshore tax loopholes (including those relating to inversions), or discouraging United States enterprises from relocating United States operations to other countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 524. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION BY REDUCING THE COST OF CAPITAL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting economic growth and job creation by reducing the cost of capital, which may include repealing the 3.8 percent tax on investment income imposed by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 525. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TAX RELIEF FOR CATASTROPHIC MEDICAL EXPENSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing tax relief for catastrophic medical expenses, which may include restoring the value of the itemized tax deduction for costly medical expenses that was reduced by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 526. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT HIGH-QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 527. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE TRANSLATION OF BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH INTO TREATMENTS AND CURES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the translation of biomedical research into treatments and cures, which may include legislation to develop a strategic plan with funding priorities based on disease burden, the streamlining of Federal processes that would accelerate cures, and the creation of more transparency in the funding approval process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 528. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO UPGRADING DATA COLLECTION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CONDUCTED ON HEALTH CARE SERVICES DELIVERED AT THE FACILITIES OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to upgrading data collection and statistical analysis conducted on health care services delivered at the facilities of the Veterans Health Administration in order to increase the desired health outcomes that are consistent with current professional knowledge and facilitate comparisons with other health care delivery systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 529. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING SCREENING, TESTING, AND DIAGNOSIS FOR VIRAL HEPATITIS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving screening, testing, and diagnosis for Viral Hepatitis, which may include legislation to increase the number of individuals tested for Viral Hepatitis with a priority for early diagnosis of chronic cases of hepatitis type B (HBV) and Hepatitis type C (HCV) in veterans or other high-risk populations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 530. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE DIVERSION OF FUNDS SET ASIDE FOR THE USPTO.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the diversion or transfer of funds made available for use by the United States Patent and Trademark Office by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 531. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DETERRING ABUSIVE PATENT LITIGATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to deterring abusive patent litigation, which may include fee shifting, heightening pleading and discovery standards, demand letter reforms, stays of customer suits, an accountability mechanism that allows for the recovery of fees against shell companies, and providing appropriate funding for the United States Patent and Trademark Office, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 532. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE VITALITY OF TRADITIONAL CRIMINAL LAW REQUIREMENT OF MENS REA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to restoring and fortifying the traditional criminal law requirement that in order to convict a person of a criminal offense the Government must prove that the defendant acted with a guilty mental state, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 533. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ATTORNEYS COMPLY WITH DISCLOSURE OBLIGATIONS IN CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that all Department of Justice attorneys comply with all legal and ethical obligations in criminal prosecutions, which may include legislation that ensures the disclosure to the defendant in a timely manner of all information known to the Government that tends to negate the guilt of the defendant, mitigate the offense charged or the sentence imposed, or impeach the Government's witnesses or evidence, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 534. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING ACCESS TO MARIJUANA EDIBLES BY CHILDREN IN STATES THAT HAVE DECRIMINALIZED MARIJUANA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing access to edible marijuana products by children in States that have decriminalized marijuana, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 535. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to balancing the Federal budget, which may include legislation to ensure that total outlays for any fiscal year do not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year and legislation to ensure that total outlays for any fiscal year do not exceed 18 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States for the calendar year ending before the beginning of such fiscal year, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 536. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SAFEGUARDING DATA STORED ABROAD FROM IMPROPER GOVERNMENT ACCESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to safeguarding data stored abroad from improper government access, which may include prohibiting the United States Government from compelling the disclosure of data from United States providers stored abroad if accessing of such data would violate the laws of the country in which such data is stored, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 537. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE AGGRESSIVE AND CONSISTENT ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL LAWS PROHIBITING THE PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND POSSESSION OF ADULT OBSCENITY AND CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the aggressive and consistent enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting the production, distribution, and possession of adult obscenity and child pornography, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 538. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RAISING THE FAMILY OF FUNDS LIMIT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Small Business Investment Company Program of the Small Business Administration, which may include raising the Family of Funds limit of the Small Business Investment Company Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 539. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING MEDICAID BASED ON SUCCESSFUL AND BIPARTISAN STATE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to initiatives that would improve the Medicaid program and provide stable and predictable funding for long-term services and supports under the program, including initiatives that are based on successful and bipartisan State demonstration projects, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 540. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING HEALTH CARE RATIONING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the use of data obtained from comparative effectiveness research to deny coverage of items or services under Federal health programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 541. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE TRANSPARENCY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION'S REGULATORY FEES AND THE COMMISSION'S RECOVERY OF COSTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that require the Federal Communications Commission to adjust its regulatory fees to more accurately correspond to the benefits that the Commission's activities provide to the payor of each such fee by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 542. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY FOR CLOSING OUT EXPIRED GRANT ACCOUNTS WITH AN EMPTY BALANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving transparency for closing out expired grant accounts with an empty balance by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 543. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Department of Commerce, which may include elimination of funding for the National Technical Information Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 544. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXTRADITING INTERNATIONAL CYBERCRIMINALS COMMITTING CREDIT CARD THEFT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extraditing international cybercriminals committing credit card theft, which may include legislation pursuing additional extradition agreements or authority, enhancing international negotiations, or providing additional protection for Americans' financial information, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 545. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REIMPOSING WAIVED SANCTIONS AND IMPOSING NEW SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE JOINT PLAN OF ACTION OR A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Iran, which may include efforts to immediately reimpose waived sanctions and impose new sanctions against the Government of Iran for violations of the Joint Plan of Action or a comprehensive agreement on Iran's nuclear program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 546. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 95, line 6, strike ''$57,997,000,000'' and insert ''$96,000,000,000''.

SA 547. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WELFARE REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to any welfare reform initiative that increases State flexibility, innovation, and efficiency in operating anti-poverty programs and provides for a wage-enhancement tax credit targeted at low-income individuals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such

legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 548. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT INTERNET FREEDOM AND THE CURRENT MULTI-STAKEHOLDER GOVERNANCE OF THE INTERNET.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting Internet freedom and the current multi-stakeholder governance of the Internet by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 549. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROVIDING LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME STUDENT ACCESS TO PRIVATE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS THROUGH A TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a program or programs to serve low- and middle-income students by providing access to private elementary and secondary schools through a tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 550. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSOLIDATING TAX INCENTIVES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to consolidating tax incentives for higher education into a universal tax credit for higher education and skills obtainment, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 551. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, INCLUDING PROMOTING FREEDOM OF RELIGION (INCLUDING BELIEF) AROUND THE WORLD, GIVEN THE IMPORTANCE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM TO HUMAN RIGHTS, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, STABILITY, AND DEMOCRACY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting religious freedom, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 552. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE RELOCATION OF THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN ISRAEL FROM TEL AVIV TO JERUSALEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for United States embassies, which may include the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 553. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting public-private partnerships with the National Laboratories under the Department of Energy to facilitate innovation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 554. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. ELIMINATION OF THE RETIREMENT EARNINGS TEST UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM.

In the Senate, no point of order shall lie under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that eliminates the Retirement Earnings Test under the Social Security program.

SA 555. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. ELIMINATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY PAYROLL TAXES FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ATTAINED RETIREMENT AGE.

In the Senate, no point of order shall lie under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against any bill, joint resolution, motion,

amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that eliminates the imposition of payroll taxes relating to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance under the Social Security program for individuals who have attained retirement age.

SA 556. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DELIVERING WEAPONS TO UKRAINE USING EMERGENCY DRAWDOWN AUTHORITY IN THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an emergency drawdown, which may include an emergency drawdown to provide lethal assistance to the Government of Ukraine to respond to critical threats to the territorial integrity of Ukraine, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 557. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE SPIRIT OF TRANSPARENCY, RESPECT FOR BASIC HUMAN FREEDOMS, AND EFFECTIVE NONPROLIFERATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the United Nations in the spirit of transparency, respect for basic human freedoms, and effective nonproliferation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 558. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO PALESTINE AND INCREASING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing foreign assistance to Palestine and increasing foreign assistance for Israel by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 559. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING HIGHER EDUCATION DATA AND TRANSPARENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving higher education data and transparency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 560. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the enforcement of the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (S. 404, 114th Congress), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 561. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO UNDERUTILIZED FACILITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND THEIR POTENTIAL USE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is the ninth largest real property holder of the Federal Government, with more than 123,000 acres and 4,819 buildings and other structures with a replacement value of more than $32,700,000,000.

(2) The annual operation and maintenance costs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have increased steadily, and, as of November 2014, the Administration had more than $3,350,000,000 in deferred annual maintenance costs.

(3) According to Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Administration continues to retain real property that is underutilized, does not have identified future mission uses, or is duplicative of other assets in its real property inventory.

(4) The Office of Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and Congress have identified the aging and duplicative infrastructure of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as a high priority and longstanding management challenge.

(5) In the NASA Authorization Act of 2010, Congress directed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to examine its real property assets and downsize to fit current and future missions and expected funding levels, paying particular attention to identifying and removing unneeded or duplicative infrastructure.

(6) The Office of Inspector General found at least 33 facilities, including wind tunnels, test stands, airfields, and launch infrastructure, that were underutilized or for which National Aeronautics and Space Administration managers could not identify a future mission use and that the need for these facilities have declined in recent years as a result of changes in the mission focus of the Administration, the condition and obsolescence of some facilities, and the advent of alternative testing methods.

(7) The Office of Inspector General found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has taken steps to minimize the costs of continuing to maintain some of these facilities by placing them in an inactive state or leasing them to other parties.

(8) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has a series of initiatives underway that, in the judgment of the Office of

Inspector General, are ''positive steps towards 'rightsizing' its real property footprint'', and the Office of Inspector General has concluded that ''it is imperative that NASA move forward aggressively with its infrastructure reduction efforts''.

(9) Existing and emerging United States commercial launch and exploration capabilities are providing cargo transportation to the International Space Station and offer the potential for providing crew support, access to the International Space Station, and missions to low Earth orbit while the National Aeronautics and Space Administration focuses its efforts on heavy-lift capabilities and deep space missions.

(10) National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities and property that are underutilized, duplicative, or no longer needed for Administration requirements could be utilized by commercial users and State and local entities, resulting in savings for the Administration and a reduction in the burden of the Federal Government to fund space operations.

(b) SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to underutilized facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and their potential use, which may include actions described in subsection (c), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(c) ACTIONS.—The actions referred to in this subsection are—

(1) reduction of National Aeronautics and Space Administration infrastructure and, to the greatest extent practicable, making Administration property available for lease to a government or private tenant;

(2) pursuit of opportunities for streamlined sale or lease of National Aeronautics and Space Administration property and facilities, including for exclusive use, to a private entity, or expedited conveyance or transfer to a State or political subdivision, municipality, instrumentality of a State, or Department of Transportation-licensed launch site operators for the promotion of commercial or scientific space activity and for developing and operating space launch facilities; and

(3) lease or transfer of underutilized National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities and properties to commercial space entities or State or local governments to reduce operation and maintenance costs for the Administration, save money for the Federal Government, and promote commercial space and the exploration goals of the Administration and the United States.

SA 562. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A NEW OUTCOMES-BASED PROCESS FOR AUTHORIZING INNOVATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a new outcomes-based process for authorizing innovative higher education providers to participate in programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 563. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REFORM OF FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reform of repayment plans for student loans made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 564. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BUDGETING REGULATORY PROMULGATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing for regulatory reform, which may include regulatory reform that would allow Congress to budget regulatory promulgation under each Federal agency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 565. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT MEDICARE IS NOT RAIDED TO BAILOUT INSURANCE COMPANIES UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE OVERHAUL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Medicare funds are not used to bailout insurance companies, which may include through the risk corridor program or other programs established in the President's health care law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 566. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FINANCIAL VEHICLES OTHER THAN LOANS TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO PAY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing for financial vehicles other than loans to provide funds to pay for higher education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 567. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING DUPLICATION, FRAGMENTATION, AND OVERLAP IN GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ending duplication, fragmentation, and overlap in Government economic development programs in order to create efficiencies in such programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 568. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO IMPLEMENT THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND REDUCE IDENTITY THEFT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for the Internal Revenue Service, which may include increasing funding to fully implement the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to reduce identity theft and fraudulent tax returns, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 569. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN RURAL AND TRIBAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to designate funds for water projects, which may include authorized rural water projects or tribal water rights settlements or irrigation projects, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 570. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-REDUCING RESERVE FUND FOR REQUIRING SENATORS TO FILE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REPORTS ELECTRONICALLY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring Senators to file designations, statements, and reports under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 in electronic format, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over both the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 571. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST THE SALE OF FEDERAL LAND TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEFICIT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide for the sale of any Federal land (other than as part of a program that acquires land that is of comparable value or contains exceptional resources) that uses the proceeds of the sale to reduce the Federal deficit.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 572. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT RURAL SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the establishment of the Office of Rural Education Policy within the Department of Education, which could include a clearinghouse for information related to the challenges of rural schools and school districts or providing technical assistance within the Department of Education on rules and regulations that impact rural schools and school districts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 573. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF NATURAL GAS DISTRIBUTION PIPELINES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NO LONGER FIT FOR SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the repair and replacement of natural gas distribution pipelines and infrastructure no longer fit for service by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 574. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE RELIABILITY OF THE ELECTRIC GRID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to electric grid reliability, which may include legislation to address any regulation that would affect the reliability of the grid, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 575. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL THE TRICARE EXCLUSION FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the TRICARE program, which may include legislation that would repeal the Reserve Select exclusion, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 576. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECURING SOURCES OF SUPPLY OF RARE EARTH MINERALS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the supply chain vulnerabilities of rare earth materials extracted, processed, and refined from secure sources of supply to develop and produce advanced technologies in support of the requirements of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 577. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REDUCTION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reduction of Department of Defense contractors by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 578. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing methamphetamine abuse in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 579. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing full and dedicated funding for the various Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 580. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR THE CONTRACT TOWER PROGRAM OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing full and dedicated funding for the Contract Tower Program of the Federal Aviation Administration by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 581. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REESTABLISHING THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT TO PROVIDE NONPARTISAN INFORMATION TO CONGRESS ON COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES OF REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY CHANGES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reestablishing the Office of Technology Assessment to provide nonpartisan information to Congress on cost-benefit analyses of regulations and regulatory changes by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 582. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL SERVICE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to significantly increasing the number of young adults participating in 2 years of national service, which may include expanding national service programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 583. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE COMMERCIALIZATION OF CARBON TECHNOLOGIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the research, development, and demonstration projects necessary for the commercialization of fossil energy related technologies required for electric generating units (EGUs) and other energy conversion facilities to meet proposed and future emissions standards, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 584. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING EXPORT PROMOTION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting export promotion for small businesses, which may include educational programs, marketing services, or participation in foreign trade missions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 585. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 55, strike line 4 and insert the following:

support for caregivers; or

(8) improving outreach, access, and services for rural veterans;

SA 586. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 54, line 9, insert '', including the growing backlog of appeals of decisions regarding claims for disability compensation'' after ''veterans''.

SA 587. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO DISALLOW ANY FEDERAL TAX DEDUCTION FOR THE COST OF COURT-ORDERED PUNITIVE DAMAGES AS AN ORDINARY BUSINESS EXPENSE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to individual and corporate deductions allowable under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include provisions to disallow any Federal tax deduction for the cost of court-ordered punitive damages or similar costs if covered by taxpayer insurance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 588. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE NUMBER OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICERS AT AIR PORTS OF ENTRY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers at air ports of entry to reduce wait times and otherwise facilitate travel, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 589. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS FROM LIMITING COMPENSATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that employers are not precluded under the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) from providing compensation to employees that is greater than the compensation specified in an applicable collective bargaining agreement by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 590. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare Advantage program, which may include reversing the cuts to the Medicare Advantage program that were enacted under the President's health care law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 591. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE LIFELINE PROGRAM AND REDUCE FRAUD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient funding for the Federal Communications Commission to modernize the Lifeline program, which may include fundamental reforms to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 592. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE NEGOTIATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to intellectual property rights in international trade negotiations, which may include the protection of United States intellectual property, the improvement of the global intellectual property protection regime, or the strengthening of intellectual property protections among United States trading partners, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 593. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 87, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 88, line 4.

SA 594. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE PARTICIPATION OF UNDERREPRESENTED INDIVIDUALS, INCLUDING WOMEN AND MINORITIES, IN 21ST CENTURY FIELDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging underrepresented individuals, including women and minorities, to pursue careers in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, which may include competitive grants, workshops, internship programs, outreach efforts, and mentoring programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 595. Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE CYBERSECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increased sharing of cybersecurity threat information while protecting individual privacy and civil liberties interests, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 596. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. TO CONVEY CLEAR INFORMATION TO CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC ABOUT PROJECTED DEFICITS.

As part of the annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook required by section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S. C. 602(e)), the Congressional Budget Office shall—

(1) include a projection of Federal revenues, outlays, and deficits for a 30-year period beginning with the budget year, expressed in terms of dollars and as a percent of gross domestic product; and

(2) publish a graph depicting the magnitude of projected deficits in the Federal budget on a unified basis under current policy, expressed in terms of billions of dollars, arranged appropriately to show—

(A) the magnitude of the combined projected deficits of the budget year and the 9 subsequent fiscal years;

(B) the magnitude of the combined projected deficits of the 10th through 19th subsequent fiscal years;

(C) the magnitude of the combined projected deficits of the 20th through 29th fiscal years; and

(D) the magnitude of the combined projected deficits of the entire period that includes the budget year and the 29 subsequent fiscal years.

SA 597. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. TO CONVEY CLEAR INFORMATION TO CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC ABOUT PROJECTED FEDERAL OUTLAYS, REVENUES, AND DEFICITS.

As part of the annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook required by section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S. C. 602(e)), and at any other time the Congressional Budget Office releases projections of Federal deficits over any term of years, the Congressional Budget Office shall publish with its projection a 1-page statement—

(1) summarizing and categorizing total outlays, receipts, surpluses, and deficits of the Federal Government on a unified basis for that same prospective time period;

(2) categorizing and subtotaling separately—

(A) outlays for mandatory programs and for discretionary programs;

(B) outlays, payroll tax revenue, and offsetting receipts for Social Security and for Medicare;

(C) the surplus or deficit of revenues over outlays for Social Security and for Medicare; and

(D) revenues.

SA 598. Mrs. CAPITO (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 72, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine; as follows:

On page 4, beginning on line 6, strike ''provide'' and all that follows through ''unanimously supported by Congress'' on lines 7 and 8 and insert ''prioritize and expedite the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies, as authorized and supported by Congress''.

SA 599. Mrs. CAPITO (for Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 72, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine.''.

SA 600. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 20, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 22, line 21, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 23, line 4, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 23, line 8, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

SA 601. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. ___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE MEDICARE, CUT GUARANTEED BENEFITS, INCREASE OUT-OF-POCKET SPENDING, OR TURN MEDICARE INTO A PREMIUM SUPPORT PLAN.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) privatize or change the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) into a system that provides a payment either to pay for or offset private plan premiums or the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program;

(2) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program; or

(3) increase out-of-pocket spending for prescription drugs or preventive services under the Medicare program.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 602. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A SINGLE FOOD AGENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to food safety, which may include creating a single independent Federal food safety agency to implement Federal food safety law, including inspections, enforcement, standards-setting, and research or consolidating all the authorities for food safety inspections into a single agency to benefit both consumers and industry by preventing food borne illness and limiting costly recalls, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 603. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE PROMOTION OF NUTRITION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the improvement of operations in the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 604. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING COST SAVINGS IN OFFICE SPACE USED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging cost savings in office space used by Federal agencies, which may include encouraging Federal agencies to utilize office space unused by the Federal Government before purchasing or renting additional space, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 605. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOMELESSNESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to homelessness, which may include ensuring that Federal agencies that serve homeless populations are using the same methodology in counting the number of homeless persons served, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 606. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFRICAN ELEPHANT IVORY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to amending the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) to conserve elephants while appropriately regulating the United States trade in ivory, including the import and export of objects containing antique ivory, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Waters of the United States: Stakeholder Perspectives on the Impacts of EPA's Proposed Rule.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Examining the Regulatory Regime for Regional Banks.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled ''Surface Transportation Reauthorization: Performance, not Prescription.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled ''Unmanned Aircraft Systems: Key Considerations Regarding Safety, Innovation, Economic Impact, and Privacy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ENZI. 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 March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Continuing America's Leadership: Advancing Research and Development for Patients.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Securing the Border: Assessing the Impact of Transnational Crime.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Veterans Choice Act—Exploring the Distance Criteria.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Capital Formation and Reducing Small Business Burdens.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Rob Jones, Virginia Lenahan, Karen Matthews, Baxter Matthews, David Mitchell, Jennifer Phillips, Jacob Puhl, Chris Shim, Polly Webster, and Austin Williams for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOYS TOWN CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 301, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 301) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the

motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 301) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 301

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 ''Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Boys Town is a nonprofit organization dedicated to saving children and healing families, nationally headquartered in the village of Boys Town, Nebraska;

(2) Father Flanagan's Boys Home, known as ''Boys Town'', was founded on December 12, 1917, by Servant of God Father Edward Flanagan;

(3) Boys Town was created to serve children of all races and religions;

(4) news of the work of Father Flanagan spread worldwide with the success of the 1938 movie, ''Boys Town'';

(5) after World War II, President Truman asked Father Flanagan to take his message to the world, and Father Flanagan traveled the globe visiting war orphans and advising government leaders on how to care for displaced children;

(6) Boys Town has grown exponentially, and now provides care to children and families across the country in 11 regions, including California, Nevada, Texas, Nebraska, Iowa, Louisiana, North Florida, Central Florida, South Florida, Washington, DC, New York, and New England;

(7) the Boys Town National Hotline provides counseling to more than 150,000 callers each year;

(8) the Boys Town National Research Hospital is a national leader in the field of hearing care and research of Usher Syndrome;

(9) Boys Town programs impact the lives of more than 2,000,000 children and families across America each year; and

(10) December 12th, 2017, will mark the 100th anniversary of Boys Town, Nebraska.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) $5 GOLD COINS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall mint and issue not more than 50,000 $5 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 8.359 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(b) $1 SILVER COINS.—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 $1 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 26.73 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(c) HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 300,000 half dollar clad coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 11.34 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(3) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(d) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(e) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 100 years of Boys Town, one of the largest nonprofit child care agencies in the United States.

(b) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

(1) a designation of the value of the coin;

(2) an inscription of the year ''2017''; and

(3) inscriptions of the words ''Liberty'', ''In God We Trust'', ''United States of America'', and ''E Pluribus Unum''.

(c) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the National Executive Director of Boys Town and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens of Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2017.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins; and

(2) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge as follows:

(1) A surcharge of $35 per coin for the $5 coin.

(2) A surcharge of $10 per coin for the $1 coin.

(3) A surcharge of $5 per coin for the half dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be paid to Boys Town to carry out Boys Town's cause of caring for and assisting children and families in underserved communities across America.

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the Federal Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ATTACKS ON THE CIVILIAN POPULATION IN MARIUPOL, UKRAINE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 72.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 72) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lee amendment be agreed to and that the Senate now vote on adoption of the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 598) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To urge the President to prioritize and expedite the provision of lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies)

On page 4, beginning on line 6, strike ''provide'' and all that follows through ''unanimously supported by Congress'' on lines 7 and 8 and insert ''prioritize and expedite the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies, as authorized and supported by Congress''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 72), as amended, was agreed to.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to, the Leahy amendment to the title be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 72

Whereas Russian-backed rebels continue to expand their campaign in Ukraine, which has already claimed more than 5,000 lives and generated an estimated 1,500,000 refugees and internally displaced persons;

Whereas, on January 23, 2015, Russian-backed rebels pulled out of peace talks with Western leaders;

Whereas, on January 24, 2015, the Ukrainian port city of Mariupol received rocket fire from territory in the Donetsk region controlled by rebels;

Whereas, on January 24, 2015, Alexander Zakharchenko, leader of the Russian-backed rebel Donetsk People's Republic, publicly announced that his troops had launched an offensive against Mariupol;

Whereas Mariupol is strategically located on the Sea of Azov and is a sea link between Russian-occupied Crimea and Russia, and could be used to form part of a land bridge between Crimea and Russia;

Whereas the indiscriminate attack on Mariupol killed 30 people, including 2 children, and wounded 102 in markets, homes, and schools;

Whereas, on April 19, 2000, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1296, reaffirming its strong condemnation of the deliberate targeting of civilians;

Whereas, even after the Russian Federation and the Russian-backed rebels signed a ceasefire agreement called the Minsk Protocol in September 2014, NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, General Philip Breedlove, reported in November 2014 the movement of ''Russian troops, Russian artillery, Russian air defense systems, and Russian combat troops'' into Ukraine;

Whereas, on January 24, 2015, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg stated, ''For several months we have seen the presence of Russian forces in eastern Ukraine, as well as a substantial increase in Russian heavy equipment such as tanks, artillery, and advanced air defense systems. Russian troops in eastern Ukraine are supporting these offensive operations with command and control systems, air defense systems with advanced surface-to-air missiles, unmanned aerial systems, advanced multiple rocket launcher systems, and electronic warfare systems.'';

Whereas, on January 25, 2015, after Russian-backed rebels attacked Mariupol, European Council President Donald Tusk wrote, ''Once again appeasement encourages the aggressor to greater acts of violence; time to step up our policy based on cold facts, not illusions.'';

Whereas, on November 19, 2014, at a Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate confirmation hearing, Deputy National Security Adviser Anthony Blinken stated that the provision of defensive lethal assistance to the Government of Ukraine ''remains on the table. It's something we're looking at.'';

Whereas the Ukraine Freedom Support Act (Public Law 113–272), which was passed by Congress unanimously and signed into law by the President on December 18, 2014, states that it is the policy of the United States to further assist the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereignty and its territorial integrity to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia; and

Whereas the Ukraine Freedom Support Act authorizes $350,000,000 in fiscal years 2015–2017 for the President to provide the Government of Ukraine with defense articles, defense services, and military training for the purpose of countering offensive weapons and reestablishing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, including anti-tank and anti-armor weapons; crew weapons and ammunition; counter-artillery radars; fire control and guidance equipment; surveillance drones; and secure command and communications equipment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

The Senate—

(1) condemns the attack on Mariupol by Russian-backed rebels;

(2) urges the President to prioritize and expedite the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies, as authorized and supported by Congress in the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–272);

(3) calls on the United States, its European allies, and the international community to continue to apply economic and other forms of pressure on the Russian Federation, especially in the form of sanctions, if the Government of the Russian Federation continues to refuse to cease its aggression in Ukraine;

(4) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately end its support for the rebels in eastern Ukraine, allow Ukraine to regain control of its internationally recognized borders, and withdraw its military presence in eastern Ukraine; and

(5) expresses solidarity with the people of Ukraine regarding the humanitarian crisis in their country and the destruction caused by the military, financial, and ideological support of the Government of the Russian Federation for the rebels in eastern Ukraine.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war.

The amendment (No. 599) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine.''.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ABOUT A STRATEGY FOR THE INTERNET OF THINGS TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 110, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 110) expressing the sense of the Senate about a strategy for the Internet of Things to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 110) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani into the House Chamber for the joint meeting at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 25; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 11, with 18 hours of debate time remaining, and that the time until 10:30 a.m. be equally divided and controlled by the two managers or their designees; further, that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair at 10:30 a.m. to allow for the joint meeting of Congress; lastly, that all time during the recess count against the remaining debate time on the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. CAPITO. 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 7:51 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 25, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MS. GEORGIA HENLEY ON THE OCCASION OF HER 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Georgia Henley upon the joyous occasion of her 90th birthday, which will be celebrated with her family, friends, and church family on March 22nd, 2015 at Unity Church of Buffalo.

Ms. Henley was born in Mobile, Alabama on March 21st, 1925. In 1945, during the period of the ''The Great Migration'' Ms. Henley and her husband joined the millions of African Americans leaving the rural South to find better opportunities in the Northeast. This journey landed her in our beloved Queen City, Buffalo, NY. After a divorce in 1954, Ms. Henley was left to raise 5 small children and often worked 6–7 days a week, from 4 AM and not finishing sometimes until 9 PM. Her strong determination coupled with her propensity for unconditional love allowed her to provide for her children and in turn her sacrifice has blessed her with 10 grandchildren, 18 great grandchildren, and 5 great-great-grandchildren.

A longtime member of Unity Church of Buffalo, Ms. Henley will also be celebrating her 50th Anniversary of church membership. She is deeply devoted to her church and community and has served on the Unity Church Board, Erie County Senior Services Advisory Board, and received the Network of Religious Communities Religious Service Award.

Ms. Henley is well-known for her generosity and spirit. She has said, ''The most important thing and the greatest blessing I've received in life is learning to love unconditionally.'' Ms. Henley continues to demonstrate this power to love in life, despite challenges and hardships.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to celebrate the life of Ms. Georgia Henley. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Ms. Henley a very happy birthday and congratulate her for reaching this exciting milestone. I wish Ms. Henley and all those who worship with her at the Unity Church of Buffalo all the best for years to come.

COMMEMORATING THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, it has been 70 years since the end of World War II. Seventy years since, as allies, the R.O.C. (Taiwan) and the United States stood shoulder to shoulder against the forces that threatened the destiny of our two peoples.

In commemoration of another event of the combined interests of our two peoples, the 36th anniversary of the passage of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), we rededicate ourselves to enhance the critical relationship between the people of Taiwan and the United States of America.

The economic and strategic security of Taiwan is of highest importance to our well-being. In these times of worldwide political chaos, we must have dependable allies; Taiwan has proven itself time and time again. In addition to being a dependable ally, Taiwan is one of our strongest trading partners; contributing greatly to our economic stability.

To ensure the viability of Taiwan, which is in our self-interest, we must enable Taiwan under the mandate of the TRA the ability to purchase defensive arms necessary to help them defend themselves.

CLARE EDMUNDSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Clare Edmundson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Clare Edmundson is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Clare Edmundson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Clare Edmundson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join many of my colleagues in recognizing the 36th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act. Through the Taiwan Relations Act, the United States and Taiwan have enjoyed a warm and mutually beneficial relationship, which has promoted security and economic prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

I would like to point out another anniversary that will take place later this year of great significance to both the people of the United States and Taiwan—the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II.

The contributions of the Republic of China played a key role in the successful victory over the Axis Powers. While many are familiar with figures such as General Joseph Stilwell, General Claire Chennault and the Flying Tigers, few fully appreciate the fact that for eight years, ROC forces tied down Japanese troops in China, preventing Tokyo from throwing its full military might against the rest of the Allied Powers.

The war came at a great cost to the ROC both during and after the war. In the post WW II upheaval, the communists took power, and in 1949, the ROC was forced to relocate to Taiwan.

Despite the seemingly impossible challenges the ROC faced over much of the 20th century, Taiwan has achieved the vision of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and other visionaries, who foresaw a modern, democratic state with a great deal to offer to its neighbors and the world. Today, Taiwan is a multiparty democracy with an advanced economy that is an important component of the regional and global economy. Taiwan remains one of our closest economic and security partners, and I am proud to call myself a friend of Taiwan.

I hope my colleagues will join me during this 70th anniversary year, in recognizing the contributions all of our allies made to defeat the Axis Powers and in securing the peace and prosperity of the postwar Asia-Pacific. I thank the Taiwan people for their important contribution.

HONORING CATHY PERKOWITZ FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cathy Perkowitz, an extraordinary woman from the sixth district of Illinois. Recently, the Alzheimer's Association named Cathy the 2015 Outstanding Advocate of the Year. This award is given to an advocate who has a deep commitment and strong passion for the Alzheimer's cause.

Cathy's husband, Bill, was diagnosed with younger-onset Alzheimer's in 2006 at the age of fifty two. Cathy has been actively involved with the Alzheimer's Association since 2009. Since then, she has dedicated herself to caring for her husband and advocating on behalf of those with Alzheimer's disease. She has been an Alzheimer's Ambassador since the program's inception in 2010 and recently traveled to Springfield, Illinois to attend her sixth straight lobby day on behalf of the Alzheimer's cause.

During her time as an Alzheimer's advocate, Cathy has worked to develop strong personal relationships with elected officials. I can personally speak to this. Cathy was kind enough

to invite me to visit her husband Bill in his long-term care facility. This was a special experience for me, and I am grateful for Cathy and her family's willingness to help me understand what it's like to live with and care for someone with Alzheimer's. Not many people are willing to open their lives up that way.

Cathy's involvement also stretches beyond the advocacy field. She is active in a local younger-onset caregiver support group since 2006, when there were less than twelve contributors. Now, Cathy is one of seventy. She also participates in the Walk to End Alzheimer's and her team has been the top fundraiser for the past three years. Since that fateful news in 2006, she has dedicated her life to the Alzheimer's cause. Cathy is the true definition of an advocate.

Mr. Speaker, and distinguished colleagues, please join me in congratulating Cathy Perkowitz on receiving this distinct honor and wishing her and her family many future successes as they continue their advocacy on behalf of those with Alzheimer's disease.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF CAROL BURGESS EMMOTT, PH.D.

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and work of a dear friend and revered colleague, Carol Burgess Emmott. Born on November 11, 1946, Carol died peacefully at her home in Hillsborough, California on February 25, 2015, at the age of 68, in the arms of her loving husband, Cameron.

Carol was born and raised in Bartlesville, Oklahoma. She graduated from Southern Methodist University in 1969 with a double major in History and Political Science. In 1975, while working for the California Senate Pro Tem George Moscone, she earned her Ph.D. from Oklahoma University in Health Policy, studying the California Legislature through UC Berkeley's Institute of Governmental Studies. After completing her Ph.D., Carol contributed to the health policy research agenda of the Institute for Health Policy Studies at the University of California, San Francisco.

After her tenure at UCSF, Carol accepted a political appointment in Washington, D.C. working under Joseph A. Califano, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. During her tenure there she managed a third of the health care legislative agenda for the Carter Administration. Carol returned to California as Chief Deputy Director of the State Health Department, working under Director Beverlee Myers. She was later the Deputy of the San Francisco Department of Public Health under Mayor Dianne Feinstein, where she shaped policies to respond to the AIDS crisis.

Carol's commitment to California's public safety net facilities led her to found and serve as CEO of the California Association of Public Hospitals. During her long tenure at CAPH, Carol and her colleagues were successful in bringing billions of dollars of state and federal funds to help support California's health care safety net, facilitating the passage of legislation to rebuild the majority of these vital facilities.

After 15 years in federal, state, and local health policy, Carol complemented her career by contributing to private sector health care through senior level executive recruiting. During the course of her 25-year career, Carol was a partner at three of the top four international recruiting firms: Spencer Stuart, Heidrick & Struggles, and Russell Reynolds Associates. Carol's last 10 years were dedicated to building and leading the Health Services Practice at Russell Reynolds Associates. She was successful in recruiting many of the top leaders in American health care across a broad swath of the industry, including academic medical centers, major health plans, significant health systems, and prominent health policy positions.

Carol's dedication to executive development was manifested in her leadership forums in California and Massachusetts, and her CEO/Innovator's Roundtable. Devoted to her professional colleagues, Carol focused especially on mentoring the emerging young women leaders across the industry. The recent creation of the Carol Emmott Fellowship stands as a testament to her commitment to the success of women in the health care industry.

Carol was deeply devoted to her family. Cameron, her husband of 45 years, was the love of her life. Having met in high school, they were soul mates in all endeavors, most particularly in the nurturing of their son, Parker Emmott. While Carol was a dedicated wife and professional, she was a devoted mother, always prioritizing her connection to Parker, his friends, and his evolution as a unique and talented individual. Carol was predeceased by her parents, Robert Banks Burgess and Mary Gary Bedwell. In addition to her husband and son, she is survived by her sister, Betsy Wright, and many other beloved family members and friends.

Carol was special in every way. She knew how to be a friend. She used her intellect for the betterment of humanity, and she was beautiful inside and out. Once you met Carol, she became unforgettable. I am blessed to have known her, to have learned from her, to have been inspired by her, and to have had her as a trusted friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life and work of Carol Burgess Emmott and in extending our deepest condolences to her magnificent family. She strengthened our community and our country, and bettered the lives of countless Americans.

IN HONOR OF 2014 MISS UNITED STATES ELIZABETH SCOTT SAFRIT BEING NAMED MISS WORLD AMERICAS

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Elizabeth Scott Safrit, a constituent from Kannapolis, North Carolina, who placed 3rd in the 64th Miss World pageant on December 14, 2014, in London, England.

Elizabeth represented North Carolina in the Miss United States Pageant last year, and upon winning qualified to represent our country in the Miss World competition.

The 130 Miss World contestants were judged not only on beauty but also on physical fitness, modeling, social media skills, interview skills, and their philanthropy project, called ''Beauty with a Purpose.''

Elizabeth represented the United States well, finishing first in the multimedia portion of the competition. She ultimately was crowned 2nd Princess, a 3rd overall finish in the 2014 Miss World pageant, thereby receiving the additional title of Miss World Americas.

So far, Elizabeth has served admirably as Miss United States. She has traveled across the country promoting ''Save the Children'', advocating for the welfare of children, and has also served as a spokesperson for ''Rock the Vote.'' She will travel much of the world as Miss World Americas.

Her parents, Walter and Lynne Safrit, who I know well, along with Elizabeth's extended family and friends, are very proud of her accomplishments.

It is a great honor and privilege to extend these congratulatory remarks to an inspiring young lady who represents Kannapolis, North Carolina's 8th District, North Carolina, and the United States worldwide in her role as Miss United States and Miss World Americas.

SUE POSER OF PIERZ

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Sue Poser of Pierz, Minnesota who has been named the 2015 Quilter of the Year by Minnesota Quilter's Inc. Not only is she an exceptional quilter, she is also the third generation owner of Gruber's, which many people liken to a ''Laura Ingalls Wilder'' style shop and community hub—and award-winning quilting mecca in Genola. Her quilting business began with Poser's grandparents and a small general store serving a town of a population of 75 and perhaps another 100 in the surrounding farms and townships. The store eventually included everything from quilting supplies to movie rentals, although it was particularly famous for its meat market and quilting parties. An often-told story in the area tells of a man who brought a bear into the meat market for procession and while negotiating, he saw a group of 50 women enjoying margaritas from the bar across the street for a quilting party. Curious to find out more about the party, he stopped in only to hear one of the spirited woman say, ''We have to get back to the convent before they lock the doors at eight!''

The meat market, like so many small businesses, no longer operates—though the quilting shop prospered and has expanded to other locations. Gruber's now operates with 20 employees in Waite Park and has been voted one of the best quilt shops in the nation.

Sue is the common thread that binds huge sections of the quilting community together, not only as a crafter but as an encourager helping a lot of people find success in the quilt and pattern-design industry. Some years ago, she was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis—but that doesn't stop her from doing what she loves. She said, ''If God gave me MS, it was to slow me down because otherwise I'd never stop.'' She is such an inspiration to others.

People who struggle with a recent health diagnosis or life changes often come to her for support and a ready ear to listen.

In our rural areas, weekly or monthly quilting bees are still a time for women to leave their cares at home and join in the laughter, fellowship and wisdom of others—and often a potluck lunch or dinner, and yes, the occasional margarita shared with a group of nuns.

Sue Poser exemplifies the embodiment of utilizing creativity and hard work to build a small business success while staying rooted to family, friends and community.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the work and accomplishments of Dr. Marcella Maxwell in recognition of Women's History Month. On Sunday, March 22nd, I joined the 369th Harlem Historical Society for their annual awards dinner dance celebrating Women's History Month at the elegant Marina del Rey in Throgs Neck, New York. This annual salute pays special tribute to phenomenal women of color currently serving and those that have served in our Nation's military. I was very proud to present this year's prestigious 369th Historical Society Women's History Month Award to my beloved friend, Dr. Marcella Maxwell.

Under the leadership of retired Major General Nathaniel James, AUS, the 369th Historical Society was established to collect, preserve and maintain artifacts, relics, books, papers, photographs, films and other artifacts touching on the past history of the 369th Infantry Regiment (also known as the Harlem Hellfighters who were given their name by same German soldiers they help to defeat in the liberation of France and Europe in World War I), its allies and affiliates and of Soldiers who served in the Military Services of the United States. One of the primary services it provides is to exhibit all gathered data to the public and ensure that the contributions of all African Americans and Minorities in the Military are recognized, preserved and accurately presented to the public.

The Society also recognizes individuals who have contributed their time, effort and support for Women Veterans as they transition back to civilian life. My dear friend Dr. Marcella Maxwell is such a person who through her organization, the Greater New York Link's Incorporated has led the way in this very important effort. On Saturday, March 21, Dr. Marcella and the Link's Inc. joined with The Home Depot Chelsea neighborhood Store in New York City, under the direction of CEO Craig Menear, Al Manigault, Mohammed Bello, Vincent Merlo, Leana Baker, and Nalinee Hobert to honor women veterans, by providing ''Do it Yourself Workshops, a ''Career Fair'' and a special ceremony, where I presented congressional certificates to 32 women veterans for their service to our Nation. Dr. Maxwell, whose late husband served under retired Brigadier General George A. Jones, has been an amazing advocate and supporter of not only women veterans, but all veterans throughout this entire Nation. Every year at the NAACP National Convention she convenes and presides over the Association's annual Military Dinner, where one of our United States Armed Forces Services Divisions is featured and honored.

The Links, Incorporated is an international, not-for-profit corporation, established in 1946. The membership consists of 12,000 professional women of color in 280 chapters located in 41 states, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of the Bahamas. It is one of the nation's oldest and largest volunteer service organizations of extraordinary women who are committed to enriching, sustaining and ensuring the culture and economic survival of African Americans and other persons of African ancestry.

The members of The Links, Incorporated, such as, Dr. Maxwell, who is the National Eastern Area Chair of the Women's Issues Committee as are influential decision makers and opinion leaders. The Links, Inc. has attracted many distinguished women who are individual achievers and have made a difference in their communities and the world. They are business and civic leaders, role models, mentors, activists and volunteers who work towards a common vision by engaging like-minded organizations and individuals for partnership. Links members contribute more than 500,000 documented hours of community service annually—strengthening their communities and enhancing the nation.

In addition, Dr. Marcella Maxwell has been an Adult Educator for over two decades. She served as a Founding Dean at Medgar Evers College, CUNY where she sponsored and coordinated the first Women's History Month Conference at the College. Her background and experience in helping women to improve their status and empowering them to transform their lives and the lives of their families lead to her appointment as Chair of Mayor Koch's Commission on the Status of Women and Chair of the City's Human Rights Commission. She subsequently served as the Director of Alternative Education for the New York City Housing Authority where students earned their General Education Diplomas, making them eligible for entering College. Dr. Maxwell earned her Bachelors and Masters Degrees with Honors from Long Island University and her Ed.D Doctorate in Higher Education Administration from Fordham University on a Ford Foundation Scholarship. She retired from the New York City Board of Education and states that one of the best experiences of her teaching career was living and working in Puerto Rico as one of the first 20 teachers to participate in ''Operation Understanding'', an exchange program, sponsored by the New York City Board of Education and the Puerto Rican Board of Education.

Education was always a priority for Dr. Maxwell and her family. Her grandfather donated the land for the first elementary school for African-Americans in Cleveland, N.C.

Today, she forges partnerships with a wide range of organizations to bring new scholarships and educational programs for New York City youth. Dr. Marcella Maxwell is a clinical supervisor of teaching fellows at Brooklyn College, a part of the City College of New York system. In this role Dr. Maxwell trains teaching fellows to foster their professional development, organizes collaboration between principals, teachers and other faculty, spearheads team building seminars, curriculum design and development and instructional strategies and methods.

In addition to her role as an educator, Dr. Maxwell is a well-known advocate for women's issues, community development, organizational administration, fund development, curriculum development and government relations. Dr. Maxwell is a passionate advocate for Geriatric Education which allows her with several organizational partners to provide information, and education for seniors to help them navigate the challenges of Aging Gracefully.

In the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Dr. Maxwell serves as the Vice Chair of the Special Contributions Fund and on the Committee charged with awarding The Spingam Medal for outstanding achievement by an African American. Dr. Maxwell's philosophy and mission in life is to use her relationships and resources to help others in their pursuit of Civil Rights and Social Justice. She is truly an Ambassador for the City of New York as she carries out her responsibilities for The Links Incorporated and as a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) representative for Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Incorporated at the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing Dr. Marcella Maxwell, and her efforts that have positively impacted the quality of life for countless citizens across this Nation. Her constant dedication, commitment, and spiritual guidance is worthy of our Nation's highest esteem.

INTRODUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES–CARIBBEAN PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2015

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the United States–Caribbean Partnership Act of 2015, along with my friends and colleagues Representatives GREGORY MEEKS, FREDERICA WILSON, ALCEE HASTINGS, BARBARA LEE, YVETTE CLARKE, LOIS FRANKEL, ALBIO SIRES and TED DEUTCH. This bill will establish embassies in the five Caribbean countries where we currently have no physical diplomatic presence—Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Five years ago, President Obama attended the Summit of the Americas in Trinidad and Tobago and declared that, ''It's appropriate and important that we hold this summit in the Caribbean. The energy, the dynamism, the diversity of the Caribbean people inspires us all, and is such an important part of what we share in common as a hemisphere.'' I could not agree more. As we approach the upcoming Summit of the Americas in Panama next month, the United States must redouble our commitment to the people of the Caribbean. That is precisely why I am introducing this bill today.

I ask my colleagues to imagine countries where tens of thousands of American citizens travel for pleasure or business; where thousands of American citizens go to school; where there is a constant concern about drug trafficking to the United States; but where the United States has no U.S. embassies. Most

people I speak to are surprised to learn that there are five countries in the Caribbean—only a few hundred miles from the United States—where we have no physical diplomatic presence. My legislation will correct this problem by establishing U.S. embassies in Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Currently, all diplomatic relations with these countries are run out of the U.S. embassy in Barbados.

While these countries are small, they must not be taken for granted. They are key voting members of the United Nations and other international organizations. As members of the Organization of American States (OAS), their votes are extremely important. Without a U.S. presence in these five countries, it is very difficult to conduct in-person diplomacy with our counterparts on a range of crucial international issues. These countries are also of profound interest and importance to the millions of Caribbean-American citizens in the United States.

Currently, in order to meet with local officials, the private sector or civil society, U.S. diplomats must fly in from Barbados (or Washington) on often expensive, infrequent flights, and stay overnight in often expensive island hotels. Close working relationships with key leaders cannot develop, because our diplomats are not there to establish them. And, our diplomacy is limited to phone calls, emails and faxes, even though we all know that the best interaction is carried out in person. In addition to our stymied diplomacy, U.S. citizens living in these countries do not have full consular services to assist in the event of emergencies.

This bill establishes uses existing embassy construction funding to establish these new embassies. In 2011, I authored a bipartisan amendment with the former Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Congressman Connie Mack (R–FL), to create these embassies which was approved unanimously by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I look forward to working with the Obama Administration to get this legislation across the finish line and to seeing U.S. diplomats permanently stationed in every country in the Caribbean.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO CAROLINE JOK

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Caroline Jok attends Seven Lakes High School in Katy, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should the government play in our lives?

It is said: One can never have too much of a good thing.

While it is certainly true that in many cases it is harder for a good thing to turn bad, it is impossible for this statement to be infallible with the absolute qualifier ''never'' hanging in the balance. For example, though water is essential to life, if one drinks too much of it they will face hyponatremia, otherwise known as water intoxication. While chocolate is undeniably sweet and pleasant, too much chocolate induces contrastingly unpleasant feelings, sickness, and even dangerous health conditions. Even something as wonderful and essential as freedom—the very virtue this great Nation is founded on, the very virtue that our ancestors fought and gave their lives for—can become a negative force if there is too much of it. The statement ''too much freedom'' sounds seemingly absurd, however, this is precisely why our founding fathers, despite the hard fought efforts to escape the oppression of one government, worked to build another. Too much freedom can result, ironically, in oppression, in chaos, in exploitation, and in a bloodbath driven by greed. This is where the role of our government comes in.

Our government serves as a counterbalance to a good thing, not to control all things; it is the protector of this good thing. It is the role of our government to address and settle conflicts from an unbiased standpoint to the best of its ability. It is the role of our government to compose and enforce legislation that will benefit, protect, and create opportunity for its citizens, to set limitations on freedom so that freedom can be preserved and ensured. It is the role of our government to serve as the voice of the nation to the rest of the world, to serve as our representative, as our ambassador. It is the role of our government to serve the people who elected it. It is essential for our government to be involved in the day to day lives of its citizens, be it through the corporate world, cyberspace and security, on a local level, in education, immigration, in the health industry, and countless other niches, not to control these realms, but to serve as an equalizer, safeguard and creator of opportunity in each of these.

Professor of Communication at American University, Leonard Steinhorn comments, ''[if many] Americans feel 'unease' toward [our] government's role in our daily lives, it is either because they take much of what the federal government does for granted, or because the media tend to give a disproportionate voice to those whose ideological temper tantrums against government make for good copy and sound bites.'' Our government's involvement in day-to-day life proceedings is essential to balance and preserve a very good thing: freedom. This is precisely the role our government plays in our lives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote yesterday because of a family medical issue. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call #130—NAY

Roll Call #131—YEA

EGAN WALKER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Egan Walker for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Egan Walker is a 10th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Egan Walker is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Egan Walker for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks regarding my absence from votes which occurred on March 23, 2015. I was delayed in arriving in Washington because I was in attendance at a funeral for a beloved family within our community. The Columbia community and the University of South Carolina worshipped in thankful memory for the life of Charles ''Charlie'' Leverett Adams Terreni, Jr.

H.R. 360—Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act—NAY

H. Res. 162—Calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity—AYE

JASON SHORT OF INTERNATIONAL FALLS

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jason Short of International Falls, Minnesota and the work of the Falls Hunger Coalition under the leadership of Nancy Anderson.

I am sure many of my fellow Members have seen the nightly weather reports indicating that International Falls has the coldest temperatures in the United States.

Jason is a young adult working as a delivery driver for UPS in the International Falls region that covers a 300-mile route. On one brisk day, one of his package recipients noted that Jason was wearing shorts and told him he

was crazy for dressing like that in the cold weather. He took that craziness and his love of wearing shorts to Facebook to initiate a challenge to his friends and posted, ''Until I raise 1,000 dollars for the Falls Hunger Coalition Food Bank, I'm going to wear shorts no matter if it's snowing, 30 below, rain, sleet, or snow.''

Soon the amount turned into $2,000, $3,000, $4,000, $5,000, $6,000 to $7,192 at the end of the year.

The comments on his Facebook ranged from, ''We need to dress this young man,'' or ''I don't know, maybe we want to keep Jason in shorts all winter. However, he did stop wearing his shorts when he reached $5,000 with contributions from friends and strangers all over the United States. He modestly says, ''It's all about paying it forward. Everyone can use a helping hand once in a while and you never know if the shoe was on the other foot, you never know if you're going to need something yourself so why not get out there and help somebody.''

The Falls Hunger Coalition served over 8,000 people in 4,178 households in calendar year 2014. That added up to over 164,000 pounds of food distributed through Bonus Bucks, Senior Select, the Nutritional Assistance Program for Seniors, and the Summer Snack Packs and Summer Meals. Population wise, it's a small county but the coalition is doing an outstanding job of serving the needs of many.

I understand that Jason is planning to hatch another fundraising later this year and as a former UPS employee during my college days and spending time on a ride-along-driver ''in the browns'' this past summer in Duluth, I know he has the determination to once again achieve great success. With one out of five children in this country going to bed hungry every night, I am so proud of this young man for stepping up and trying to alleviate the issue of hunger in his own community.

Let's just hope for warmer temperatures during his next fundraising phase.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL CASSIE STROM OF THE UNITED STATES AIR NATIONAL GUARD

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Missouri's 1st district, I am proud to honor one of our most distinguished constituents and homegrown heroes, Major General Cassie Strom of the United States Air National Guard. In June of this year—2015, General Strom is retiring, after an incredible 31 plus years of dedicated service.

General Strom received her commission by direct appointment and began her active duty career with the Air Force in February 1984. She has served at all levels—Department of Defense, Combatant Command, Headquarters United States Air Force, Major Command, wing and base legal offices. She previously served on active duty for six years at the base legal offices at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, Osan Air Base, Korea and Torrejon Air Base, Spain. General Strom is admitted to practice law in the State of Missouri and the State of Nebraska.

General Strom transferred to the Air Force Reserve with an assignment as an Individual Mobilization Augmentee at Scott Air Force Base, Illinois. She then moved to the Missouri Air National Guard in 1990 as a traditional Guard member. She has deployed to Bosnia and Herzegovina and augmented the Army Civil Affairs mission, worked a variety of international peacekeeping exercises, served in the Department of Defense Office of General Counsel in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, acted as the Deputy Staff Judge Advocate, United States Transportation Command, and as a Supervising Senior Attorney at the United States Air Force Academy.

Major General Cassie A. Strom concludes her achievement filled career as the Air National Guard Assistant to The Judge Advocate General. In this position, she is the principal adviser and liaison to The Judge Advocate General on Air National Guard legal matters. In addition, she serves as a senior representative on The Judge Advocate General's Air National Guard Council, providing leadership, strategic planning and management of the entire Air National Guard Judge Advocate program, encompassing over 440 judge advocates and paralegals at Air National Guard legal offices throughout the United States.

Her service to our country does not stop with her time in military status—she runs the Veteran's Advocacy Project for the Catholic Legal Assistance Ministry, which is housed in Scott Hall, in our own St. Louis University School of Law!

As further testament to her exceptional service, General Strom's military decorations include the Defense Superior Service Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Joint Service Commendation Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal (with 3 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Army Commendation Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal (with 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, Air Force Organizational Excellence Award (with 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), National Defense Service Medal (with Bronze Star), Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Armed Forces Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Short, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Long, Air Force Longevity Service (with 3 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Armed Forces Reserve Medal (with 1 Gold Hourglass) Air Force Training Ribbon, and NATO Medal!

General Strom has set a truly inspiring example of dedication to the defense of freedom, service before self, and what it means to be an Officer. She has been a trailblazer—as one of the first JAGs to deploy into Bosnia to becoming the first female ANG Advisor to Air Force Special Operations Command's Staff Judge Advocate to becoming the first woman to become a Major General Air National Guard Judge Advocate! The people of the first district of Missouri—thank General Strom for her service and wish her well in her future endeavors!

CHARLIZE GALLEGOS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Charlize Gallegos for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Charlize Gallegos is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Charlize Gallegos is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Charlize Gallegos for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO KANIKA DRAKSHARAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Kanika Draksharam attends Clements High School in Sugar Land, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should the government play in our lives?

In my opinion, the role of the government in our lives should be to protect and help the people of the country when they are not able to do those things themselves.

The topmost priority for a government should be the safety of the people living in that country. If the people are not safe, then the country will fall apart. Providing safety for the people includes a police force, military, a fire department or emergency response team, and an emergency medical system. Without a working police force, society would not be stable, as there would be large amounts of crime. This should be provided from a local government. A military is vital to a country's protection. A government must ensure that the borders of a country are protected. Federal protection is necessary in order to maintain the safety and well being of the people. The military should be provided from a federal level however. Federal and local law enforcement must be enforced. If a country did not have a fire department or emergency medical system, the

safety of people would be threatened, and lives would be lost and endangered. It is the responsibility of the government to ensure that people are safe.

Another role the government must play in people's lives is to provide basic necessities such as education and infrastructure. It should be prioritized, that the citizens of a country are educated and are able to support themselves and benefit to the country. Providing education should be one of the roles of a state or local government to determine the standards of. Providing infrastructure lies in the role of the government, because water, roads, waste collection and electricity are needed. These things are required for a country to be functioning and to ensure the well being of the people. An equal priority, of the government should be to provide a democratic federal justice system. If an individual violates a law, the role of the government is to make sure this person is brought to justice.

In conclusion, when we consider the role of the government in our lives today, my opinion is the role should be to provide defense, protection, infrastructure facilities, quality education, and a democratic justice system. These things all benefit the people themselves, but at the same time, do not have complete control over them.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL GRAZIANO, FILMMAKER, AND THE DOCUMENTARY FILM RESISTANCE

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michael Graziano and his extraordinarily talented team at Uji Films who have created a fantastic documentary called Resistance. Michael recently joined me along with a panel of experts on antibiotic resistance for a screening of Resistance in my district of Rochester, New York, to an amazing response. The film uses microscopic footage, harrowing personal stories and expert insight to delve into the history of antibiotic resistance, starting with the mass production of antibiotics 70 years ago and tracking the rise of superbugs into the 21st Century.

Resistance does a tremendous job laying out the issues at hand, explaining that eighty percent of the antibiotics sold in this country are used on the farm, mostly with healthy animals to "prevent disease," and how that impacts human health and modern medicine. The World Health Organization said in a recent report that antibiotic resistance is, "a problem so serious that it threatens the achievements of modern medicine." In ten years, surgeries, procedures, and illnesses that rely on antibiotics could be fatal. Pulling your teeth. Hip replacements. These could all be rendered obsolete without antibiotics. Strep throat could be fatal.

We must preserve medically important antibiotics for the treatment of humans, and for sick animals. That is exactly what my bill, the Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act, or PAMTA, would do. Tomorrow I will reintroduce that bill for the fifth time.

The American people need to understand that while I am fighting every day in Congress to highlight this issue, consumers, neighbors, doctors, and parents will be the ones who turn the tide of antibiotic resistance. Citizens taking a stand and asking grocery stores like Costco or fast food chains like McDonald's and Chick-Fil-A to sell meat and poultry raised without unnecessary antibiotics has made a difference. Resistance is making a difference. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the film and the filmmakers for making an important contribution to fighting the public health crisis of our time.

IN HONOR OF DR. BARRY SHEPHERD'S CAREER

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Barry Shepherd for his faithful service as the Superintendent of the Cabarrus County School system in the 8th Congressional District of North Carolina.

When Dr. Shepherd became Superintendent in 2008, he brought a unique vision that transformed Cabarrus County Schools during many challenging years. In spite of reductions in funding, Dr. Shepherd continually emphasized the value of people and his students.

As a result of this approach, students from Cabarrus County Schools are scoring higher on end-of-year assessments, graduation rates have increased, and the school system was able to open eight new schools during his tenure.

Today, Cabarrus County Schools boast some of the most unique learning experiences offered in the country. Specifically, Cabarrus County Schools have a partnership with the Center for International Understanding at the University of North Carolina called Confucius Classrooms. This program features a reciprocal agreement where teachers and administrators from Cabarrus County visit schools in China to fine tune best practices in education. As part of this program, Chinese educators come to Cabarrus County Schools to learn from their successes as well.

Dr. Shepherd is a native of Wilkes County, North Carolina, and received a Bachelor's Degree in Music Education and a Master's Degree in Educational Leadership from Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina. He went on to receive his Doctoral Degree in Education from Columbia University in New York.

Dr. Shepherd served as Superintendent of Elkin City Schools and as Assistant Superintendent in the Mooresville Graded School District before arriving in Cabarrus County. He also held various administrative positions in the Iredell-Statesville Schools, Lexington City Schools, and Thomasville City Schools.

It is truly an honor to extend these remarks congratulating Dr. Shepherd on his retirement and to thank him for his esteemed service to our local community as a visionary educator.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,152,412,192,314.93. We've added $7,525,535,143,401.85 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

DAISY SHAW

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Daisy Shaw for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Daisy Shaw is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Daisy Shaw is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Daisy Shaw for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. GILKISON

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Frank E. Gilkison, a longtime Muncie attorney and a truly admirable Hoosier.

Frank was a devoted husband to his wife Donna, the loving father to five children, and stepfather to two step-sons. After initially serving as an Air Cadet for two years in the U.S. Army Air Corps, Frank diligently attended IU Law School before moving to Muncie. He started his 62-year law practice with a predecessor firm to Beasley and Gilkison and remained a member until his retirement in 2012. Not only was Frank one of the longest practicing attorneys from East Central Indiana, but he also served on the Indiana Supreme Court Commission on Character & Fitness for 35 years. Additionally, he was the CEO of Home Beverages, Inc., a small beverage distribution company for 45 years.

Frank and Donna are also my close friends, who both played a key role in my career. They

were among the first friends in Muncie to step forward in support of my initial Congressional pursuits. I will always be grateful for their friendship and early leadership.

Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of Frank Gilkison. My thoughts and prayers go out to Frank's family, and may God comfort those he left behind with His peace and strength.

GLEN STEVENS FROM NORTH BRANCH

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story of how a conversation at the National Association of Secondary School Principals Conventional last year in Dallas turned into a transformational life experience. Glen Stevens, who serves as the Assistant Principal at North Branch Area High School, was offered an opportunity to have an expense-paid volunteer trip to the Dominican Republic to help in the building of a vocational center of a local school. He submitted an application and his name was thrown into a large pool of educators willing to have the experience. He said, ''When you're 13 or 14 in the Dominican Republic, and you're done with elementary school, unless you have phenomenal talent or potential, you're not going to high school.'' Because sixty percent of the Dominican Republic's vegetables come from the Constanza area where he was volunteering, many of these families only find work in the fields, earning perhaps $4 to $5 a day. Stevens could see the disparity of the income gap between workers and the wealthy land owners.

Fortunately, Glen was able to speak some Spanish, but it took him a while to understand what the school children were trying to communicate when they kept saying ''espaldas.'' After a short time, he found out the children wanted to ride on his big, strong shoulders. During his volunteer stint from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm each day, he was moving blocks and mixing concrete all day. Though he had a short break for lunch, children would come clamoring for attention and suddenly his weariness was gone. He explained, ''It was like a big ''boom'' and your energy level would be back up again.'' He was heart-warmed from the warm reception he received from all the Dominicans. ''Even though most of the volunteers spoke little or no Spanish, and the Dominicans didn't speak English, a bond had formed between them than transcended language.

He said he came back a different person and knows the next group of volunteers coming to finish painting and completing the electrical work will find the same spirit.

This school, founded by Pastor Angel Moreta, will give children more options than working in the fields after elementary school. They will be adding programs for culinary arts, beautician trades, music and woodworking in addition to building on their skills in reading and mathematics.

Glen Stevens has hopes and dreams for these children to achieve success with newfound skills. I am certain he came home with far more than he brought with him and will share this new message to the students at the North Branch Area High School.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIC LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW BRUNSWICK

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick as it prepares to celebrate its 70th anniversary at a gala celebration on March 28, 2015. I would also like to join with the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick in congratulating its gala honorees, Mayor James Cahill, Richard Kaplan and Charlene Brown.

Since its inception, the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick has striven to strengthen the minority populations of central New Jersey. Its efforts have created several programs and services to advance opportunities and improve the quality of life of all residents. Its focus on employment and housing services helps develop a foundation to better the well-being of individuals and families. Through its youth programs, the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick offers tutoring and enrichment activities to students and builds leadership skills. The Civic League of Greater New Brunswick continues to fulfill its mission of an equal society for all through the enhancement of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick on its 70th anniversary and recognizing the outstanding efforts of the Civic League and the gala honorees.

HONORING JUDE KIBODEAUX

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Jude Kibodeaux attends Dawson High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

Making landfall on August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina was the most destructive disaster in United States history. A Category 3 storm with winds faster than 100 miles per hour, the storm took a great toll on the country. Its social cost, at least in New Orleans, is obvious. Nearly 2,000 of its citizens were killed by the storm, and thousands more were displaced by the grievous destruction it caused. Even today, nine years later, the city is still recovering from its losses. But the effects of Hurricane Katrina were not limited to just the area hit. The winds of Katrina were felt throughout the entire nation, if not through physical destruction then through economic downturn and political discontent.

The cost of the storm can be measured not only in deaths but also in dollars. This latter loss was not as tragic as the former, but it was significant enough to impact the rest of the country. The damage caused cost, according to the lowest estimate, a staggering $96 billion, only $40 billion of which was insured. And this does not even account for losses in the various affected industries. Its most serious impact was on oil production. Oil pipelines and offshore rigs were destroyed, causing national oil prices to rise and pushing the government to tap into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The sugar industry, worth $500 million annually in Louisiana alone, was also severely damaged. Chemical plants in the area, which accounted for one-fourth of the country's chemical production, were not spared either. The losses suffered by these important industries were great enough to stint the economic growth of the whole country. After Katrina, national GDP growth decreased from 3.8% to 1.3%. With all of these losses taken into account, the total cost of the hurricane amounts to $250 billion. It was undoubtedly a severe setback for the economy.

The government stepped in to try and alleviate the storm's effects, but its efforts were not as cohesive as many would have hoped. On the federal level, it was days before the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), an organization created for this kind of situation, got its act together in New Orleans. And even once it had established itself, FEMA lacked an effective strategy and had a minimal impact on the recovery. The organization was evidently unprepared to do its duty. The director of FEMA, Michael D. Brown, was forced to resign in the fallout, and the popularity of President George W. Bush plummeted, the beginning of a trend that ended Bush's political career. There was also much criticism at the local level. Most was directed toward the mayor of New Orleans, Ray Nagin, for having understated the severity of the storm before it hit and responded inadequately in the aftermath. He managed to stay in office but faced serious criticism, making it difficult for him to implement policies. In all, Katrina caused just as much a political disturbance as an economic one.

The winds of Katrina had proven themselves the winds of change as they caused great disturbances to the society, economy and government of this nation. Homes destroyed by the hurricane can still be seen today in New Orleans, serving as a testament to the lasting effect this storm has had.

DEVORAH LINFORD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Devorah

Linford for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Devorah Linford is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Devorah Linford is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Devorah Linford for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 130/131 my flight was cancelled due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted Aye on both.

THE 4 CHAPLAINS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, anywhere there is someone in the military, there will be chaplains. They are men of God, doing God's work. Bringing faith in a time of misery, pain and sorrow, chaplains serve their spiritual duty on the battlefields alongside our servicemen and women. Chaplains help battle demons in every sense of the word. While their efforts are spiritual in nature, their courage deserves to be celebrated.

The Chaplain Corps was created in 1775 by the Continental Congress to be an essential part of the Army while ensuring American soldiers would have spiritual guidance available anytime. The corps is made up of both ordained clergy who are commissioned officers and enlisted soldiers who serve as chaplain assistants and they can be assigned anywhere they are needed.

One of the most famous stories about these brave faith warriors is the tale of the Four Chaplains. It was February 3, 1943. The U.S. Army Transport Dorchester made up a three ship convoy that was moving from Newfoundland to an American base in Greenland. The ship was at full capacity, carrying 902 servicemen, merchant seamen and civilian workers.

Only 150 miles from its destination, the Dorchester became a quick target for a German submarine. The hit was detrimental.

It was 12:55 a.m., when 902 lives were completely turned upside down. The Dorchester began rapidly taking on water. It was sinking. The ship's captain, Hans J. Danielsen, gave orders to abandon the ship.

The fate off the ship however was not much better; the icy waters gave many of the men hypothermia, even killing some of them. All alternatives were bleak.

The torpedo hit killed and wounded many of the men. Those who were still alive were desperately trying to get aboard lifeboats and rafts and struggling to find life preservers. As mass chaos erupted aboard, four men remained calm and brave. Aboard the ship were four Army chaplains: Lt. George Fox, a Methodist; Lt. Alexander Goode, a Jewish Rabbi; Lt. John Washington, a Roman Catholic Priest; and Lt. Clark Poling, a Dutch Reformed minister.

Witnessing the situation in front of them, the chaplains took charge. They began quickly handing out lifejackets, prayers and words of encouragement. Rabbi Goode even gave his own gloves to a soldier. When there were no more lifejackets, the chaplains simply removed their own and handed them out, no questions asked.

In a mere 20 minutes, the ship slipped below the surface of the sea, drifting to its final resting place in the Atlantic. 672 men died. Only 230 survived. Among the casualties were the four selfless chaplains. They were an earthly liaison and a light of peace during a time of complete turmoil. It was a German death wish, but death was defeated by faith, the divine won that day at sea.

The Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart were awarded posthumously as well as a posthumous Special Medal of Heroism; The Four Chaplains' Medal was approved by Congress and awarded by the President in 1961.

They were from different denominations and even religions, but bound together by a God's love and their faith in his eternal promise. The chaplains lived by a uniting example that transcends religions, countries and generations: laying down their lives for others, there is no greater love.

The epitome of selflessness, they fought a silent battle. While in a literal sense they lost, they gained all in the eyes of their creator.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KENTUCKY YMCA

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 125th Anniversary of the Kentucky YMCA by recognizing March 1st as Kentucky YMCA Day in Lexington, Kentucky.

On March 1, 1890, the Kentucky YMCA was incorporated by an Act of the Kentucky General Assembly. For 125 years, the YMCA has supported families and communities across our Commonwealth through programs that promote youth development, healthy living, social responsibility, and that build a healthy spirit, mind, and body for all.

Nineteen YMCA Associations throughout Kentucky proudly serve more than 367,100 individuals, including 160,000 children and youth as well as 32,700 seniors. They also provide nearly $7 million in financial assistance for families to participate in YMCA programs and membership. YMCAs mobilize almost 8,300 Kentuckians each year to volunteer and serve their local communities, including over 100 students in the Y-Corps service learning program who collectively perform over 1,500 hours of service.

The Kentucky YMCA is home to the largest YMCA Youth and Government program in the country, providing thousands of middle school, high school, and college-aged students the opportunity to become better leaders and engaged citizens through the Kentucky Youth Assembly (KYA) and Kentucky United Nations Assembly (KUNA).

The sixth district of Kentucky is proud to be home to 50 Student YMCAs and KYA/KUNA Delegations with over 1,000 student members, including my alma mater, Henry Clay High School. The mission of the Kentucky YMCA is to develop engaged citizens and servant leaders, inspired to stet change in their school, community, Commonwealth, nation, and world. The YMCA has and will continue to shape the future of the Sixth District and Kentucky.

Therefore, I encourage all Kentuckians and my colleagues to observe March 1, 2015 as ''Kentucky YMCA Day.''

TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN ROTH

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Jonathan Roth attends Seven Lakes High School in Katy, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, why is it important to be involved in the political process?

Why should you be involved?

The United States was founded on the principle of freedom, freedom from oppression, freedom from foreign rule, and freedom to participate openly in our government. The United States rebelled against the British Crown so that they and future generations may experience the freedom they so desperately desired.

The national voter turnout for the 2012 general election dipped all the way down to 57.5%. That's almost a situation in which one in every two people doesn't vote. Only 65.1% of the voting eligible general population was registered to vote in that general election. For a nation that prides itself on its democratic processes, it is quite ironic that less than three fourths of the nation actually participates in that democracy. Our nation politically travels the world masquerading as the ideal democratic country when we rank in the lower half of global voter participation. There are many in our country that complain about laws and decisions made by those on Capitol Hill. Yet the majority of these people have never contacted a congressman nor attempted to voice their opinions in a constructive way. ''No taxation without representation'' was the battle cry during the United States' quest for freedom. Even though there are more problems than taxation in our country today, the representation part fits our situation perfectly. Our

government needs to be representative of the population as a whole. That means that everyone (or the majority) needs to participate. For a democratic government to function at its fullest capacity with the least amount of issues all demographics and cultures need to be represented so that all decisions that are made keeping the whole population in mind. Without an equally diverse voting populace some populations will not be represented as they should be. The majority of the problems that plague our country stem from the perception that some laws seem unfair to a certain group or groups in the nation. If everyone voted and voiced their opinion then those problems and perceptions would diminish greatly. Not only would these problems disappear there would also be an increase in national pride and patriotism. With an increase in voter participation more citizens would feel involved in how the nation is run and the democratic process. This increased national pride could lead to a decrease in social or hate crimes or perhaps even racial violence. If the populace feels included and an active part of the nation then they may look at themselves as a contributing member of the country and not an outsider in a foreign land.

In conclusion voter participation is essential to the overall success of our country. Not only is it a founding principle of our country but it may also lead to an increase in common understanding between various social and ethnic groups decrease in violent crime and frustration over perceived unfair legislation.

CHRISTIAN CASTILLO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Christian Castillo for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Christian Castillo is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5–8 and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Christian Castillo is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Christian Castillo for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

CELEBRATING LIFE OF DR. YOSEF ALFREDO ANTONIO BEN-JOCHANNAN, DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR AND KEMETAPHYSICIAN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and historic contributions of my dear friend Dr. Yosef Alfredo Antonio ben-Jochannan (Dr. Ben), one of our community's most distinguished scholars who passed away on March 19, 2015. Dr. Ben was the foremost intellectual on the history of religion and its impact on the world. He was an influential professor and activist—a pioneer of Africana studies. Dr. Ben was a man who believed in the value of digging deep for facts that have been long obscured. He has inspired generations of scholars and students with his tireless research and thoughtful teachings.

Dr. Ben's cultural journey began as a student of Arthur Schomburg in Puerto Rico and Edward Wilmot Blyden in St. Croix, where as a youth he spent time participating with Pedro Albizu Campos during Puerto Rico's independence quest in the 1950s to providing African-centered reading material to Malcolm X in the early 1960s and educating young teenaged Five Percenters at Harlem Prep during the late 1960s. Through his annual fact-finding tours to Kemet (Egypt) for over four decades, he helped uncover the history of Africa and our own roots. Dr. Ben accomplished a great deal in his life, most notably writing 49 books on African history. Dr. Ben was well known for his thought-provoking assertions on the influence of Africans on ancient civilizations. Dr. Ben was a regular invited special guest on the popular late Gil Noble's "Like It Is" television Sunday show.

A man way ahead of his time, Dr. Ben spoke truth about the origins of world religion and documented it to prove it. I am proud to have called Dr. Ben my neighbor. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and loved ones. While I am sad that Harlem has lost a great prophet and spiritual leader, I know Dr. Ben's legacy will live on for many years to come.

ABC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT 50TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize ABC Unified School District (ABCUSD) on their 50th Anniversary. I am proud to represent the students, teachers, and parents of ABC Unified. Their educational excellence is a source of pride for the 38th Congressional District.

In 1965 the school districts of Artesia, Bloomfield, and Carmenita combined to form ABCUSD. The school district serves Cerritos, Hawaiian Gardens, as well as portions of Lakewood, Long Beach, and Norwalk.

The district's motto "Student Achievement—Our Main Thing," exemplifies the district's leadership and dedication to strong counseling, staff development, and alternative education programs. ABCUSD has received numerous awards and recognitions for its educational excellence. In recent years, it was the recipient of National Blue Ribbon, California Distinguished Schools, and Schools to Watch awards.

ABCUSD is a prime example of how educators and community groups can work together for the benefit of our students. In 1999, ABCUSD and the ABC Federation of Teachers formed the ABC Labor Management Partnership. This collaboration is focused on student achievement and has inspired many districts and unions to form similar partnerships. The district also has a strong history of working with local colleges and local businesses to build vibrant educational programs for its students.

This year, ABCUSD will be celebrating 50 years of excellence. On this special occasion, I would like to congratulate the ABC Unified School District, the teachers, faculty, students, and parents, past and present, who make the ABCUSD community so exceptional.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAY DAVIS' RETIREMENT

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Dr. Jay Davis, President of the Hertz Foundation, who will be retiring after decades of service to our country as a scientist and philanthropist. Jay resides in Livermore, California, in my congressional district.

Dr. Davis graduated from the University of Texas with a Bachelor's and Master's degree in 1963 and 1964 respectively. In 1969, he graduated from the University of Wisconsin with his PhD in physics.

For three decades, Dr. Davis worked as a scientist at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), supporting the lab's fusion program through research in nuclear physics and material science. Dr. Davis also founded the Center for Accelerator Mass Spectrometry at LLNL.

Following his service at LLNL, in 1998, Dr. Davis used his science background to support the Department of Defense as the Associate Director for Earth and Environmental Sciences. He worked to develop and enhance arms control treaties and twice served as an inspector for the United Nations Special Commission's mission to Iraq following the first Gulf War. During his time with the Department, he served as the founding Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency. Because of Dr. Davis' exceptional service to the nation, he was twice awarded the Distinguished Public Service Medal, the Department of Defense's highest civilian award.

In 2009, following his exceptional career in public service, Dr. Davis was elected to serve as President of the Hertz Foundation. The Hertz Foundation provides talented PhD students in the Applied Sciences and Engineering the opportunity for financial and fellowship support to pursue their careers. On top of his work at the Hertz Foundation, Dr. Davis has also been a tireless advocate for benefits owed to retired lab employees.

Dr. Davis' distinguished legacy of service to the Livermore community and the nation will continue through his scientific accomplishments and his philanthropic work at Hertz foundation. I wish Jim all the best in his retirement.

HONORING SONYA ROMERO

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride to honor one of our exceptional teachers, Ms. Sonya Romero from Lew Wallace Elementary School in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Sonya Romero is a bilingual teacher who focuses on early childhood education. She is a candidate for National Board certification; she serves on the state's NMTEACH council; and was recently appointed Executive Vice President of the Albuquerque Teachers Federation.

A teacher for the past 20 years, Sonya has worked at Lew Wallace Elementary located in downtown Albuquerque for the last 10 years. The small student population is represented by a wide variety of cultures and languages. Three out of every four students qualifies for the National School Lunch Program. Many of the kids are from families that are homeless or rely on housing assistance; and they struggle with food insecurity.

The tightknit Downtown community is also home to everyday heroes who will do anything for students, colleagues and neighbors, including rallying around families in need; locating desperately needed services; packaging food in back packs for the weekend; inviting parents to have a free breakfast with their son or daughter; spending their own money on clothes, shoes or school supplies; and even inviting an illiterate mother to sit in during story time to help her learn to read.

Several months ago, some of her former students were placed in a dire family situation causing Child Protective Services to intervene with the intent of placing the two sisters with a foster family. Sonya and her teenage son made the decision to take the girls into their own home and they have been there since.

Sonya and Lew Wallace Elementary School were recently featured on "The Ellen DeGeneres Show" and received $20,000 from Target. Sonya is grateful that her story is shedding light on the roles that many teachers embrace for the benefit of their students. She considers her work and that of her fellow teachers very special and views this recognition as a community celebration. Sonya reminds us that most teachers are not just providing instruction, but are deeply committed to the overall well-being and success of their students. They overcome challenges, and create a secure and trusting environment for our children.

CANDICE CODR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Candice Codr for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Candice Codr is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Candice Codr is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Candice Codr for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO JACK HAWKINS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Jack Hawkins attends Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

The most important reason I believe Americans should be involved in the political process is because of the right we were given to vote for the leaders of our country. One reason I believe this is a crucial role of citizens is because with this right it allows us to vote into office the people who we believe will pursue and advocate effectively what we as citizens are needing from our city, state, and federal government. This right is one of the primary reasons our great nation was founded, so that people could live in a democracy and advocate to officials what they needed instead of having a monarchal (or more commonly today) a dictatorship classification of government speak for them. But more importantly, I believe citizens should exercise this right because we have thousands of soldiers stationed all over the world helping to both defend this right for our country, and try to help others achieve the type of democratic government that we possess and believe in so prominently. Therefore by exercising this right, it is a small way to show our appreciation and gratefulness for our troops by exercising this right that they are fighting for so valiantly.

The other important reason I believe Americans should be involved in the political process is because with the election of our nation's leaders it is has repeatedly proven by history that through former political leaders, specifically past American presidents, the United States has made substantial positive differences in both domestic and international affairs. For example with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt who transformed the country's economy. With the enacting of his New Deal policies Roosevelt was able to provide millions of Americans with jobs and economic security therefore helping America incredibly through the Great Depression. Also America has made major strides in international affairs such as through President Obama who with the aid of America's top military leaders and the United States' Navy SEALs team was able to kill Osama bin Laden, the leader of the terrorist group Al-Qaeda who was responsible for horrific acts including most infamously the bombing of the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001. Although it has not stopped Al-Qaeda completely, President Obama along with his esteemed colleagues made American history and showed the strength of the United States as an international power. The United States is the by far the best country in the world and it is repeatedly shown through the election of our country's leaders who throughout history and in the future will continue to show America's greatness both domestically and internationally if the citizens of our magnificent country continue to take an active role in America's political process.

CONGRATULATING LEROY AND OVIA MARIE MCGINNIS ON THEIR 65TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Leroy and Ovia Marie McGinnis on their 65th wedding anniversary. They were married on March 3, 1950 in a courthouse in Arkansas. Although they were young, their love for one another was unconditional. In fact, Leroy was so intent on marrying the love of his life that he spent the last four dollars to his name to pay for their modest ceremony. Worried of what their families might think, Leroy and Ovia Marie kept their marriage a secret for several weeks.

Soon after marrying, the young couple moved to Cuba, Missouri, where their love and affection for one another continued to grow. They have raised six children together, and Mr. McGinnis still serves as CEO of McGinnis Wood Products, a very successful business that he founded in 1968.

Again, I want to wish Mr. and Mrs. McGinnis a Happy Anniversary and many more years of joy!

HERMANTOWN FIFTH-GRADERS

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three very compassionate fifth-grade school children for their leadership in protecting us against the silent killer of carbon monoxide poisoning. The students who have stepped forward to meet an important community need are Bryanna Kliegle, Alexa Aagenes and Ani Jovanovich of Hermantown Middle School.

I don't think I have to remind anyone that winters in Minnesota can be very cold. We Minnesotans are hardy souls and deal with it. But with the cold temperatures, there is a silent killer that unfortunately creeps into our communities every year as people try to warm their homes. This killer is called carbon monoxide poisoning.

Bryanna had a friend who died from carbon monoxide poisoning just a few weeks before Christmas. She turned her grief into action, reaching out to two friends to help her so others would not be lost to this killer. They formed a group and went door-to-door raising donations to buy carbon monoxide detectors for local families. These detectors cost only about $20.00 each, but within a short span they formed Hopes of Faith to handle the donations. To date, they have raised more than enough money to buy 200 detectors and then received 100 more from Safe Kids Minnesota and Kiddie, a company that makes the units.

Bryanna recently spoke at a school assembly and told her classmates, ''We didn't think we could do this much at first. We're just fifth-graders. Regular fifth graders, but we reached out and wanted to take a chance.''

How many times do we look around our communities and think something should be done and wait for others to lead the way? Bryanna, Alexa and Ani are exceptional young students we can look to as leaders. They saw a need, stepped forward and did something about it. I am so very proud of them.

HONORING LUCY COFFEY

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lucy Coffey, the oldest living female veteran who passed away last week after 108 vibrant years. Originally from Indiana, Ms. Coffey was working in a Dallas, Texas supermarket when she learned of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Putting country before self, Ms. Coffey quit her job and joined the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. She bravely served in the Pacific Theater during World War II, earning two bronze stars and ascending to the rank of sergeant.

For 13 years after her discharge in 1945, Ms. Coffey worked as an Army civilian in Okinawa, Japan. She ultimately settled in my hometown of San Antonio, where she worked in the procurement office at Kelly Air Force Base until her retirement in 1971.

Last year, Ms. Coffey visited the nation's capital on an Honor Flight. While in Washington, she not only visited the women's memorial at Arlington National Cemetery and the National World War II Memorial, she also met with both Vice President Biden and President Obama.

Ms. Coffey leaves behind an abundance of admirers who have sung her praises since her passing. President Obama cited Ms. Coffey's pioneering spirit and the inspiration she has provided generations of patriots since her service. Vice President Biden celebrated her legacy and said he was honored to have met her. Bexar County veterans service officer Queta Marquez highlighted Ms. Coffey's liveliness and spunk.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer Ms. Coffey's loved ones my sincere condolences for their loss and echo San Antonians' deep gratitude for her exemplary service and unwavering patriotism. She was a remarkable American who will be greatly missed.

HONORING COAST GUARD CAPTAIN ANDY BLOMME

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a proud son of North Carolina, Captain Carlyle ''Andy'' Blomme, as he prepares to retire from the United States Coast Guard.

Captain Blomme has served as the Coast Guard Chief of Congressional Affairs since June 2012, where he has been an excellent representative of the Coast Guard here on Capitol Hill. Captain Blomme has worked diligently to ensure the Coast Guard has the resources and authorities necessary to not only keep our nation safe, but to be a steward of its natural resources. His deep knowledge of Coast Guard operations, acquisitions, and strategic priorities has been invaluable to the members who work closely with the Coast Guard, which I came to appreciate as Ranking Member of the Appropriations Subcommittee of Homeland Security. This has been especially true as we have worked to recapitalize the Coast Guard's aging fleet in a time of shrinking budgets.

There has been no better advocate for, or representative of, the Coast Guard than Captain Blomme and I am proud to have had the opportunity to work closely with Andy during this time. My staff and I have often relied on him and his staff's knowledge and understanding of the missions, challenges and responsibilities of the Coast Guard.

Captain Blomme comes from a distinguished family of seafarers from North Carolina. His great, great grandfather was First Mate on the SS *Ella and Annie*, a Blockade Running Steamship in the Civil War. *Ella and Annie* ran the Federal blockade on behalf of the Confederacy until November 1863, when she was captured by USS *Niphon* off New Inlet, North Carolina. Demonstrating his pride as the son, of the son, of a sailor, Captain Blomme came back to the same proud roots decades later as the Commanding Officer of Coast Guard Cutter *Diligence*, homeported in Wilmington, North Carolina.

Captain Blomme is a 1985 graduate of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut. He has served at sea and ashore in a variety of operational and staff tours throughout his distinguished career, including serving in Command of Coast Guard Sector Jacksonville, as well as Coast Guard Cutters *Diligence*, *Nantucket*, and *Point Huron*. He also rounded out his nearly twelve years of sea duty with tours aboard Coast Guard Cutters *Gallatin* and *Chase*. Aside from an impressive record of sea service, Andy has also served ashore as a controller in the Coast Guard's Fifth District Command Center in Portsmouth, VA, as the Operations Officer at Coast Guard Group Miami and as Military Assistant to the Secretary of Homeland Security during the tenures of Secretaries Michael Chertoff and Janet Napolitano.

This week, Captain Blomme will depart his post on Capitol Hill and retire after 30 years of honorable service. During that time, he has embodied the spirit of the Coast Guard and its motto, Semper Paratus, Always Ready. We thank him and his family for his service to the United States Congress and to the country. On behalf of the House of Representatives, we wish Captain Blomme, his wife Peg, and their two sons, Matthew and Alex, the best in their future endeavors. We congratulate Captain Andy Blomme on his retirement and wish him fair winds and following seas.

PLATTE VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Platte Valley Medical Center for receiving the 2014 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales or new capital investment to the city in the last year. The Platte Valley Medical Center built their first off-site medical office building in the Reunion Marketplace area expanding their service to northern Commerce City. This provides critical service from medical providers to a community that has had limited access at this new location while ensuring access to quality care and support to the community.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Platte Valley Medical Center for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

HONORING CONOR DEVLIN

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Conor Devlin attends Tompkins High School in Katy, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

Our government has evolved far beyond its original parameters. It now regulates entire economic industries, healthcare, going so far as to regulate the types of things we can and cannot buy. Our government has left its original designation as a Lassiz-Faire Democratic Republic to a borderline Socialist country like the rest of the European and the EU. Our government is an overgrown bureaucracy that costs us—the American people—trillions each year, and yet it fails to accomplish its task when its people are spiraling into debt and unemployment is skyrocketing. The job of the American government is to protect its citizens with an up to date military comprised of the most advanced arsenal. Secondly, the government

needs to protect the welfare of its citizens and by that I mean low taxes that are not crushing small business and forcing Corporations to locate to other places like China and Japan because it is cheaper there, and a dissolution of the current welfare state which would put millions of American back to work if they no longer receive a monthly check for not being productive. The government needs to defend the rights of all its citizens by preventing foreign nations from infringing on our rights or any companies and agencies from infringing on our rights. The government also needs to stimulate the economy by providing a workplace that will foster economic growth in the private sector and not continually grow the bureaucracies in the public sector wasting the revenues generated by its citizens. Additionally, the government needs to step back and change its role in the healthcare system it should not waste taxpayer's dollars providing for other people's healthcare, which is that individual's choice not to be insured by the government. The government shouldn't waste money on useless agencies that can be easily cut down such as the EPA, the IRS, the USDA and many other branches that are full to the brim with useless employees wasting the American taxpayer's money. The American government's job is to protect the American citizens and their welfare. This does not include regulating major economic industries, driving companies and small businesses out of business and out of America, infringing on American's God-given rights and becoming a major player in an American citizen's life.

HONORING CAPTAIN LAWRENCE R. VASQUEZ

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Captain Lawrence R. Vasquez, Installation Commander of Naval Base Ventura County, on the special occasion of his Change of Command.

Since February 2012, Captain Vasquez has been recognized for his outstanding leadership and service as Commanding Officer of Naval Base Ventura County. His exemplary tour as the senior ranking officer in charge has been marked with distinction and remarkable success.

Under his dedicated command, Naval Base Ventura County became the first and to date only military installation to operate manned and unmanned aerial systems in FAA-controlled airspace. Naval Base Ventura County is also the only Navy installation tapped to support the Department of Health and Human Service's mission to house and process unaccompanied minors apprehended crossing the border into the United States.

During the Springs Fire of May 2013, Captain Vasquez's exceptional leadership enabled a joint city, county, and federal response to the fast-moving blaze, which threatened homes, California State University Channel Islands, and valuable military assets near the Pacific Coast Highway in Ventura County.

Captain Vasquez has been a staunch supporter of community engagement, personally participating in over 250 public meetings, and hosting tours and events to bring a better understanding of the Navy's mission and better collaboration among community partners, including government organizations, schools and business entities.

Captain Vasquez is the embodiment of an extensive and distinguished career of service to our country in the United States Navy. As a Naval aviator with over 26 years of commendable service, Captain Vasquez led a 12-aircraft helicopter squadron, the HSL–45 ''Wolfpack.'' Additionally, he served as the Flag Aide to Commander of the Naval Coordinator Mid-South Region, as well as personal administrative aide to the Secretary of the Navy.

Captain Vasquez is recognized for his outstanding leadership and served as Commander of the Provincial Reconstruction Team in Farah, Afghanistan, a joint military and civilian team charged with extending the reach of the government in Afghanistan through reconstruction, development, governance, and security.

Captain Vasquez's exemplary work has earned him numerous accolades and awards to include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Navy and the Marine Corps Commendation Medal, the Navy Achievement Medal, the Combat Action ribbon and various unit and campaign awards. Additionally, he was awarded the 2004 League of United Latin American Citizens' (LULAC) ''Excellence in Military Service'' award.

Captain Vasquez's remarkable career and many accomplishments are indicative of his unwavering commitment and dedication to his country and community. As he embarks on a new chapter in his career as the Chief of Staff for the Navy Region Europe, Africa, Southwest Asia in Naples, Italy, I want to express my sincere appreciation for Captain Vasquez's honorable and selfless service to our community and wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

CIERAH KELLEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cierah Kelley for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Cierah Kelley is an 8th grader at Arvada K–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cierah Kelley is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cierah Kelley for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

THE PRESERVATION OF ANTIBIOTICS FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT ACT OF 2015—H.R. 1552

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that I have introduced H.R. 1552, the Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act of 2015. This legislation would preserve the effectiveness of antibiotics by ending the unnecessary non-therapeutic uses of antibiotics in healthy food-animals.

The discovery of antibiotics literally transformed modern medicine, but their effectiveness is now being threatened by the spread of antibiotic resistant bacteria. Recently the World Health Organization warned that the crisis is ''so serious that it threatens the achievements of modern medicine.''

Already the CDC has told us that these superbugs cause two million infections and kill at least twenty-three thousand Americans every year. We spend twenty- to thirty-five billion dollars fighting these infections—sometimes in vain, as there are now strains of bacteria which have become completely untreatable. The scale of this problem worldwide is truly staggering—each year, seven hundred thousand people die unnecessarily and the global cost could be as high as $1.2 trillion.

Unfortunately this problem is our own doing. Despite warnings from the very scientists who discovered antibiotics we have utterly failed to use them wisely. Overuse in medicine and rampant misuse in food-animal production has caused widespread resistance and led to the current crisis.

Food-animal production currently uses 80% of all antibiotics sold in the U.S. The majority of these are routinely given to healthy animals for ''growth promotion'' or ''disease prevention.'' These non-therapeutic uses are not only unnecessary, but they also create the perfect environment for bacteria to evolve resistance, resulting in antibiotic resistant superbugs. Right now, we are allowing the greatest medical advancement of the 20th century to be frittered away, in part because it's cheaper for factory farms to feed these critical drugs to animals rather than fix the stressful, overcrowded or unsanitary conditions which allow disease to spread.

By the 1970's the dangers of misusing antibiotics in food-animals were well known and in 1977 the Food and Drug Administration sought to end sub-therapeutic uses of penicillin and tetracycline in food-animals. However, no substantive action was ever taken, antibiotic use has steadily increased and the problem is now worse than ever.

The FDA's recent decision to ask pharmaceutical companies to voluntarily remove ''growth promotion'' uses from drug labels is an inadequate response which fails to address routine non-therapeutic uses, often called the disease prevention loophole. A recent analysis by the PEW Charitable Trust clearly shows that this loophole can be exploited as many drugs have overlapping approvals for disease prevention and growth promotion and can be given to animals with no limit on the duration of use.

The Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act would phase out the use of the

eight classes of medically important antibiotics that are currently approved for non-therapeutic use in animal agriculture. The bill clearly defines the term ''non-therapeutic use'' to ensure that sick animals may be appropriately treated, but that any use of medically important antibiotics outside of treatment of a sick animal is not permitted.

Both the American people and the U.S. government need to give this issue the attention it demands. Unless we act now and act together to preserve the effectiveness of our current antibiotics we face a future without them. Strep throat could once again lead to fatal heart infections. Common surgeries such as having wisdom teeth removed, joint replacements and Cesarean sections would become too risky to perform. Even something as common as dressing your child's scrapes with Neosporin could no longer be able to keep an infection at bay.

Protecting the public's health is one of the greatest responsibilities of this body and I urge my colleagues to stand with me to support the Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FRANCISCAN SISTERS OF MARY

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable and historic order of Catholic women called to the service of all God's children and his creation, the Franciscan Sisters of Mary, who have been at the forefront of healing the sick, fighting discrimination, advocating for equal rights under the law, and protecting the wonders of the natural world.

Arriving from Germany in the winter of 1872, Mother Mary Odelia Berger and four other religious sisters crossed the icy Mississippi River by ferry to land on the St. Louis riverfront near the site of today's Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, better known as the magnificent Gateway Arch.

They came to St. Louis seeking religious freedom and as a response to a call to serve the sick and indigent. Beginning with only five dollars among them, and armed with their resolute faith, they quickly deployed to the streets of our growing city to provide care to thousands suffering from tuberculosis, cholera and other epidemics of the time.

St. Mary of Victories Church, at 744 S. 3rd Street would become their first home where they treated the poor suffering from small pox, diphtheria, typhoid fever and scarlet fever. As their patient load increased so did their numbers and they eventually became known as the Sisters of Mary because of their connection to the church.

On May 24, 1877, the sisters opened their first hospital in a renovated home on Papin Street. During its first year, St. Mary's Infirmary treated 82 patients. Eventually, a newer and much larger facility was built on the same site.

Mother Mary Concordia Puppendahl, the superior general of the Sisters of St. Mary from 1921 until 1956 believed that all persons deserved the best possible medical care regardless of their race, ethnic background or country of origin. At a time when educational opportunities lagged for women, Mother Concordia organized the congregation's first school of nursing in 1907.

In 1924, Mother Concordia signed an agreement with Saint Louis University designating three facilities operated by the sisters (St. Mary's Infirmary, St. Mary's Hospital, and Mount St. Rose Chest and Throat Hospital) as teaching hospitals. In later years, Mother Concordia helped reorganize the St. Mary's Infirmary School of Nursing into the Saint Louis University School of Nursing. In 1933, St. Mary's Infirmary became the first Catholic hospital dedicated to treating African Americans and training African American physicians and nurses.

In the 1960s, the sisters became very active in the civil rights movement, most notably Sister Antona Ebo, who marched shoulder to shoulder in Selma, Alabama with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and our heroic colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS (D) Georgia, to demand the right to vote for African Americans in Alabama, and across this country.

On Wednesday, March 10, 1965, she and several other sisters and clergymen boarded a rickety airplane in St. Louis bound for Selma with several other sisters and clergymen to protest the Bloody Sunday attack on peaceful marchers and to join Dr. King in his second attempt to cross the bridge on the way from Selma to the state capital in Montgomery.

Once there, Sister Antona, the only African-American sister in the crowd, found herself thrust to the front of the march. Before the marchers reached the end of the block, they were stopped by rows of helmeted policemen standing shoulder to shoulder, three deep, batons in hand.

In the midst of it all, a microphone was thrust in front of Sister Antona. She spoke simply and from her heart into a sea of Confederate flags: ''I am here because I am a Negro, a nun, a Catholic, and because I want to bear witness.'' She later recalled, ''We wore our full regalia of habits at that time. We got a lot of people shook up who thought we should be in church with our hands folded.'' Many years later, she added, ''Selma happened really because it was the time and place to take a risk. Taking a risk has its payoff, too.'' Their courageous actions led to passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The legacy of healing and devotion to building communities of compassionate care by the sisters inspired the development of SSM Health, a system of 19 non-profit Catholic hospitals, more than 60 outpatient care sites, a pharmacy benefit company, an insurance company, two nursing homes, comprehensive home care and hospice services, a technology company, and two Accountable Care Organizations operating in Missouri, Illinois, Wisconsin and Oklahoma.

And most recently, the sisters have added their moral force, spiritual guidance and integrity to the cause of environmental justice in North St. Louis County where neighborhood groups and civic activists are advocating for the removal of radiological waste left over from the Manhattan Project that was illegally dumped in an unlined landfill, near homes, schools, businesses and an underground fire.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of Congress to join me in honoring the Franciscan Sisters of Mary for their living example of faith in action to heal the sick, advocate for equality and preserve our environment for future generations.

TRIBUTE TO GRANT DENTRY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Grant Dentry attends Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

An important event that has occurred in the past 15 years is the rapid evolution of technology in our everyday lives. From single function cell-phones, to compact flip phones with cameras, to the now pervasive ''smart phone'' that serves as a multi-function computer, phone, hi-resolution camera, personal assistant, and a comprehensive tracking device. I believe technology; although innovative and fun, can have a negative effect on our country. While technology has benefited our lives, its evolution has changed how America operates and is watched over.

Even though technological evolution has made our lives easier, it can expose our personal and private business to the Government (and hackers) who can access our information at will. The evolution of technology has reshaped the security of American citizens. Our Constitutional freedoms as Americans have been infringed upon because of our technological devices do not guarantee secure privacy. Now that almost everyone in America has a laptop or cellphone, the Government is able to conduct surveillance on its citizens. Constantly being watched over has had unfortunate effects on what we consider personal, private, freedom. The effect of being watched over has caused citizens to be constantly vigilant of what they are doing on electronic devices, where they go, and what they say. The Government is able to read our text messages and listen to our calls as well as see us through cameras on streets, smartphones and computers. Although we are still technically free, it is not the freedom we used to have before technology evolved. Fifteen years ago, concerns about Government surveillance on citizens was not as alarming as today.

The next 15 years will bring changes in the relationship between Governments and their citizens. While many found out in 2012 about Government surveillance, more and more Americans are becoming increasingly concerned about the issue of privacy now. Sadly, our media is distracting our citizens away from privacy issues. Many disapprove of the spying and frown upon the Government's decisions to monitor U.S. citizens. Since 9/11,

security has been stepped up (rightfully so), but it has been taken to a level almost comparable to George Orwell 's Nineteen Eighty-Four in which everything is closely monitored and scrutinized.

Overall, the surveillance technology revolution has changed our country drastically and has brought concern and worry to many American citizens. Monitoring citizens was not the intent when surveillance technology first developed, but now it has the potential for large scale abuse. While technology has benefited our lives in many ways, it has also changed how America operates, how we are kept safe, and how we view our Constitutional freedoms and our privacy. Hopefully, the next 15 years will bring us towards a balance between security, safety, and privacy.

BREANNA NELSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Breanna Nelson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Breanna Nelson is an 8th grader at Arvada K–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Breanna Nelson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Breanna Nelson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1739–S1832.

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 842–856, and S. Res. 108–110. **Pages S1780–81**

Measures Passed:

Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 301, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S1830–31**

Attacks Carried Out by Russian-Backed Rebels: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 72, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1831–32**

Capito (for Lee) Amendment No. 598, to urge the President to prioritize and expedite the provision of lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies. **Page S1831**

Capito (for Leahy) Amendment No. 599, to amend the title. **Page S1832**

Internet of Things: Senate agreed to S. Res. 110, expressing the sense of the Senate about a strategy for the Internet of Things to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment. **Page S1832**

Measures Considered:

Budget Resolution—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1740–74**

Adopted:

By 94 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. 79), Sanders/Wyden Amendment No. 386, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicaid beneficiaries from benefit cuts. **Pages S1744–48, S1750–51**

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. 80), Portman/Bennet Amendment No. 349, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve health outcomes and lower the costs of caring for medically complex children in Medicaid. **Pages S1744, S1751**

Sanders Amendment No. 474, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect and strengthen the Department of Veterans Affairs, hire more health care professionals for the Department, and ensure quality and timely access to health care for all veterans. **Pages S1765–66**

Ayotte Amendment No. 400, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to maintain and enhance access, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Choice Card program under section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014. **Pages S1764, S1766**

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 81), Fischer Amendment No. 409, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to promoting equal pay, which may include preventing discrimination on the basis of sex and preventing retaliation against employees for seeking or discussing wage information. **Pages S1757–58, S1766**

By 75 yeas to 24 nays (Vote No. 83), Enzi (for Hatch) Amendment No. 498, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to legislation submitted to Congress by President Obama to protect and strengthen Social Security. **Pages S1765, S1767**

Rejected:

By 45 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 78), Sanders/Wyden Modified Amendment No. 323, to create millions of middle class jobs by investing in our nation's infrastructure paid for by raising revenue through closing loopholes in the corporate and international tax system. **Pages S1740–44, S1748–50**

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 82), Mikulski Amendment No. 362, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to amending the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to allow for punitive damages, limit the any

factor ''other than sex'' exception, and prohibit retaliation against employees who share salary information. **Pages S1751–57, S1766–67**

By 1 yea to 98 nays (Vote No. 85), Cornyn Amendment No. 357, to raise taxes and spending by enacting President Obama's fiscal year 2016 budget. **Pages S1758–62, S1768**

Pending:

Cotton Amendment No. 481, to establish a deficit-neutral fund relating to supporting Israel. **Pages S1764–65**

Enzi (for Kirk) Amendment No. 545, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to reimposing waived sanctions and imposing new sanctions against Iran for violations of the Joint Plan of Action or a comprehensive nuclear agreement. **Pages S1768–69**

Rounds/Inhofe Amendment No. 412, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for engaging in closed-door settlement agreements that ignore impacted States and counties. **Pages S1769–70**

Rubio Modified Amendment No. 423, to increase new budget authority fiscal years 2016 and 2017 and modify outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2022 for National Defense (budget function 050). **Pages S1770–73**

Daines Amendment No. 388, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the designation of national monuments. **Pages S1773–74**

Daines Amendment No. 389, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget. **Page S1774**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 84), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to waive all applicable budgetary discipline pursuant to Section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, with respect to Whitehouse (for Wyden) Amendment No. 471, to create a point of order against legislation that would cut benefits, raise the retirement age, or privatize Social Security. Subsequently, the point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, was sustained, and the amendment was ruled out of order. **Pages S1762–64, S1767–68**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, March 25, 2015, with 18 hours of debate time remaining; that the time until 10:30 a.m., be equally divided and controlled by the two managers, or designees; that Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair at 10:30 a.m., to allow for the Joint Meeting of Congress; and that all time during the recess count against the remaining debate time on the concurrent resolution. **Page S1832**

Joint Meeting—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, into the House Chamber for the joint meeting at 11 a.m., on Wednesday, March 25, 2015. **Page S1832**

Messages from the House: **Page S1779**

Measures Referred: **Page S1779**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1779–80**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1780**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1781–83**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1783–86**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1778–79**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1786–S1830**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1830**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1830**

Record Votes: Eight record votes were taken today. (Total—85) **Pages S1750–51, S1766–68**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:51 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1832.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine waters of the United States, focusing on stakeholder perspectives on the impacts of the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed rule, after receiving testimony from Arkansas Attorney General Leslie Rutledge, Little Rock; Donald R. van der Vaart, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Secretary, Raleigh; Susan Metzger, Kansas Department of Agriculture Assistant Secretary, Manhattan; Josh Baldi, Washington Department of Ecology Regional Director, Bellevue; Lynn Padgett, Ouray County Commissioner, Montrose, Colorado, on behalf of the National Association of Counties; T. Furman Brodie, Charles Ingram Lumber, Inc.,

Effingham, South Carolina; Jason Kinley, Gem County Mosquito Abatement District, Emmett, Idaho, on behalf of the Northwest Mosquito and Vector Control Association; Mac McLennan, Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., Grand Forks, North Dakota; Jeff Metz, Metz Land and Cattle Co., Bayard, Nebraska; and Kent Peppler, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, Denver, Colorado.

APPROPRIATIONS: THE JUDICIARY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Judiciary, after receiving testimony from Julia S. Gibbons, Chair, Committee on the Budget of the Judicial Conference of the United States; and James C. Duff, Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

UNITED STATES MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States Middle East policy, after receiving testimony from Ray Takeyh, Council on Foreign Relations, Kenneth M. Pollack, The Brookings Institution Center for Middle East Policy, and Dafna H. Rand, Center for a New American Security, all of Washington, D.C.; and Colonel Derek J. Harvey, USA (Ret.), University of South Florida Global Initiative for Civil Society and Conflict, Riverview.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 2,360 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

REGULATORY REGIME FOR REGIONAL BANKS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the regulatory regime for regional banks, after receiving testimony from Oliver I. Ireland, Morrison and Foerster, and Mark Olson, Bipartisan Policy Center Financial Regulatory Reform Initiative's Regulatory Architecture Task Force, both of Washington, D.C.; Deron Smithy, Regions Bank, Birmingham, Alabama, on behalf of The Regional Bank Group; and Simon Johnson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management, Cambridge.

CAPITAL FORMATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment concluded a hearing to examine capital formation and reducing small business burdens, including S. 576, to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, after receiving testimony from Tom Quaadman, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Center for Capital Markets Competitiveness, Marcus M. Stanley, Americans for Financial Reform, and John C. Partigan, Nixon Peabody LLP, all of Washington, D.C.; and William H. Spell, Spell Capital Partners, LLC, Minneapolis, Minnesota, on behalf of the Small Business Investor Alliance.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security concluded a hearing to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on performance, not prescription, after receiving testimony from Peter M. Rogoff, Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy; David B. Nichols, Missouri Department of Transportation Director, Jefferson City, on behalf of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; John D. Graham, Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Bloomington; and Peter Sweatman, University of Michigan Transportation Research Center, Ann Arbor.

UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security concluded a hearing to examine unmanned aircraft systems, focusing on key considerations regarding safety, innovation, economic impact, and privacy, including status of test sites and international developments, after receiving testimony from Margaret Gilligan, Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; John B. Morris, Jr., Associate Administrator, Office of Policy Analysis and Development, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce; Gerald L. Dillingham, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; John Villasenor, Brookings Institution, and Paul Misener, Amazon.com, both of Washington, D.C.; and Jeff VanderWerff, American Farm Bureau Federation, Sparta, Michigan.

THE NATION'S FOREST SYSTEM

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine management reforms to improve forest health and socioeconomic opportunities on the nation's forest system, after receiving testimony from Robert Bonnie, Under Secretary of Agriculture; Brian Brown, Alcan Forest Products,

LP, Ketchikan, Alaska; Carlton N. Owen, U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities, Greenville, South Carolina; Mark L. Peck, Lincoln County Montana County Commissioner, Libby; and Duane Vaagen, Vaagen Brothers Lumber Company, Colville, Washington.

SECURING THE BORDER

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine securing the border, focusing on assessing the impact of transnational crime, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Kempshall, Executive Director, Arizona Region of the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Bryan Costigan, Montana Department of Justice Division of Criminal Investigation Supervisory Agent, Helena, on behalf of the National Fusion Center Association; Benny Martinez, Brooks County Chief Deputy Sheriff, Falfurrias, Texas; General Barry R. McCaffrey, USA (Ret.), former Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Seattle, Washington; and John P. Torres, former Deputy Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, D.C.

ADVANCING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR PATIENTS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine continuing America's leadership, focusing on advancing research and development for patients, after receiving testimony from Bruce A. Sullenger, Duke University Medical Center Duke Translational Research Institute, Durham, North Carolina; Alexis Borisy, Third Rock Ventures, Boston, Massachusetts; Michael A. Mussallem, Edwards Lifesciences, Irvine, California; and Allan Coukell, The Pew Charitable Trusts, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Sally Quillian Yates, of Georgia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Isakson and Perdue, and Representative Lewis, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

VETERANS CHOICE ACT

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Veterans Choice Act, focusing on exploring the distance criteria, after receiving testimony from Sloan Gibson, Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and Roscoe Butler, The American Legion, Peter B. Hegseth, Concerned Veterans for America, Joseph A. Violante, DAV, Bill Rausch, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, and Carlos Fuentes, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, all of Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 40 public bills, H.R. 2, 1557–1595; 1 private bill, H.R. 1596; and 6 resolutions, and H. Res. 165–170, were introduced. **Pages H1898–1900**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1901–02**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Foxx to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1851**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:01 a.m. and reconvened at 10 a.m. **Page H1851**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:31 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1855**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Dennis Fountain, Moses Lake Baptist Church, Moses Lake, Washington. **Page H1855**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 254 yeas to 156 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 135. **Pages H1855, H1870**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Palazzo wherein he resigned from the Committees on Armed Services and Homeland Security. **Page H1855**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 165, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H1855**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Monday, March 23rd:

Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Planning Reform Act of 2015: H.R. 216, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, and to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 134. **Pages H1869–70**

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025: The House began consideration of H. Con. Res. 27, establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H1858–95**

H. Res. 163, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 180 nays with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 133, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 180 nays, Roll No. 132. **Pages H1858–70**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Designating the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the ''Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Bureau of Investigation Miami Field Office'': H.R. 1092, amended, to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the ''Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Bureau of Investigation Miami Field Office''; **Pages H1895–97**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: ''To designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the 'Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building'.''. **Page H1897**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1858.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1868, H1868–69, H1869–70, and H1870. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINATION OF THE COSTS AND IMPACTS OF MANDATORY BIOTECHNOLOGY LAWS

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing on examination of the costs and impacts of mandatory biotechnology laws. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REAUTHORIZING THE CFTC: END-USER VIEWS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit held a hearing on reauthorizing the CFTC: end-user views. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC AND OUTSIDE WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing for American Indian and Alaska Native public and outside witnesses. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AGENCIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Agriculture Research Agencies budget. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Agriculture officials: Catherine E. Woteki, Under Secretary, Research, Education and Economics; Chavonda Jacobs-Young, Administrator, Agriculture Research Service; Sonny Ramaswamy, Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture; Mary Bohman, Administrator, Economic Research Service; Joseph Reilly, Administrator, National Agriculture Statistics Service; and Michael Young, Budget Officer.

APPROPRIATIONS—MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Missile Defense Agency budget. Testimony was heard from Vice Admiral James D. Syring, Director, Missile Defense Agency. This hearing was closed.

APPROPRIATIONS—NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on Nuclear Regulatory Commission budget. Testimony was

heard from Stephen Burns, Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Kristine Svinicki, Commissioner, Nuclear Regulatory Commission; William Ostendorff, Commissioner, Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and Jeff Baran, Commissioner, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS—COAST GUARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Coast Guard budget. Testimony was heard from Paul F. Zukunft, Commandant, United States Coast Guard.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on National Labor Relations Board budget. Testimony was heard from Mark Pearce, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board; and Richard F. Griffin Jr., General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board.

APPROPRIATIONS—HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Housing and Urban Development Programs budget. Testimony was heard from Julian Castro, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on Federal Communications Commission budget. Testimony was heard from Tom Wheeler, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Ajit Pai, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS—ASSISTANCE TO CENTRAL AMERICA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a hearing on Assistance to Central America budget. Testimony was heard from Roberta S. Jacobson, Assistant Secretary of State, Western Hemisphere Affairs; William R. Brownfield, Assistant Secretary of State, International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs; and Elizabeth Hogan, Acting Assistant Administrator, Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.

FISCAL YEAR 2016 ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE HEARING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2016 Atomic Energy Defense Hearing''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Frank Klotz (USAF, Retired), Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration; Mark Whitney, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, Department of Energy; and Jessie Hill Roberson, Vice Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing on H.R. 548, the ''Certainty in Enforcement Act of 2015''; H.R. 549, the ''Litigation Oversight Act of 2015''; H.R. 550, the ''EEOC Transparency and Accountability Act''; and H.R. 1189, the ''Preserving Employee Wellness Programs Act''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE 340B DRUG PRICING PROGRAM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Examining the 340B Drug Pricing Program''. Testimony was heard from Diana Espinosa, Deputy Administrator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Debbie Draper, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and Ann Maxwell, Assistant Inspector General for Evaluation and Inspections, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services.

THE INTERNET OF THINGS: EXPLORING THE NEXT TECHNOLOGY FRONTIER

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade held a hearing entitled ''The Internet of Things: Exploring the Next Technology Frontier''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPROVING COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS REGULATION ACT OF 2015

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy concluded a hearing on the ''Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act of 2015''. Testimony was heard from Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy began a markup on

the ''Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act of 2015''.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade began a markup on the ''Data Security and Breach Notification Act of 2015''.

EXAMINING THE SEC'S AGENDA, OPERATIONS, AND FY 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining the SEC's Agenda, Operations, and FY 2016 Budget Request''. Testimony was heard from Mary Jo White, Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission.

THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION'S ROLE IN OPERATION CHOKE POINT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's Role in Operation Choke Point''. Testimony was heard from Martin J. Gruenberg, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

THE U.S. REBALANCE IN SOUTH ASIA: FOREIGN AID AND DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''The U.S. Rebalance in South Asia: Foreign Aid and Development Priorities''. Testimony was heard from Nisha Desai Biswal, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs, Department of State; and Jonathan Stivers, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia, U.S. Agency for International Development.

OVERSIGHT OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUNDING PRIORITIES FOR THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the State Department and Agency for International Development Funding Priorities for the Western Hemisphere''. Testimony was heard from Roberta S. Jacobson, Assistant Secretary, Bureau for Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; and Elizabeth Hogan, Acting Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.

IRAN'S NONCOMPLIANCE WITH ITS INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY OBLIGATIONS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled ''Iran's Noncompliance with Its International Atomic Energy Agency Obligations''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AFTER PARIS AND COPENHAGEN: RESPONDING TO THE RISING TIDE OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''After Paris and Copenhagen: Responding to the Rising Tide of Anti-Semitism''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

A GLOBAL BATTLEGROUND: THE FIGHT AGAINST ISLAMIST EXTREMISM AT HOME AND ABROAD

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''A Global Battleground: The Fight against Islamist Extremism at Home and Abroad''. Testimony was heard from Former Speaker Newt Gingrich; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 348, the ''Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2015''; H.R. 712, the ''Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015''; H.R. 1155, the ''Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015''; H.R. 690, the ''Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act of 2015''; and H.R. 889, the ''Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act''. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1155, H.R. 348, H.R. 690, H.R. 712, and H.R. 889.

EXAMINING THE SPENDING PRIORITIES AND MISSIONS OF THE FOREST SERVICE AND THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2016 BUDGET PROPOSALS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Spending Priorities and Missions of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management in the President's FY 2016 Budget Proposals''. Testimony was heard from Neil Kornze, Director, Bureau of Land Management; and Thomas Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

EXAMINING THE SPENDING PRIORITIES AND MISSIONS OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, THE POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS AND USGS WATER DIVISION IN THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2016 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Power, and Oceans held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Spending Priorities and Missions of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Power Marketing Administrations and USGS Water Division in the President's FY 2016 Budget Proposal''. Testimony was heard from Estevan Lopez, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; Mark Gabriel, Administrator, Western Area Power Administration; Elliot Mainzer, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration; Christopher Turner, Administrator, Southwestern Power Administration; Kenneth Legg, Administrator, Southeastern Power Administration; and William Werkheiser, Associate Director, Water, U.S. Geological Survey.

EXAMINING THE SPENDING PRIORITIES AND MISSION OF THE U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2016 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Spending Priorities and Mission of the U.S. Geological Survey in the President's FY 2016 Budget Proposal''. Testimony was heard from Suzette Kimball, Acting Director, U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee began a markup on H.R. 152, the ''Corolla Wild Horses Protection Act''; H.R. 308, the ''Keep the Promise Act of 2015''; H.R. 373, the ''Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act''; H.R. 404, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska; H.R. 533, to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes; H.R. 979, to designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as ''Sky Point''; H.R. 984, to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; H.R. 1168, the ''Native American Children Safety Act''; and H.R. 1324, the ''Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2015''.

USSS: HOLDING THE PROTECTORS ACCOUNTABLE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''USSS: Holding the Protectors Accountable''. Testimony was heard from Joseph P. Clancy, Director, Secret Service.

SEARCHING FOR THE ORIGINS OF THE UNIVERSE: AN UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS OF THE JAMES WEBB SPACE TELESCOPE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space held a hearing entitled ''Searching for the Origins of the Universe: An Update on the Progress of the James Webb Space Telescope''. Testimony was heard from John Grunsfeld, Associate Administrator, Science Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Cristina Chaplain, Director of Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office; John Mather, Senior Project Scientist, James Webb Space Telescope, Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and a public witness.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OVERSIGHT: OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled ''Department of Energy Oversight: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy''. Testimony was heard from David Danielson, Assistant Secretary, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

OPTIONS FOR FAA AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL REFORM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled ''Options for FAA Air Traffic Control Reform''. Testimony was heard from Matt Hampton, Assistant Inspector General for Aviation Audits, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Transportation; Craig Fuller, Vice Chairman, Federal Aviation Administration Management Advisory Council; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE HEARING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing on H.R. 456, the ''Reducing Barriers for Veterans Education Act of 2015''; H.R. 473, the ''Increasing the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability to Veterans Act of 2015''; H.R. 474, the ''Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Programs Reauthorization Act of 2015''; H.R. 475, the ''GI Bill Processing Improvement Act of 2015''; H.R. 476, the ''GI Bill Education Quality

Enhancement Act of 2015''; H.R. 643, the ''Veterans Education Survey Act of 2015''; H.R. 1038, the ''Ensuring VA Employee Accountability Act''; H.R. 1141, to amend title 38, United States Code, to consider certain time spent by members of reserve components of the Armed Forces while receiving medical care from the Secretary of Defense as active duty for purposes of eligibility for Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes; H.R. 1187, to amend title 38, United States Code, to adjust certain limits on the guaranteed amount of a home loan under the home loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 1313, the ''Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Relief Act''; and H.R. 1382, the ''Boosting Rates of American Veteran Employment Act''. Testimony was heard from Representative Murphy of Florida; Major General Robert M. Worley II USAF (Retired), Director, Education Service, Veterans Benefit Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Teresa W. Gerton, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Veterans' Employment and Training Service, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S USE OF DATA ANALYSIS TO IDENTIFY EMERGING TRENDS AND STOP MEDICARE FRAUD

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing on the federal government's use of data analysis—particularly the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' Fraud Prevention System (FPS)—to identify emerging trends, and stop Medicare fraud. Testimony was heard from Shantanu Agrawal, Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Program Integrity, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; Gary Cantrell, Deputy Inspector General for Investigations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Defense and Overhead Architecture held a budget hearing. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Defense Health Program, 9 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Energy, 2:30 p.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower, to hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9 a.m., SR–222.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine the current state of readiness of U.S. forces in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program, 3 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC) accountability, focusing on nonbank designations, 2 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Paul A. Folmsbee, of Oklahoma, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, and Katherine Simonds Dhanani, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Somalia, all of the Department of State, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine securing the border, focusing on understanding and addressing the root causes of Central American migration to the United States, 2 p.m., SD–342.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine the fight against Alzheimer's disease, focusing on a treatment by 2025, 2:15 p.m., SD–106.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture, hearing to examine the implications of potential retaliatory measures taken against the United States in response to meat labeling requirements, 9 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy and Credit, hearing on reauthorizing the CFTC: market participant views, 1:30 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, hearing on Centers for Disease Control and Prevention budget, 8:30 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Intelligence Community and Global Threat budget, 9 a.m., H–405 Capitol. This hearing will be closed (Members only).

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing for American Indian and Alaska Native public and outside witnesses, 9 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing on Federal Railroad Administration, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration budget, 9 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on National Nuclear Security Administration, Nuclear Nonproliferation and Naval Reactors budget, 9:30 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing on Federal Bureau of Investigation budget, 1 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing for public and outside witnesses, 3 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on Judiciary budget, 2:30 p.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled ''Stakeholder's Views on the Recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission'', 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing entitled ''Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Strategy and the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and Chemical Biological Defense Program'', 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2016 National Security Space Hearing'', 5 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, markup on the ''Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act of 2015'' (continued), 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, markup on the ''Data Security and Breach Notification Act of 2015'' (continued), 12 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 299, the ''Capital Access for Small Community Financial Institutions Act of 2015''; H.R. 601, the ''Eliminate Privacy Notice Confusion Act''; H.R. 650, the ''Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act of 2015''; H.R. 685, the ''Mortgage Choice Act of 2015''; H.R. 1195, the ''Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection Advisory Boards Act''; H.R. 1259, the ''Helping Expand Lending Practices in Rural Communities Act''; H.R. 1265, the ''Bureau Advisory Commission Transparency Act''; H.R. 1367, to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to clarify the application of that Act to American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands; H.R. 1408, the ''Mortgage Servicing Asset Capital Requirements Act of 2015''; H.R. 1480, the ''SAFE Act Confidentiality and Privilege Enhancement Act''; H.R. 1529, the ''Community Institution Mortgage Relief Act of 2015''; and a resolution to establish the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, 9 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, markup on H.R. 237, to authorize the revocation or denial of passports and passport cards to individuals affiliated with foreign terrorist organizations, and for other purposes, 1:30 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''The Goldman Act to Return Abducted American Children: Reviewing Obama Administration Implementation'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation Security, hearing entitled ''Risk-Based Security: Assessing the Path Forward for TSA Pre✔™'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, hearing entitled ''Patent Reform: Protecting American Innovators and Job Creators from Abusive Patent Litigation'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Wrecking the Internet to Save It? The FCC's Net Neutrality Rule'', 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, hearing on H.R. 707, the ''Restoration of America's Wire Act'', 4 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 152, the ''Corolla Wild Horses Protection Act''; H.R. 308, the ''Keep the Promise Act of 2015''; H.R. 373, the ''Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act''; H.R. 404, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska; H.R. 533, to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes; H.R. 979, to designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as ''Sky Point''; H.R. 984, to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; H.R. 1168, the ''Native American Children Safety Act''; and H.R. 1324, the ''Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2015'' (continued), 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 653, the ''FOIA Oversight and Implementation Act of 2015''; H.R. 901, the ''Eliminating Pornography from Agencies Act''; H.R. 1069, the ''Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2015''; the ''Federal Employee Tax Accountability Act of 2015''; the ''Contracting and Tax Accountability Act of 2015''; the ''Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2015''; H.R. 1531, the ''Land Management Workforce Flexibility Act''; and H.R. 651, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2, Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup on the ''Weather Research and Forecast Innovation Act of 2015'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1481, the ''Small Contractors Improve Competition Act of 2015'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1058, the ''Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act of 2015''; H.R. 1152, to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to conduct official business; H.R. 1026, the ''Taxpayer Knowledge of IRS Investigations Act''; H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations''; H.R. 1295, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code; H.R. 709, the ''Prevent Targeting at the IRS Act''; H.R. 1104, the ''Fair Treatment for All Donations''; and H.R. 1105, the ''Death Tax Repeal Act of 2015'', 1:30 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on NSA and Cybersecurity, budget hearing, HVC–304. This hearing will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 11, Budget Resolution.

At 10:30 a.m., Senate will recess to allow for the Joint Meeting of Congress with His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani. Senators will gather in the Senate Chamber at 10:35 a.m. and depart as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives at 10:40 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 25

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Joint Meeting with the Senate to receive His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Continue consideration of H. Con. Res. 27—Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2017 through 2025.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E396
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E400
Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E399
Clay, Wm. Lacy, Mo., E393, E401
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E394
DesJarlais, Scott, Tenn., E389
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E391
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E390
Farenthold, Blake, Tex., E389
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E389
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E390, E394
Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E398
Messer, Luke, Ind., E394
Nolan, Richard M., Minn. E390, E392, E395, E398
Olson, Pete, Tex., E392, E393, E395, E396, E398, E399, E401
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E395
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E389, E392, E393, E394, E395, E397, E398, E399, E400, E402
Poe, Ted, Tex., E396
Price, David E., N.C., E399
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E391, E397
Roe, David P., Tenn., E392
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E389, E396
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E397
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E394, E400
Smith, Jason, Mo., E398
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E397
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E392

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.