United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2015 No. 79

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 21, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GARRET GRAVES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, God of the Universe, for giving us another day.

As the various Members of this people's House return to their home districts, we ask Your blessing upon each. Give each a discerning ear and the wisdom and good judgment needed to give credit to the office they have been honored by their constituents to fill.

Bless the work of all who serve in their various capacities here in the United States Capitol.

Bless all those who visit the Capitol today, be they American citizens or visitors to our Nation. May they be inspired by this monument to the noble idea of human freedom and its guarantee by the democratic experiment that is the United States.

And as we take time this weekend to remember those who have died serving our country, God, bless America, and may all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOLD 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.

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, May 21, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 21, 2015 at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 47.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

MEMORIAL DAY

(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, on Memorial Day, Americans will remember and honor those who have served this Nation to protect and defend the freedoms we cherish. As we reflect on the heroism and devotion of the brave servicemembers who have given their lives in defense of our Nation, we must never forget to thank and pray for their families. Let us take time to show our appreciation for the service and sacrifice of America's heroes.

I especially appreciate Memorial Day. My father served our country as part of the Flying Tigers in India and China during World War II, which inspired my military service, as well as the service of my four sons, who all currently are on military duty.

This weekend, I am thankful for the opportunity to join County Council Chairman Ronnie Young in the Aiken Memorial Day parade. I am grateful to Councilwoman Gail Diggs for her role in the efforts to reinstate the parade ably begun by the Marine Corps League, as well as Wes Jerrell and Betsy Davis with the Aiken Jaycees for their work to honor and support our Armed Forces and their families.

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

BOKO HARAM CRIMES

(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, press reports this week show that the reign of terror wrought by Boko Haram in northeastern Nigeria has reached appalling

Printed on recycled paper.

new depths of depravity. They have chosen to use as a weapon of war widespread, organized sexual violence against young girls and women. Hundreds of women and girls as young as 11 have been subjected to systematic, organized rape.

The terrorists have also used women and children to carry out suicide bombings against civilian targets.

These are crimes against humanity, which is why I am pleased to join Congresswoman BARBARA LEE in support of an International Criminal Court investigation.

I am also pleased that the House approved an amendment that Representative ED ROYCE and I offered to the National Defense Authorization Act that calls for continued U.S. support of international efforts to combat Boko Haram.

History has taught us, to our everlasting sorrow, that when such horror arises in the world, the world cannot and should not stand idly by.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF RABBI CARL WOLKIN

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rabbi Carl Wolkin. He is retiring after 35 years of service to the Congregation Beth Shalom in Northbrook, Illinois. He will be sorely missed by many in our community.

Over the past 35 years, Rabbi Wolkin has served as the president of the Northbrook Clergy Association, the Chicago region of the Rabbinical Assembly, the president of the Chicago Board of Rabbis, and he is also a member of the Jewish United Fund board. In these roles, Mr. Speaker, he has worked tirelessly to support his fellow rabbis in making their congregations centers for worship and learning.

In 2004, Rabbi Wolkin was in the first group of graduates of the Center for Rabbinic Enrichment of the Shalom Hartman Institute in Jerusalem.

Rabbi Wolkin has been a tremendous asset to the Jewish community at large, as has his wife, Judy, who has enriched the lives of Jewish children by her teaching at the Solomon Schechter Day School for many years.

I wish Rabbi Wolkin well on his retirement and the next chapter of his life.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, Congress is engaged in a vigorous debate about national trade policy, but no matter where you stand on the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Export-Import Bank is one trade program that we should all get behind.

After all, this is a Federal agency that operates at no cost to taxpayers and whose sole purpose is to create jobs by helping American manufacturers increase exports.

The Export-Import Bank provides loans to help American businesses compete against foreign companies that receive subsidies from their governments, and it provides credit to facilitate the sale of American goods abroad.

Since 2009, the Export-Import Bank has helped dozens of businesses in western New York export nearly $100 million in goods and has helped create or sustain 1.3 million jobs across this Nation.

A number of local business leaders, including Barre Banks, the owner of Midland Machinery in Tonawanda, have reached out to my office to share their stories of success with the Bank and to warn against its expiration.

I urge the majority to stand with American businesses, protect American jobs, and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF CORPORAL FRED WHITAKER, SR.

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

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day, I wish to recognize our servicemembers who have so bravely answered the call to defend our great Nation.

As the daughter of a U.S. Marine, I am eternally grateful for the service and sacrifice our troops make, all in the name of freedom.

Today, I wish to pay a special tribute to a hero that I have the honor of representing in Congress, Corporal Fred Whitaker, Sr. Corporal Whitaker, a World War II veteran, proudly served our Nation in the combat infantry from 1943 to 1946. He participated in several campaigns, including Saar, Rhineland, Central Europe, and the historic Battle of the Bulge.

Corporal Whitaker received numerous awards for his honorable service, including the Distinguished Unit Citation, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Medal, the European Theater Medal with four battle stars, and a World War II Victory Medal.

I thank him for his sacrifice to our Nation and for the sacrifice all military personnel make to keep our country safe and free. We are forever indebted to this true hero of the Greatest Generation.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROJECT HEAD START

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I ask all my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 92, commemorating the 50th anniversary of Project Head Start, launched in the White House Rose Garden on May 18, 1965, as bold and audacious in its scope design and as a project to launch against those who lived in poverty.

President Johnson said: ''We set out to make''—and to contain certain—''that poverty's children would not be forevermore poverty's captives.'' This means that nearly half of the preschool children of poverty will get a head start on their future. These children will receive preschool training and prepare them for regular school in September. They will get medical and dental attention that they badly need, and parents will receive counseling.

Again, we have set out to make certain that poverty's children would not be forevermore poverty's captives.

Today, 160,000 enrolled in Early Head Start, 910,000 enrolled in Head Start, 20,000 American Indian-Alaska Native children, 4,000 American Indians, 32,000 migrant or seasonal workers, and 40,000 homeless children.

We must continue this infrastructure, and I want to thank AVANCE and the Harris County School District in my district because they believe in helping children.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by thanking those who have fallen in battle for the United States of America as we memorialize them on Memorial Day.

CONGRATULATING MAJOR STEPHEN J. BONNER

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my constituent, Major Stephen J. Bonner of the U.S. Air Force, who has earned the Congressional Gold Medal for his distinguished service as an American fighter pilot with the Flying Tigers squadron in World War II.

Growing up in the 1930s and during World War I, Major Bonner had always dreamt of becoming an ace. When he graduated from flight school in 1943, his dream came true when he was assigned to fly with the 76th Fighter Squadron in China, battling Japanese fighter pilots in his P–40 Warhawk.

During his time with the Air Force, Major Bonner became a member of the American Fighter Aces, who have been renowned as our country's most distinguished fighter pilots. In both world wars, along with the Korean war and the Vietnam war, these individuals have not only courageously defended our Nation, but have also made outstanding achievements in aerial combat.

Major Bonner, now 96, lives with his daughter Jane just outside Carlinville in my district in central Illinois. I am proud to congratulate Major Bonner for his outstanding accomplishments as an American Fighter Ace.

The bravery and dedication he displayed as a pilot in World War II make him a very deserving recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal, and I am proud and thankful to have such brave veterans like them in my district.

Congratulations, Mr. Bonner.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, family income shouldn't dictate a child's educational outcome; but today, study after study shows that children from lower-income families face unique social, emotional, and financial challenges that lead them to start school already behind their peers.

We began addressing this problem in 1965 when President Lyndon Johnson established the Head Start program. Fifty years later, over 30 million of our most vulnerable children have benefited from Head Start and a more level playing field.

In Illinois today, there are 48 Head Start programs across the State. These programs not only provide opportunities for more than 40,000 Illinois children and their families each year, but they also give tens of thousands of passionate educators the chance to give our most needy children a shot at success.

This week, as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of Head Start, I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of this vital program. I look forward to ensuring that all children can have an equal opportunity to succeed.

I want to salute our troops, our veterans, and those who gave their lives as we move into Memorial Day.

□ 1015

PROBLEMS AT THE IRS CONTINUE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, while it may feel like a case of deja vu, the sad fact of the matter is, we are once again talking about real problems at the IRS. This time, the Treasury inspector general reports that 1,600 IRS agents in a 10-year period did not pay their taxes.

While it is bad enough to think that those tasked with collecting our taxes can't manage to pay their own, what makes this case worse is that a majority of these employees were given reduced penalties instead of facing the full consequences of their actions. A number of these employees even received promotions and bonuses.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers deserve better than a government agency that can't seem to follow the rules, and hard-working Americans should be treated with more respect. It is time for more oversight and more transparency at this agency and holding employees accountable who break the rules.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Head Start, which President Johnson announced May 18, 1965. Head Start is our Nation's commitment that every child—regardless of their ZIP Code—has an opportunity to succeed.

Since its creation, Head Start has prepared more than 30 million children for success in the classroom and beyond. My former district director, a brilliant African American man, was a Head Start graduate. His story and millions of others demonstrate just how important early childhood education programs are.

Yet nearly 57,000 children across the country have lost access because of draconian sequester cuts, and the 2016 Republican budget makes it worse by removing another 35,000 children from the program, including 4,500 from my home State of California.

Our children deserve better. How in the world will they compete with children throughout the world if we deny them an early start?

Mr. Speaker, we know high-quality, early childhood education is one of the best investments we can make. So on the 50th anniversary of Head Start, I urge my colleagues to fully support this critical program and leave no child behind.

I, too, want to commemorate and remember my dad, a veteran who served in two wars. And also, I want to commemorate and thank our veterans, our young men and women on duty, and those who have paid a very serious price on behalf of this country.

SPURRING PRIVATE AEROSPACE COMPETITIVENESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2262.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 273 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2262.

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

□ 1018

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes, with Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, when I was a child, I learned that there was more to our universe than just my home and my town. There were people in great cities. There were buildings that stretched to the clouds. There were machines that could explore the character of atoms and telescopes that saw into distant galaxies. There is so much in the world.

And in recent decades, we have grown accustomed to seeing it all. Entire continents and countries are a plane ride away. The Internet is a window to the world from the comfort of our homes. In this time of innovation, what was once unimaginable is now common, and what was once distant now feels so close.

But we all know there is still so much left to learn. In my heart, I believe man's journey of exploration and discovery has barely begun.

For generations, dating back to the dawn of humankind, every man, woman, and child has looked up to the stars in wonder. We imagined that the dots of light could reveal a glimpse of the future. And we thought that each night, we saw the whole heavens stretching above us.

But as technology has given us new eyes to see the universe, we discovered that even on the clearest of nights, we can only see a fraction of the stars in one small section of our galaxy.

I still look up at the stars with wonder. And I know that we are only at the start of our mission into this great frontier.

You see, I spent time in school, just like every kid in America, learning about our first voyages into space and the Moon landing. I remember how much pride I felt, knowing that America did it first and that our flag still flies up there today.

But that is not where we were meant to stop.

America has always led because it is in our nature to lead. We crossed over the mountains of Appalachia and into the Great Plains. We climbed the Rockies to the golden coast of California and beyond, creating a Nation in

this land that has far surpassed all others in truth, hope, and liberty.

We are a beacon of freedom and human dignity to every person that longs for the right to choose their own future, and we are a force for good unlike anything this world has ever known.

And yet in space, we are losing our ability to lead. We once stood up to the challenge of the Soviet's Sputnik and made it to the Moon. But today our astronauts use Russian rockets, and other nations are working to put people on Mars and beyond.

But we must go beyond. We must face the great unknown with that American spirit of adventure and hope.

To paraphrase President Kennedy, we must lead mankind into space—not because it is easy, but because it is hard and because that goal brings out the very best of our Nation.

There are people—scientists, engineers, astronauts, and entrepreneurs—out in the deserts of California who have a goal, the same goal so many Americans have had before them. It was our forefathers' goal at the founding of this Nation conceived in liberty. It was our goal when two young bicycle repairmen rose above the sand and waves of a North Carolina beach to fly. It was our goal when Chuck Yeager raced through the skies over California and broke the sound barrier.

That goal is to make our dreams a reality.

Today these 21st century explorers in California and across the Nation want to bring man above the clouds, above the Earth, and above the Moon, itself. And we should let them.

Government has great power; that is true. But in America, we believe that power is limited. It cannot, should not, and will not be used to diminish our dreams.

I stand here before you today, Mr. Chairman, presenting a bill. This bill asks us to make a decision: Do we concede our future to one of managed decline where others lead? Or do we make a future where America and her people guide us in our journey to the stars?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015. And I am actually quite saddened by that. It is not the outcome I had hoped for. Like the gentleman from California, I share in the enthusiasm and the wonder of space.

I would note that the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee has just cut $230 million from the President's request for these activities.

It was my sincere belief that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee could have reached bipartisan agreement on a commercial space bill. Indeed, during the past few weeks, there was a concerted attempt on both sides of the committee to reach common ground on tackling these issues and developing a bipartisan bill.

However, with the backdrop of meeting the majority's floor schedule as the top priority, there was insufficient time given to negotiate a compromise before last week's full committee markup.

Mr. Chairman, I think most of us on both sides of the aisle share in the excitement and enthusiasm about the commercial space industry, and we want it to succeed. Indeed, hundreds of millions of dollars have been paid by taxpayers into this industry to get it off the ground. American taxpayers have a lot of skin in the game when it comes to the success of commercial space.

Since the very beginning, the Federal Government has supported the private space industry, at both the State and Federal level, with funding, data, and guidance with best practices.

Since the Commercial Space Launch Act was passed in 1984, followed by the Commercial Space Launch Act Amendments of 1988 and 2004, it is clear that the commercial space industry has made significant strides.

Even in 2004, few would have predicted that NASA would be relying today on commercial space transportation to deliver critical supplies, spare parts, and research material to the International Space Station.

Who knows what developments will occur in the commercial space arena in the coming years. What we do know is that it won't just be commercial cargo transported into space; in fact, it will also be people. That is why it is up to Congress to develop responsible commercial space policies that both encourage the commercial space industry and protect those who participate as the users of the industry's services and activities.

Sadly, this bill just doesn't measure up to that responsibility. Instead, it takes a fundamentally unbalanced approach to the issues facing the commercial space launch industry.

Two key areas should concern all Members, Republicans and Democrats alike.

The first area pertains to safety. A moratorium on the FAA's authority to regulate the safety of crew and spaceflight participants was initially included in the Commercial Space Launch Act Amendments of 2004 in order to allow the commercial space industry the time to acquire experience and data that would inform the development of safety regulations.

However, initial expectations of industry progress simply were not realized. So in 2012, Congress extended the moratorium for 3 more years as part of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012. The end of that learning period is set to expire on September 30, 2015.

H.R. 2262, the bill in front of us, would extend the learning period to December 31, 2025, a decade-long moratorium on FAA's ability to even start proposing a safety framework.

This is very dangerous. This unprecedented regulation-free period for a decade for the commercial and human spaceflight industry puts no pressure on the industry to establish industry consensus standards, standards that could potentially be used as self-regulation measures for the industry.

In addition to providing the industry with 10 years of no safety regulations, H.R. 2262 negatively affects the rights of individuals on important safety matters by requiring spaceflight passengers to waive liability against launch providers and other parties.

What that means is that spaceflight participants have to waive their rights to sue the launch provider and related parties for claims, even if there is negligence involved.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 2262 puts policy in place that favors industry over policy that ensures balanced consideration for those people the industry will serve. That is a position that I and all of my Democratic colleagues on the committee oppose.

Another area of concern pertains to space resource utilization, such as asteroid mining.

Mr. Chair, there is merit to positioning ourselves to answer questions associated with space mining, the property rights that accrue from such activities, and the harmonization with our treaty obligations.

However, establishing prescriptive policies, as H.R. 2262 would do, is simply premature.

To preclude the proverbial placement of the cart before the horse, it would be prudent to establish an interagency review to help identify appropriate roles and responsibilities and a proposed organizational structure for the Federal Government's oversight and licensing of commercial space resource exploration and utilization.

And it would also be prudent, Mr. Chair, to hold hearings on these issues and on this legislation, as well as to have a subcommittee markup, what we sometimes refer to as regular order. H.R. 2262 skips these steps.

Proponents of the space resources utilization provisions in H.R. 2262 argue that the range of issues has been adequately vetted and reviewed by the executive branch.

□ 1030

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that while several individuals in the executive branch have offered technical drafting comments in response to queries about the bill, no Federal agency has taken a position on the bill.

Indeed, the administration says: "While the administration strongly supports the bill's efforts to facilitate innovative new space activities by U.S. companies, such as the commercial exploration and utilization of space resources to meet national needs, the administration is concerned about the ability of U.S. companies to move forward with these initiatives absent additional authority to ensure continuing supervision of these initiatives by the

U.S. Government as required by the Outer Space Treaty.''

In addition to these concerns, we have received a number of letters from legal scholars, consumer interest groups, and attorneys who have raised concerns or are opposed to H.R. 2262 as written. I am submitting for the RECORD letters from Professor Joanne Gabrynowicz, Director of the National Center for Remote Sensing, Air and Space Law; the American Association for Justice; the Center for Justice & Democracy; Consumer Watchdog; the National Consumers League; the Network for Environmental and Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ; Protect All Children's Environment; and Public Citizen.

520 DEER CREEK DRIVE,
Oxford, MS, May 12, 2015.

Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: At the request of Congressional Staff I am submitting this letter as a citizen expert for your consideration. I was requested to review H.R. 1508 and provide a comment. I am currently Professor Emerita at the University of Mississippi School of Law where I taught United States National Space Law, International Space Law, and Remote Sensing Law from 2001 to 2013. Prior to that I taught similar courses in the Space Studies Department at the University of North Dakota Odegard School of Aerospace Sciences from 1987 to 2001. I was the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Space Law from 2001–2013. My complete curriculum vitae is attached for your reference.

1. Outer Space Treaty Art. II prohibition of national appropriation by ''any other means''.

This comment addresses the most important issue raised by the Bill on its face. The Bill provides, ''[a]ny asteroid resources obtained in outer space are the property of the entity that obtained such resources, which shall be entitled to all property rights thereto, consistent with applicable provisions of Federal law.'' The Bill defines a ''space resource'' as a ''natural resource of any kind found in situ in outer space.'' It further defines an ''asteroid resource'' as ''found on or within an asteroid.'' The bill is addressing unextracted resources.

The United States is a State-Party to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. It prohibits ''national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.'' The Bill attempts to grant U.S. jurisdiction over ''any asteroid resource'' in situ in order to authorize and require the ''President . . . to facilitate the commercial exploration and utilization of space resources to meet national needs''. Making unextracted, in situ ''asteroid resources'' subject to U.S. Federal law and requiring the President ''to meet national needs'' is a form of national appropriation by ''other means''.

2. The Bill does not provide for any specific licensing regime.

Unlicensed U.S. commercial space activities are unprecedented in United States space law. All commercial space activities to date require appropriate licensing by an authorized agency. Specific statutes delegate licensing authority to specific agencies. For example, the Commercial Space Launch Act authorizes the FAA to license commercial launch activities. The 1992 Land Remote Sensing Policy Act authorizes the Department of Commerce to license commercial remote sensing systems. Licensing is how the U.S. meets its obligations to authorize and continually supervise the space activities of non-government entities under the Outer Space Treaty.

In particular, it is important to note that the license requirement imposed on the licensee that it maintain 'operational control,' as the term is defined in Section 960.3, is an implementation of U.S. obligations under the United Nations Outer Space Treaty of 1967. That treaty provides that the U.S. Government, as a State party, will be held strictly liable for any U.S. private or governmental entity's actions in outer-space. Consequently, NOAA requires that licensees under this part to maintain ultimate control of their systems, in order to minimize the risk of such liability and assure that the national security concerns, foreign policy and international obligations of the United States are protected.

The lack of a specific licensing regime also fails to meet the State Department's concern raised in a letter to Bigelow Aerospace from the FAA: the lack of a national regulatory framework with respect to private sector activities on celestial bodies.

3. The Bill only provides for a report.

The Bill requires the President to submit a report to recommend which Federal agencies will be necessary to meet U.S. international obligations. This may be sufficient. It is worth noting that reports are not the equivalent of licensing regulations that go through the Administrative Procedure Act process. However, this is a Federalism question, not a space law question so I will only point out the issue and note it is worth questioning and seeking the view of a relevant expert.

Sincerely,

JOANNE IRENE GABRYNOWICZ,
Prof. Emerita.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR JUSTICE,
May 20, 2015.

Re Support the Edwards Amendment to the SPACE Act of 2015 (H.R. 2262)

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The American Association for Justice (AAJ) supports the Edwards substitute amendment which substitutes the text of S. 1297, a bipartisan Senate companion for the SPACE Act of 2015 the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or SPACE Act of 2015. The American Association for Justice (AAJ), formerly the Association of Trial Lawyers of America (ATLA) with members in United States, Canada and abroad, is the world's largest trial bar. It was established in 1946 to safeguard victims' rights, strengthen the civil justice system, promote injury prevention and foster public health and safety. AAJ is an advocate for a strong civil justice system in order to protect the health and wellbeing of all Americans.

Commercial space travel is an emerging industry that will allow for members of the general public to visit space for recreational or business purposes and AAJ recognizes the challenges of trying to give a new industry the flexibility to grow and innovate. However, Section 8 of the SPACE Act of 2015 requires passengers on commercial spacecraft to waive any right to damages for personal injury, property damage or death resulting from commercial space travel. While it may be acceptable for businesses with equal footing and negotiating power to execute cross waivers limiting their responsibility to each other, this waiver language should not extend to passengers. This provision is unfair and harmful to individuals. As a result, AAJ is supporting the Edwards substitute amendment, which does not contain the harmful cross waiver provision.

The SPACE Act of 2015 as introduced contains a provision which would provide the commercial space industry total immunity. This provision will be eliminated by the Manager's Amendment to the bill. We applaud Chairman Smith for protecting the American public. As the commercial space travel industry grows, safety should be put first and foremost. Industry interests should not be valued over that of the passengers.

Sincerely,

LINDA LIPSEN,
C.E.O.

MAY 20, 2015.

Re Opposition to H.R. 2262 the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or SPACE Act.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned organizations are writing to express opposition to HR. 2262, the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or SPACE Act. While some of our organizations may have concerns about various parts of this legislation, this letter addresses two sections in particular: Sections 7 and 8.

The sweeping immunity proposed by these provisions is alarming. The commercial space industry's safety record has been shoddy with normal rules in place. The last thing Congress should be doing is passing legislation that removes this industry's financial incentive to conduct safe commercial space operations. And it is particularly troubling that this legislation was passed out of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology without a single hearing held.

Section 7 of the bill states: ''Any action or tort arising from a licensed launch or reentry shall be the sole jurisdiction of the Federal courts and shall be decided under federal law.'' Given that no federal tort law exists in such cases, this provision will immunize the private space industry for any harm it causes. It wipes out any tort remedy for death, injuries or property damage suffered as a result of a negligent or reckless launch or reentry. And space passengers are not the only individuals covered by this language. Anyone, from innocent bystanders watching a rocket launch, to people who happen to be at the wrong place at the wrong time, suffering any harm, whether that be losing a house, limb, or life, will be left without recourse. Imagine the vast radioactive carnage that could result from an exploding nuclear rocket, which the industry is discussing for future rocket propulsion.

Section 8 of the SPACE Act requires both companies and passengers on commercial space flights to cross-waive liability claims. It is one thing for companies with equal bargaining power to establish liability agreements between them. However, it is unfair to force passengers into such agreements. This provision does not protect passengers—it strips away their rights.

Supporters of the bill say immunity is needed to spur innovation and save jobs. This is nonsense. If the civil justice system

were harming the industry in some way, this would already be evident. But according to the most recent Space Foundation report, ''The global space economy grew to $314.17 billion in commercial revenue and government budgets in 2013, reflecting growth of 4 percent from the 2012 total of $302.22 billion. Commercial activity—space products and services and commercial infrastructure—drove much of this increase. From 2008 through 2013, the total has grown by 27 percent.''

This industry should be subject to the same civil justice system that applies to every other dangerous industry in America. If a private space company is grossly negligent and harms people, it should be accountable for the harm it causes. For these reasons, we strongly oppose H.R. 2262 the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or SPACE Act.

Very sincerely,

Alliance for Justice; Center for Justice & Democracy; Consumer Watchdog; National Consumers League; Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ; Protect All Children's Environment; Public Citizen.

Ms. EDWARDS. In closing, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2262 is an unbalanced bill that simply doesn't adequately protect the public's interest, whether in matters pertaining to the safety of the general public or in matters pertaining to the safety of the future consumers and customers of the industry, and incorporates prescriptive provisions on space resource utilization that are indeed premature.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my fellow Members to oppose H.R. 2262, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill that comes before us today took some time in drafting. In over four hearings in a bipartisan manner, this committee reached out to the minority in October of last year and gave them a draft of the bill. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the minority party did not come back for 5 months. But we want to make clear that everybody understood the bill.

We also want to make clear that people didn't make misstatements because, in this bill, the section provides FAA's ability to regulate commercial human spaceflight in order to protect the uninvolved public, national security, public health and safety, safety of property, and foreign policy. It also preserves FAA's ability to regulate spaceflight participant and crew safety as a result of an accident or unplanned event.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SMITH, the man who has led this committee in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding, and our thanks go to Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY for introducing such an important piece of legislation. In fact, we have made him an honorary member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. Chairman, space commercialization, this bill, is the future of space. This bill will encourage the private sector to build rockets, to take risks, and to shoot for the heavens. H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015, or SPACE Act, facilitates a progrowth environment for the developing commercial space sector. It creates more stable regulatory conditions and improves safety, which, in turn, attracts private investment.

Members of Congress should know that earlier this week the administration officially stated—and this is the most important thing in my view that the administration said, and it was, unfortunately, omitted from the statement awhile ago that the ranking member quoted. Here is what the administration said:

It does not oppose House passage of this bill.

The SPACE Act secures American leadership in space and fosters the development of advanced space technologies. The SPACE Act preserves the Federal Aviation Administration's ability to regulate commercial human spaceflight in order to protect national security and public health and safety. The act preserves FAA's ability to regulate spaceflight participation and crew safety in the event of an accident.

The bill calls for a progress report on the knowledge the industry and FAA have gained about the operation and licensing of commercial human spaceflight. This allows the commercial space industry to develop standards and coordinate with the FAA so the industry can grow in a stable regulatory environment without the threat of arbitrary regulations that would adversely impact their ability to innovate.

Mr. Chairman, international law places liability for damages that result from space accidents on the launching nation. All spacefaring nations require some form of third-party liability insurance for launching entities.

The current U.S. risk-sharing structure expires in 2016. This act extends indemnification to the year 2025 and requires an update on how the FAA calculates the maximum probable loss associated with launches. Indemnification has never been utilized and is subject to future appropriations. This provision will prevent U.S. space companies from going overseas where other nations have more favorable liability protection.

The SPACE Act also closes a statutory loophole that negates an experimental permit once a launch license is issued for the same vehicle design. This fosters greater innovation and allows an experimental permit holder to continue testing while a license holder conducts operations. Current law only allows for two categories of individuals carried within a spacecraft: crew and spaceflight participants. Now that NASA is allowing other astronauts access to the International Space Station, a new category is necessary to outline the roles, responsibilities, and protections for astronauts on a commercial human spaceflight launch.

This bill also closes a loophole that carved out an exception for spaceflight participants from indemnification coverage. By including these individuals in the indemnification provision, spaceflight participants who may participate in a launch as a result of a contest or for other reasons are not burdened with financial exposure above the limits. This bill also ensures that Federal courts review lawsuits that result from accidents since the Federal Government is ultimately the responsible party, not the States.

Current law requires that all parties involved in a launch waive claims against each other. This bill adds spaceflight participants to the cross-waiver requirement to ensure consistency and reinforce the informed consent requirements.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. All space community stakeholders have expressed support for this bill. They include Blue Origin, Virgin Galactic, Mojave Air and Space Port, SpaceX, the National Space Society, and the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, which represents more than 50 commercial space companies across the United States. The bill also includes many bipartisan provisions recently considered by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

The bill is the product of over 3 years of work, numerous committee hearings, and input from industry, education groups, and grassroots citizen advocacy groups. Virtually every stakeholder group, again, has supported this bill.

H.R. 2262 will keep America at the forefront of aerospace technology, promote American jobs, reduce red tape, promote safety, and inspire the next generation of explorers. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and once again thank the majority leader for introducing it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would note, before yielding to the ranking member, that it should be no surprise that the entire commercial space industry is supporting the majority bill because it is incredibly generous to the industry without due consideration to the safety of the public and to spaceflight passengers who also might travel on their vehicle. So it is not a surprise.

I think all of us here want to see the support of the commercial space industry. We want a regulatory environment that respects their innovation but also protects United States taxpayers' interest. As I have said, taxpayers have, to the tune of hundreds of millions of

dollars, our skin in the game. It is up to us to act responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015.

This bill amends the Commercial Space Launch Act, which is one of the seminal achievements on this committee. That act opened the doors to establishment on the commercial space industry, which is poised to become a major part of the 21st century economy.

I agree that both our committee and the Congress as a whole need to address the Commercial Space Launch Act. We haven't comprehensively addressed these issues since 2004. I also want to be clear that I am a strong supporter of the commercial space industry. I think Members on both sides of the aisle want this industry to succeed because this industry's success is good for our Nation. However, the issues being dealt with in this bill are not straightforward. They are complex and require thoughtful consideration.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology hasn't given these issues thoughtful consideration. We have not held any hearings so far this Congress to examine the issues being debated today. We also haven't had a subcommittee markup to try to work through some of the underlying issues in the legislation. That is really very unfortunate, because we could be considering a bipartisan piece of legislation today if the majority had simply laid the proper groundwork for moving complex legislation. Instead, we have rushed this bill to the floor to meet some arbitrary timetable established by somebody, perhaps the Republican leadership.

So what does this bill do? In every possible measure, H.R. 2262 gives maximum preference to the priorities of the commercial space launch industry—at the expense of the safety of the general public and the safety of the future customers of this very industry, and it does so at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to provide the commercial space launch industry with another decade—decade—of regulation-free operations with respect to protecting the safety of spaceflight passengers. There won't be any passengers when they find out that they have no protection.

Some will state that the industry does not yet have enough experience to establish these regulations. That is rubbish. Both the United States and Russia have been launching humans into space for more than five decades. There has been literally hundreds of space launches on numerous different types of spacecraft during this time. The FAA has had more than enough data to rely on to set commonsense regulations on spaceflight passenger safety.

In addition, this bill also provides a lengthy 9-year extension of commercial space launch indemnification provisions. Congress has extended these provisions many times since they were originally crafted in 1988. Since 1988, the liability exposure of the U.S. Government under this regime has grown each and every year. What began as an approximately $1 billion backstop for the industry has now grown to more than $2.5 billion, and this will continue to grow for 9 more years under this bill. I think this is something that deserves a little more attention. Generally, as an industry matures, you would think their reliance on the U.S. Government for subsidies would decrease rather than increase.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill takes steps into the uncharted waters involving space property rights. I am not against asteroid mining or space resource utilization. Those activities will come in time. However, I am for getting any legislation that addresses these areas right.

We are not at all close to resolving the many unanswered questions and issues concerning space resource utilization and property rights. At the single hearing the majority held on this topic last Congress, several of the invited witnesses expressed their views that there were many unsettled issues with the majority's draft legislation. Moving this legislation without really ever addressing these issues is, I believe, negligent on the part of the Congress.

Some on the other side of the aisle may point to the fact that the administration's Statement of Administration Policy did not include a veto threat against this bill. But I would note that the administration's statement also had serious concerns about sections of the bill and notably did not endorse the bill.

With respect to the asteroid mining provisions, the statement noted: ''the administration is concerned about the ability of U.S. companies to move forward with these initiatives absent additional authority to ensure continuing supervision of these initiatives by the U.S. Government as required by the Outer Space Treaty.''

Mr. Chairman, Ms. EDWARDS will be offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute that I will speak on one more time later. It may not have everything that industry desires, it may not reflect all of our priorities for commercial space launch policy, but it is a clear route to getting a balanced, bipartisan, bicameral commercial space launch bill enacted into law, because ultimately that is what we are trying to do is get a bicameral agreement.

□ 1045

We can argue over differences, or we can just join together to pass bipartisan, bicameral commercial space legislation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2262 in its present form and instead take a bipartisan approach to enacting commercial space launch legislation.

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

Before I yield, I do want it noted, 1969, what all America felt when they watched America make a step on the Moon, on an American rocket and American ingenuity. Unfortunately, today, we pay Russia for an astronaut from America to ride on their rockets. Some may be content with that, but, Mr. Chairman, I am not. That is why this bill today allows us to have some change and growth to make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to thank the sponsor of this bill, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, for his great work. This is very important.

I also want to thank our great chairman, LAMAR SMITH, who has had an unprecedented week in the House of Representatives of passing bills of innovation, advancing science. Congratulations to him as well.

The space industry represents hundreds of billions of dollars in economic investment and thousands of jobs across the United States, but it is not just large companies.

Cain Tubular—a small, multigenerational, family-owned business in my district—is doing the innovative work necessary for safe, weld-free condensing coils for the next generation of rocket engines.

Scot Forge is another business in my district, working under an amazing employee ownership model, that is forging the heavy metal parts and casings for multiple launch systems throughout the supply chain.

The space industry is an engine of economic growth throughout the country, and our opportunity to do this right is vitally necessary to maintain American competitiveness as other nations begin to catch up.

That is why I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015. The SPACE Act facilitates a progrowth environment for the commercial space sector. It fosters a safety framework that will protect the American public, while encouraging the development of new space technologies. This will ensure America's exceptional role is maintained as the most innovative Nation in the world.

This legislation also extends the current risk-sharing structure set to expire next year and requires an update on how the FAA calculates maximum probable loss associated with potential spaceflight accidents. This ensures that U.S. space companies won't be forced to go overseas to compete.

The SPACE Act also establishes a legal framework for government property rights of resources obtained from

asteroids, giving U.S. companies the legal assurance they need to invest in and develop in situ space resource exploration and utilization technologies. The successful exploration and use of in situ asteroid resources is an important step in humanity's development and is in the national interest of the United States.

The SPACE Act helps develop the commercial space industry, ensures commercial space lawsuits are treated fairly, and allows the commercial space industry to grow like never before.

For these reasons, I strongly recommend my colleagues support commercial space with a vote for the SPACE Act of 2015.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maryland has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 17 minutes remaining.

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

I just want to, for the RECORD, because I think it is important for the American people that we don't mix apples and oranges, the Bush administration actually canceled the program that would have enabled us to make sure that we have American rocket vehicles going to the space station.

In the interim period, those requests have been severely underfunded, so I think it is important for us to put into perspective what is happening in the space industry.

Now, I—as somebody who long ago worked in the industry, worked at NASA—understand the importance of investing in science and research and funding the activities of NASA and supporting the industry. I also understand that we have put—this Congress, in fact—has placed burdens both on the industry and on the agency to perform without putting the money to do that.

I would note that this SPACE Act doesn't have any money that goes with it. In fact, on the appropriations side, as I stated earlier, $230 million has actually been cut from the President's request.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), my colleague and the ranking member.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to respond to the statement that we have to rely on Russia.

We are relying on Russia because we won't pay for it in this country, but we are willing to allow a private commercial spaceship to fly at the expense of the government and at the risk of every person who would hire a trip. We are paying them to take supplies to a space station because we refuse to fund space station flight for human flight from this country.

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

Today, we pay Russia $70 million for one astronaut to go to the International Space Station. As commercial space begins to grow, we watched others get into the market—SpaceX—so they could do it for much less. That is what this bill talks about, allowing the commercial space others to join in.

I don't think all the answers come from Washington. I think government should be limited, but we should not limit our ability to grow. Why should we complain if we can use private sector money to even increase our capabilities to go higher into space?

Mr. Chairman, the next person I am going to yield to knows a great deal about this. He represents aerospace corridor. He comes from a family that is renowned in the development of space in America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), the son of Mr. Pete Knight, who still holds the record for the fastest man on Earth in an X–15.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the majority leader for bringing this forward. This is a vital piece of legislation.

The majority leader brings up a subject that is always very important to me. It happened on December 17, 1903. It happened in a little bicycle shop in Dayton, Ohio. Two innovators took their invention across part of the country out to a little place in North Carolina in Kitty Hawk, and they flew a man-powered controllable aircraft for the first time.

Now, why is that important? It is because the government had thrown a $50,000 grant to get this done, and they couldn't get it done, but two innovators could get it done by nothing other than the brains that they had, the energy, and their two hands.

America needs to ensure that it will continue to be the leader in the space industry. Business and innovation want stability, and this bill does just that, by extending the FAA learning period and duration of indemnification to 10 years.

When I speak to fifth graders—and I think we all do at least a couple times a year; I try to speak to at least 50 schools a year—but when I talk to the fifth graders, I ask them how long it takes to fly from LA to Tokyo. There is always a 2-hour or a 20-hour or anything like that.

I tell them it takes about 10½ hours. I said: But in your lifetime, it is going to take about an hour and a half.

They said: Well, that is great. That is great. I would love to be in an airplane for just an hour and a half or a spacecraft when, today, we have to do 10½ hours.

Well, do you know what, that will happen if we let it happen. Right now, it is happening. Innovation is flourishing. These things are happening. We are doing jousting programs that is dispersing the supersonic wave which means, at some point, we will be able to fly over the continent at more than Mach 1.

That means we will be able to fly home to California in an hour and a half. Now, I know all of us Californians would love to do that instead of the 5½ hours it takes today, just like it took in 1970.

This bill allows the FAA to gather sufficient data to ensure the regulations will help foster growth in the industry. I support this bill.

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

We have been listening to this discussion, and I think, when the other side reclaims their time, it would be really helpful to explain why it is that, if this is so important and that it is so urgent, why it is that the majority has cut $230 million from commercial crew. I will wait to hear the answer, as I am sure the American people are waiting.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

I thank the managers of this bill, including the majority leader.

I just want to say that I come from Space City. Houston, Texas, has as its motto—its defining moment besides railroads—is Space City. I served 12 years on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and I had a strong commitment and continue to have a strong commitment to human space exploration—in particular, the research that is garnered out of that mighty effort.

I have traveled to most of the NASA centers across the Nation, and I have seen outstanding researchers. There is no reason for any of us, Democrats or Republicans, to oppose the idea of space exploration and, in this instance, commercial space exploration.

What I will say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to my good friend, the majority leader, let us walk step-by-step together.

Certainly, I am concerned as someone who offered and wrote legislation to promote more safety on the International Space Station—proudly so—legislation that was ultimately passed and I believe has made the space station more enduring, to be able to suggest that this bill limits to a certain extent the safety requirements that I believe would make this industry a better industry, to say also that we are highlighting or offering the commercial space industry over the investment in NASA, which I have great concern, as we look forward to the implementation of the Orion and the opportunities for further space exploration.

I would want to make sure that this legislation does not undermine our work with NASA and, frankly, that the safety elements that are so important, not only to the civilian population—because I have commercial space entities in Texas just a few hundred miles away from Houston, Texas, but I also have the NASA Johnson Space Center—and I would want to know whether or not there is a conflict between the safety

requirements that we have to implement and the safety requirements and security requirements in commercial space exploration.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The other thing that I would offer to suggest, as this bill moves to the Senate, is the investments that are made, the profits that may ultimately be made by commercial space exploration, it would be appropriate to use those moneys to invest in R&D and the Federal Government for it to continue its very important, unrestrained research that has been so mighty to helping so many different people under NASA.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, but I would ask the question: Can we not provide a safety matrix for commercial space exploration as we have done in the public sector?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago, we passed a NASA authorization bill that returns NASA to its core mission, human space flight.

The bill before us, H.R. 2262, builds on that good work. We have many American businesses employing thousands of American workers right now. These businesses are pursuing their own space missions, both orbital and suborbital.

Some of these entrepreneurs have plans to reach below low Earth orbit, such as taking the first steps toward missions to mine asteroids for precious metals. This landmark legislation will do more to secure America as the home of commercial space exploration than any other legislation that Congress has considered. These endeavors are a great complement to Federal investments in civil and military space initiatives.

Let's face it, in any field, no American entrepreneur is going to invest billions of dollars of their own money where there is regulatory uncertainty. The SPACE Act of 2015 creates a regulatory framework and provides certainty for these privately financed endeavors to take the next steps.

□ 1100

This legislation will bolster thousands of high-tech American jobs, building a stronger economy, advancing technological leadership, and strengthening our Nation's industrial base.

I want to recognize the hard work of our colleagues—Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, BILL POSEY, DANA ROHRABACHER, and JIM BRIDENSTINE. These folks have worked hard for several years on key commercial space provisions that have been incorporated into this bill. Their efforts will create an environment for these private sector companies to flourish.

I would also like to thank our chairman, LAMAR SMITH, and Space Subcommittee chair STEVEN PALAZZO for their leadership in moving this legislation through the committee and in bringing it to the House floor.

America has always prospered because we have not stood in the way of visionaries. Rather, we have found a way to enable them to take a chance and succeed on their own.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. BABIN. A vote for this bill is a vote to ignite the flame of commercial space and propel the American entrepreneurial spirit beyond our world and into the final frontier of space. Passing this bill tells the world that America is the home for commercial space.

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

I just want to be really, really clear with the American people because I think sometimes we talk about the commercial space industry as though it exists on its own. In fact, it exists because the Federal Government and Federal taxpayers have been incredibly generous for this innovative, creative, and growing industry. It is because, as taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, we support the industry.

$3 billion alone in inflation-adjusted dollars goes as a backstop for indemnification, which is in case there is an accident or whatever—a $3 billion backstop by the Federal taxpayer. Billions of dollars have gone into the development as the industry has grown. Indeed, some projections say that 9 of every 10 dollars that have gone into the development have actually come from the American taxpayer. Hundreds of millions of dollars support the infrastructure, the launch facilities that are maintained for the industry and—who knows?—countless dollars from State tax credits on down the line.

It would be really inaccurate to say that any of us—Republicans or Democrats or any American taxpayer—does not support the commercial space industry. We want it to be safe. We want to make sure that liability is taken care of. We want to make sure that, in fact, the skin in the game of the taxpayers is met with responsible public policy. To correct the record, it is $243 million that the Republican majority has actually cut from Commercial Crew.

Again, I would say, if you support the industry, then please explain why it is that you have also supported a cut to the very thing that would continue to grow the industry.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STEWART). The gentleman from California has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Maryland has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, let me note that the commercial space industry has not cost us taxpayers' money. The commercial space industry has generated billions and billions of dollars worth of income to honest citizens who then pay their taxes—who wouldn't have jobs otherwise—not to mention, of course, the billions of dollars the commercial space industry has saved us simply by doing a more efficient job at launching satellites and at supplying the space station than could be done by the public sector—by NASA and other government employees.

H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, builds on the House Science, Space, and Technology's bipartisan tradition of promoting economic growth in America. Today, we are talking about that economic growth in terms of an emerging, new, entrepreneurial industry that is tremendously beneficial to the bottom line of America—the billions of dollars that it is creating with a new, innovative approach to an industry that goes into space in order to accomplish its missions. The SPACE Act of 2015 specifically continues the streamlined regulatory regime that Congress put in place for commercial human spaceflight just a decade ago in the Commercial Space Launch Amendments Act of 2004.

I am proud to have been the one to have authored that legislation, legislation which passed in Congress with bipartisan support. I would hope that bipartisan support continues because, in 2004, it was Bart Gordon of Tennessee and Nick Lampson of Texas—both Democrats—who made it possible for us to get this legislation passed as well as Silvestre Reyes from Texas. Of course, there are a lot of Texans here today involved in this debate because there are a lot of people in Texas who are hired and who have great jobs because of what we did then.

When we talk about and when we hear that we have cut $243 million, no, no. We were willing to keep that in the budget. Republicans would have been willing if we had found other areas that had been less important. But the reason these things happen is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle cannot seem to prioritize. We prioritize this.

Mr. Chairman, we prioritize launching new industries, creating new jobs, saving billions of dollars in money that would be spent otherwise, because the commercial space industry, like SpaceX and other champions of space entrepreneurship, has done a great deal of benefit to the United States of America.

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

I just want to be very, very clear. I was not originally much of a supporter

before I knew anything about the industry. I didn't know about the industry. Indeed, it was through the bipartisan work on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee that I got to know the industry and to value the role that the commercial space industry plays.

I, actually, don't have a quibble with the American taxpayers in their providing the kind of support in the development work and in resources that are available through NASA to support the industry. I, actually, think it is a good thing for us to do. But I don't want to hide the fact that, given that and that kind of responsibility, it is also our responsibility to provide an important safety framework for the industry to proceed, especially as we go into the future, imagining that we will have many other players.

I would also say that I am concerned about what we do around liability—how we create both a safety regulatory regime but also place liability where it belongs. Although, in the manager's amendment, the majority does try to deal with the question of Federal court jurisdiction, what we don't deal with is this idea of cross-waivers. That is, if you are a passenger—you could be a researcher, not anyone who is particularly wealthy—and if something happens, then you have waived all of your liability even in a case where there would be negligence involved. This, I think, ought to raise great concerns.

The reality is that, at the end of the day, if there is any kind of catastrophic accident, the American taxpayers will, of course, bear the responsibility as we always have for those accidents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My friend on the other side makes a good point in that a lot of people may not know about spaceflight or commercial spaceflight, and they may not know about this bill. That is why this is a great opportunity to explain, and that is why the majority on this side gave the bill to the minority last October. Unfortunately, it was 5 months before anything came back.

There is one point that was brought up—indemnification. That has been extended 9 times in the last 25 years, and it has never been used. The one thing that needs to be noted is that we are in competition with the rest of the world. We are more stringent in this than is any other country with their space. If we plan on being the leader, we need to have the legislation move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this morning, during debate, there have been a number of letters—a litany of letters—by various organizations offered for the RECORD, so I thought it would be appropriate, in the interest of intellectual honesty, actually, to enter a couple of records myself.

Let me read from one of them here:

On May 13, 2015, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology conducted a markup of four critical space-related bills. Among the bills considered was H.R. 1508, the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015. During the markup—I will leave the Member's name out—submitted a letter for the record from Joanne Gabrynowicz, a former professor of space law at the University of Mississippi. After reviewing the letter, we, the undersigned, feel it is important to clarify some errors in Ms. Gabrynowicz' interpretation of H.R. 1508 and to highlight some constructive elements of the bill. There is a duplicate bill in the Senate cosponsored by Senators PATTY MURRAY and MARCO RUBIO. Our comments apply to both.

The basic claims made in the letter rest on two issues: an allegation that the bill violates article II of the Outer Space Treaty and an allegation that the U.S. Government has no licensing regime in place for commercial space activities envisioned by the bill.

Both statements are based on a misreading of the intent and words of the bill.

They go on with another four or five pages to clarify what was completely misleading there. This letter is signed by Henry R. Hertzfeld, Co-Chair of the American Branch, International Law Association, Research Professor of Space Policy and International Affairs, Elliott School of International Affairs and Adjunct Professor of Law, The George Washington University; by Matthew Schaefer, Law Alumni Professor of Law, Director—Space, Cyber and Telecommunications Law Program, University of Nebraska College of Law, Co-Chair, American Branch of International Law Association—Space Law Committee; by James C. Bennett, Consultant, Fort Collins, Colorado, Space Fellow, Economic Policy Centre, London; and by Mark J. Sundahl, Professor and Associate Dean for Administration, Cleveland State University, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law.

MAY 15, 2015.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, CHAIRMAN SMITH, RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN PALAZZO, AND RANKING MEMBER EDWARDS: On May 13, 2015, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology conducted a markup of four critical space-related bills. Among the bills considered was H.R. 1508, the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015. During the markup Ranking Member Johnson submitted a letter for the record from Joanne Gabrynowicz, a former professor of space law at the University of Mississippi. After reviewing the letter we, the undersigned, feel it is important to clarify some errors in Ms. Gabrynowicz's interpretation of H.R. 1508 and highlight some constructive elements of H.R. 1508. There is a duplicate bill in the Senate, S. 976, co-sponsored by Senators Patty Murray and Marco Rubio. Our comments, below, apply to both H.R. 1508 and S. 976.

The basic claims made in the letter commenting on H.R. 1508 and, by extension, S. 976 rest on two issues:

1. An allegation that the bill violates Article II of the Outer Space Treaty (OST), and

2. An allegation that the U.S. Government has no licensing regime in place for commercial space activities envisioned by the bill.

Both statements are based on a misreading of the intent and words of the bill.

1. With regard to the allegation that the bill violate the OST by enabling national appropriation:

The bill does not grant U.S. jurisdiction to an asteroid or any asteroid resource. It does grant U.S. jurisdiction to companies that fall under U.S. jurisdiction as specifically defined in §51301 with the intent of adjudicating claims of ''harmful interference'' between those companies if such allegations are made in the future. Protecting entities from ''harmful interference'' is consistent with, and indeed furthers, the purposes of the OST, that requires ''due regard'' be given to other's space activities and requires advance consultations if a proposed activity ''would cause potentially harmful interference.''

The letter states that the bill is addressing ''unextracted resources.'' In fact, there are several steps: identifying the resources, extracting resources, and then using/delivering them. The words of the bill are ''resources obtained'', leaving the unknown technical details to be specified in the future when they can be better defined and a process can be developed for regulatory actions as needed. In any event, ''obtained'' is inconsistent with ''unextracted.''

The use of the word ''in situ'' in defining space resources simply means resources in place in outer space; but any such resource within or on an asteroid would need to be ''obtained'' in order to confer a property right. The use of the word ''in situ'' in merely defining a space resource in the bill is not equivalent to claiming sovereignty or control over celestial bodies or portions of space. Further, there is clear Congressional direction in the bill that the President is only to encourage space resources exploration and utilization, including lowering barriers to such activity, ''consistent with'' and ''in accordance with'' US international obligations—which precludes Ms. Grabynowicz' interpretation of the impact of the term ''in situ.''

The bill does not, in any manner, claim sovereignty over a celestial body or portions of outer space; it only provides for rights for private entities to use the resources on a celestial body (specifically asteroids) just as States have in the past. Article I of the Outer Space Treaty states that ''the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be free for exploration and use by all States''. This Article has been interpreted as allowing for the extraction of natural resources.

Examples: return of Moon rocks and soil by U.S. and Russia (Soviet Union); return of asteroid materials by Japan. Each government has declared that these are their property and has enforced that action:

United States Government has treated the theft of moon rocks as a criminal offense

Russia has in the past put moon rocks up for a public auction

Japan has put its asteroid materials in a Japanese museum A customary international law of the right to claim ownership over extracted natural resources has emerged due to the collections of moon rocks by the United States and the subsequent gifting of these rocks to foreign nationals without any objections from any states.

In the ''One Lucite Ball'' case, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Miami Division, upheld the right of Honduras to assert ownership over a moon rock (unpublished Case No. 01–0116–CIV–JORDAN). The court discussed two sales of lunar rock samples involving private parties (one involving a slide of lunar dust sold at Sotheby's auction and the second involving the lunar sample and plaque given by the U.S. to Nicaragua that was purchased by a private buyer from the middle east).

The NASA proposed Asteroid Recovery Mission involves similar technologies and the current proposal is to move a boulder from an asteroid to a lunar orbit. Some of these activities may be done in partnership with private entities in the United States.

These activities, ranging from scientific missions to commercial sales have never been judged to be in violation of Article II of the OST.

If governments and private companies are ever going to ''use'' space for benefits to all humankind, the extraction of resources from celestial bodies will have to be allowed, and this foreseeable future is provided for in the space treaties. There is no prohibition on private entities or profit-making entities performing these services either for themselves or for their governments.

However, government(s) are responsible for the continuing supervision of non-government activities in outer space (Art. VI of the OST), and the United States Government has the most complete and comprehensive set of regulations for space in the world.

There already exist regulatory requirements for commercial companies that want to get to space and to use space. The particular U.S. regulatory mechanisms vary with each application but include launch payload reviews, spectrum/communications approvals, and, when appropriate, national security and export control approvals.

Since there are a variety of related new proposed activities in outer space (e.g. on-orbit satellite servicing) proposing a specific licensing requirement for resource utilization alone in this bill would be inappropriate until all new activities are reviewed together.

The required report in the bill is the first step in developing new procedures and processes for activities in outer space that have not been done before by private entities.

The criticism that this bill is to meet ''national needs'' alone is incorrect. Those words are taken out of the context of §51302. That section focuses on what the Federal agencies should do to encourage private activities in space and refers to the economic incentives for those companies. The global needs and information obtained from the science and technology behind resource extraction and use may indeed benefit all humankind through knowledge, through the future global provision of currently scarce minerals, and through expanded space exploration. Further, private foreign companies subject to the jurisdiction of the United States—and thus facing exposure to non-interference claims—also can be beneficiaries of non-interference rights under the bill.

Last month the U.S. State Department made a statement at the United Nations Committee On the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) that clearly outlines a responsible path to balancing the requirements of our Treaty obligations with the needs of new commercial entities in space:

''My Government sees great promise in private investment in path-breaking new activities to advance our understanding of the solar system and to unlock new space applications that benefit all mankind. The history of space exploration—and innovation—teaches us that it is difficult, if not impossible, to foresee the technological innovations, and downstream applications, arising from efforts to push the envelope of exploration—and that the benefits of these innovations and applications are enjoyed across the Earth. As the United States goes about encouraging private investment—from all nations—in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, *and evolves its national mechanisms for authorizing and supervising non-governmental space activities*, we will continue to be guided by the four core, and widely accepted, treaties on space—the Outer Space Treaty, the Rescue and Return Agreement, and the Liability and Registration Conventions. Under the legal framework of these treaties, the use of space by nations, international organizations, and private entities has flourished. As a result, space technology and services contribute immeasurably to economic growth and improvements in the quality of life around the world.'' [*Emphasis added*]

The Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act is in complete compliance with all existing international obligations of the United States. The bill further insists that actions taken pursuant to the bill, both by the Executive Branch and U.S. commercial space resource utilization entities (to benefit from non-interference rights), be consistent with international obligations of the United States. The bill also compliments and furthers the position of the Executive Branch. As Ms. Gabrynowicz notes in her letter regarding the Presidential report requirement, ''This may be sufficient.'' Indeed, it is not only sufficient but the most pragmatic path forward for the U.S. Government to create a process, informed by industry and international concerns, that creates the legal framework necessary to meet our existing international obligations. Creating such a legal framework right now would be short-sighted and likely hamper or destroy our growing space resource industry. Placing a legal framework in this bill is not needed to meet any current United States international obligations. There are adequate interim means of meeting those obligations through existing authorities should new activities in outer space begin before constructing a new legal framework.

The U.S., between 1980 and the effective date of the Commercial Space Launch Act, October 1984, set precedents for OST-compliant control in the absence of explicit legislation or activity-specific regulation. Two suborbital launch vehicles were privately developed and tested in the U.S. during that time period, Space Services Inc.'s Percheron (1980) and Arc Technologies' (later Starstruck, Inc.'s) Dolphin (1983–84). The U.S. Government licensed both activities. In each case, the Government used existing regulatory requirements and mechanisms (FAA airspace control, FCC radio licenses, OMC export permits) to review the proposed activities and impose conditions such as liability insurance on the launch operators. Lessons learned from these licensing exercises were incorporated in the drafting of the Commercial Space Launch Act.

Therefore, there is U.S. precedent for control of space activities, adequate to satisfy OST requirements for supervision and control, even in the absence of specific statutory law or regulation describing the particulars of the activity in question. Using these interim mechanisms can serve to provide an experience base for crafting better legislation subsequently.

In summary, the bill is a necessary step to begin to address our obligations of continuing supervision for commercial space activities and to fulfill our commitments under the terms of the OST.

It is also important to note the many constructive things that H.R. 1508 and S. 976 accomplish:

1. Advance U.S. Technology and Leadership

a. H.R. 1508 and S. 976 provide a legal foundation that provides private U.S. companies to ability to raise funds, protect their investments, employ aerospace professionals, and develop cutting edge aerospace technologies.

b. Other nations, such as China and Russia, have stated an intent to recover resources from objects in space. H.R. 1508 and S. 976 give U.S. industry a legal foundation that provides a head start to compete with these nations.

2. Create Constructive Dialogue for International Frameworks for Commercial Space Resource Exploration and Utilization

a. As stated by the U.S. delegate to COPUOS, the U.S. will need to develop a framework that meets existing international obligations and creates an environment in which all nations can benefit from space resource exploration and utilization. H.R. 1508 and S. 976 allow the U.S. to lead and direct this international discussion.

A failure to pass H.R. 1508 and S. 976 will create uncertainty about the U.S. Government's position on space resource exploration and utilization. This uncertainty would be extremely detrimental to our developing space resource industry and it would provide encouragement for other nations to challenge our leadership in this area.

It is apparent that considerable effort has gone into drafting H.R. 1508 and S. 976. These bills create a valid legal foundation to begin the processes necessary to create informed oversight mechanisms, which are required by the treaties, and are in compliance with all existing U.S. international obligations.

Sincerely,

HENRY R. HERTZFELD,
Co-Chair of the American Branch, International Law Association, Research Professor of Space Policy and International Affairs, Elliott School of International Affairs and Adjunct Professor of Law, The George Washington University.

MATTHEW SCHAEFER,
Law Alumni Professor of Law, Director—Space, Cyber and Telecommunications Law Program, University of Nebraska College of Law, Co-Chair, American Branch of International Law Assoc.—Space Law Committee.

JAMES C. BENNETT, CONSULTANT,
Fort Collins, Colorado, Space Fellow, Economic Policy Centre, London.

MARK J. SUNDAHL,
Professor and Associate Dean for Administration, Cleveland State University, Cleveland—Marshall College of Law.

Mr. POSEY. There is a similar letter, and I will submit that also. It is by Dennis J. Burnett, District of Columbia Bar Association; J.D., University of Nebraska; LL.M., Georgetown University; Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Nebraska College of Law—U.S. Trade Law and Commercial Space Law; Vice Chairman, Advisory Board, Space, Cyber and Telecom Program, University of Nebraska College of Law; Secretary and Director, International Institute of Space Law.

MAY 16, 2015.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, CHAIRMAN SMITH, RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN PALAZZO, AND RANKING MEMBER EDWARDS: On May 13, 2015, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology conducted a mark-up of four critical space-related bills. Among the bills considered was H.R. 1508, the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015.

During the markup Ranking Member Eddie Bernice Johnson submitted a letter for the record from Joanne Gabrynowicz, Professor Emerita of space law at the University of Mississippi. After reviewing H.R. 1508 and Professor Gabrynowicz's letter, I would like to comment on several issues of international law related to the proposed legislation.

In particular, I will comment on the following issues: (1) whether recognition of property rights in asteroid resources would result in a ''national appropriation'' in violation of Article II of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies (the ''Outer Space Treaty''); and (2) whether the absence of the creation of a licensing regime by H.R. 1508 would result in a failure to authorize and supervise the activities of nationals of the United States in the exploration and use of outer space as is required by Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty.

Is the use of asteroid resources and acquisition of property rights in asteroid resources is not a violation of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty?

It should be clearly stated that there is no provision of the Outer Space Treaty that explicitly prohibits the acquisition of property rights in asteroid resources. To the contrary, the Outer Space Treaty explicitly recognize the right of ''exploration and use'' of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. A right of use is a well-recognized property right in both common law and civil law.

While it may be asserted that granting property rights in asteroid resources is a national appropriation, this assertion is inconsistent with state practice. For example, Moon rocks and soil returned to the Earth by U.S. and Russia (Soviet Union), and asteroid materials return to Earth by Japan have been treated as property of those governments. The United States has prosecuted theft of moon rocks and Russia has auctioned moon rocks. These actions have never been judged to be in violation of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty.

Does the absence of a licensing regime in H.R. 1508 result in a failure to authorize and supervise the activities of nationals of the United States in violation of Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty?

It is quite clear that Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty requires the United States to authorize and supervise the activities of its nationals in outer space. It also is clear that H.R. 1508 does not authorize any executive agency or any independent commission to regulate (i.e., authorize and supervise) the activities of U.S. nationals in outer space that are not already regulated.

It is my understanding that there are a variety of new proposed activities in outer space (e.g on-orbit satellite servicing, space tourism, moon habitation, solar satellites, etc.). It may be argued that these activities need appropriate authorization and supervision by the United States if conducted by nationals of the United States. At this time it appears that there is no agreement on basic issues of what authority is required, which agency, if any, should authorize and supervise, which agency should have which responsibility and what resources would be required to implement those responsibilities.

In lieu of imposing a solution when the problem is not fully understood, it is my understanding that the drafters of H.R. 1508 propose that the President prepare a report to Congress as the first step in developing new procedures and processes for activities in outer space for which there may be no existing agency authority to authorize and supervise. It appears that the drafters are attempting to create a valid legal foundation to begin the processes necessary to create appropriate mechanisms for any authorization and supervision that may be required by the Outer Space Treaty and other existing U.S. international obligations.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. BURNETT.

Mr. POSEY. I think that, clearly, they reflect that there has been some misleading information put forth in objecting to this bill, and I urge my colleagues to take that into consideration and to vote favorably for this badly needed historic and constructive legislation to make America's space program and commercial space industry much better.

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

Just for the record, I would note that the letters that have been submitted by the majority are interesting. I would note that one of the authors, in fact, is paid by one of the companies that is involved in this legislation, so we should take that into consideration.

I also want to point out that, with respect to indemnification, again, the United States in current—today's—dollars bears a responsibility for about $3 billion in indemnification should there be an accident.

Lastly, of course, it is really important for us to understand that these liability concerns are not small potatoes. In fact, the Judiciary Committee should have taken a look at this when it came to looking at Federal court jurisdiction. We should have had additional hearings on this when it comes to looking at the impact on international treaties. We have not had any hearings in that regard. I just think we ought to proceed more responsibly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015, or the SPACE Act.

Since 2004, when Congress last amended the Commercial Space Launch Act, commercial space companies have made significant contributions to space technology development and helped to strengthen American leadership in space. Congress must keep up with the changes in the industry, and the CSLA needs to be updated to ensure that the space sector can flourish in the years to come.

Currently, all major spacefaring nations require some form of third-party liability insurance for launching entities. The indemnification regime of the CSLA expires next year. The act would extend indemnification to 2025 in order to prevent U.S. launches from going overseas and taking high-tech American jobs with them.

In a letter praising the act's extension of the indemnification, Tom Stroup, president of the Satellite Industry Association, wisely stated that the act is ''an important step in maintaining U.S. innovation and leadership in satellite launch and one that promotes overall access to space.'' Several other groups, such as the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, have had similar comments praising the extension.

Moreover, this bill promotes stability and flexibility in the commercial space market through regulatory reform. By extending the learning period to 2025, the Federal Aviation Administration and industry will have more time to collect information and develop a safety framework for commercial spaceflight. This will ensure that the growing commercial space market will not be overburdened with uninformed regulations.

Space-based technology has become a vital part of our economy. Americans rely on it every day, from GPS to weather forecasting to land remote sensing, in everything we do.

The SPACE Act gives the private sector a chance to expand this growing portion of our economy by allowing commercial spaceflight companies to take passengers to and from space and by setting the groundwork for a comprehensive safety framework that will guide future spacefaring activities.

Now is not the time to turn our backs on the innovators and the entrepreneurs who have made this Nation great. If we care about American leadership in space and the American space economy, I urge you to support this important piece of legislation.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise here today because, as I said in my opening remarks, that I think that most of us on both sides of the aisle share the excitement about the commercial space industry and we do indeed want it to succeed.

We all work for the taxpayer; and the American taxpayer, as I have stated, has a vested interest in the commercial space industry because we have laid out hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars to support it.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate yesterday marked up a bipartisan compromise bill with very few changes to it. On the other hand, this bill, if it passes the House unchanged, is going to be dead in the water. But if we pass the substitute that we are considering later on, that I offer later today, we will have a great chance to do some real lawmaking. It will not have addressed all of the industry concerns. It will not have done anything to get in the way of the advance of commercial space.

So I urge my fellow Members to support a bipartisan process that began over in the Senate. Vote for the substitute amendment later on and say, you know, we can start fresh here, not with something that just disadvantages consumers and taxpayers. Let's try to be on the same page when it comes to the strong support that I think each side feels with respect to the commercial space industry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I have one question for everyone here: Do you believe America is exceptional?

Fifty-four years ago, President Kennedy spoke to a joint session of Congress in this very Chamber, and he set forth an astounding goal: to put an American on the Moon before the end of the decade.

Many doubted our ability to do that. But like America has done throughout our history, we proved them wrong. So on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong took one small step and changed the course of history.

You see, President Kennedy's vision is part of America's fundamental character. We are pioneers. We always move forward. We never back down from a challenge, and beating the odds is in our DNA.

This was the case for our very founding. We brought forth a new nation in pursuit of a more perfect union. With the winds of freedom at our back, we headed west to unchartered lands, relying on the same spirit of adventure that endures in the Central Valley of California to this day.

We watched as two bicycle repairmen flew above the sand and waves on a beach in North Carolina, not because of government grants or Washington connections, but because they had the audacity to make a dream a reality.

Today, dorm room startups and tech entrepreneurs are connecting our entire world, paving the way to tomorrow.

The world looks to America because we give them a reason to look to us. We show them a vision of the future, and we deliver. But we can't take our global leadership and innovation for granted. Today we pay Russia $70 million for one seat on their rocket.

Right now there is a new generation of pioneers. They want to embark on the next stage of space exploration, and we should not hold them back. The truth is Washington never comes up with the next big idea, but we can support those innovators who do and create the best environment possible for them to succeed.

Steve Jobs, one of America's great innovators, once said ''innovation distinguishes between a leader and a follower.'' That is true for people and for a country. Those words carry special meaning for everyone who ever dared to venture off the beaten path. It means something to the small-business owners working at their kitchen tables and the inventors tinkering in the dorm rooms and garages. It means something to every kid who ever dreamed of space and who still dreams of leading us in a journey to the stars.

So for all American pioneers, those who will lead our Nation through the 21st century, I again ask: Do you believe America is exceptional? Because I do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–17. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2262

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015'' or the ''SPACE Act of 2015''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH

Sec. 101. Consensus standards.
Sec. 102. International launch competitiveness.
Sec. 103. Launch license flexibility.
Sec. 104. Government astronauts.
Sec. 105. Indemnification for space flight participants.
Sec. 106. Federal jurisdiction.
Sec. 107. Cross-waivers.
Sec. 108. Orbital traffic management.
Sec. 109. State commercial launch facilities.
Sec. 110. Space support vehicles study.
Sec. 111. Streamline commercial space launch activities.
Sec. 112. Space Launch System update.

TITLE II—SPACE RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND UTILIZATION

Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 202. Title 51 amendment.

TITLE III—COMMERCIAL REMOTE SENSING

Sec. 301. Annual reporting.
Sec. 302. Statutory update report.

TITLE IV—OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE

Sec. 401. Renaming of Office of Space Commercialization.
Sec. 402. Functions of the Office of Space Commerce.

TITLE I—COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH

SEC. 101. CONSENSUS STANDARDS.

Section 50905(c) of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (8); and

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

''(3) INTERIM INDUSTRY VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS REPORT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, or its successor organization, shall provide a report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the progress of the commercial space transportation industry in developing voluntary consensus standards or any other construction that promotes best practices to improve the industry. Such report shall include, at a minimum—

''(A) any voluntary industry consensus standards or any other construction that have been accepted by the industry at large;

''(B) the identification of areas that have the potential to become voluntary industry consensus standards or another potential construction that are currently under consideration by the industry at large;

''(C) an assessment from the Secretary on the general progress of the industry in adopting voluntary consensus standards or any other construction;

''(D) lessons learned about voluntary industry consensus standards or any other construction, best practices, and commercial space launch operations;

''(E) any lessons learned associated with the development, potential application, and acceptance of voluntary industry consensus standards or any other construction, best practices, and commercial space launch operations; and

''(F) recommendations, findings, or observations from the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, or its successor organization, on the progress of the industry in developing industry consensus standards or any other construction.

This report, with the appropriate updates in the intervening periods, shall be transmitted to such committees no later than December 31, 2016, December 31, 2018, December 31, 2020, and December 31, 2022. Each report shall describe and assess the progress achieved as of 6 months prior to the specified transmittal date.

''(4) INTERIM REPORT ON KNOWLEDGE AND OPERATIONAL EXPERIENCE.—The Secretary shall provide a report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the of the Senate on the status of the knowledge and operational experience acquired by the industry while providing flight services for compensation or hire to support the development of a safety framework. Interim reports shall by transmitted to such committees no later than December 31, 2018, December 31, 2020, and December 31, 2022. Each report shall describe and assess the progress achieved as of 6 months prior to the specified transmittal date.

''(5) INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—No later than December 31, 2023, an independent, private systems engineering and technical assistance organization or standards development organization contracted by the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an assessment of the readiness of the commercial space industry and the Federal Government to transition to a safety framework that may include regulations. As part of the review, the contracted organization shall evaluate—

''(A) the progress of the commercial space industry in adopting industry voluntary standards or any other construction as reported by the Secretary in the interim assessments included in reports provided under paragraph (4); and

''(B) the knowledge and operational experience obtained by the commercial space industry while providing services for compensation or hire as reported by the Secretary in the interim knowledge and operational reports provided under paragraph (4).

''(6) LEARNING PERIOD.—Beginning on December 31, 2025, the Secretary may propose regulations under this subsection without regard to paragraph (2)(C) and (D). The development of any such regulations shall take into consideration the evolving standards of the commercial space flight industry as identified through the reports published under paragraphs (3) and (4).

''(7) COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to discuss potential approaches, potential performance standards, or any other topic related to this subsection with the commercial space industry including observations, findings, and recommendations from the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, or its successor organization, prior to the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking. Such discussions shall not be construed to permit the Secretary to promulgate industry regulations except as otherwise provided in this section.''.

SEC. 102. INTERNATIONAL LAUNCH COMPETITIVENESS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for updating the methodology used to calculate the maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, with a validated risk profile approach to provide reasonable maximum probable loss values associated with potential third party losses from commercially licensed launches. An appropriately updated methodology will help ensure that the Federal Government is not exposed to greater financial risks than intended and that launch companies are not required to purchase more insurance coverage than necessary.

(b) MAXIMUM PROBABLE LOSS PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan to update the methodology used to calculate maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, through the use of a validated risk profile approach. Such plan shall include, at a minimum—

(1) an evaluation of the reasonableness of the current single casualty estimate and, if needed, the steps the Secretary will take to update such estimate;

(2) an evaluation, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the heads of other relevant executive agencies, of the reasonableness of the dollar value of the insurance requirement required by the Secretary for launch providers to cover damage to Government property resulting from a commercially licensed space launch activity, and recommendations as to a reasonable calculation if, as determined by the Secretary, the current statutory threshold is insufficient;

(3) a schedule of when updates to the methodology and calculations for the totality of the Maximum Probable Loss will be implemented, and a detailed explanation of any changes to the current calculation; and

(4) consideration of the impact of the cost of its implementation on the licensing process, both in terms of the cost to industry of collecting and providing the requisite data and cost to the Government of analyzing the data.

(c) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 270 days after transmittal of the plan under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an assessment of—

(1) the conclusions and analysis provided by the Secretary of Transportation in the plan required under subsection (b);

(2) the implementation schedule proposed by the Secretary in such plan;

(3) the suitability of the plan for implementation; and

(4) any further actions needed to implement the plan or otherwise accomplish the purpose of this section.

(d) LAUNCH LIABILITY EXTENSION.—Section 50915(f) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2016'' and inserting ''December 31, 2025''.

SEC. 103. LAUNCH LICENSE FLEXIBILITY.

Section 50906 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''launched or reentered'' and inserting ''launched or reentered under that permit'';

(2) by amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

''(1) research and development to test design concepts, equipment, or operating techniques;'';

(3) in subsection (d)(3), by striking ''prior to obtaining a license'';

(4) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''suborbital rocket design'' and inserting ''suborbital rocket or rocket design''; and

(5) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(g) The Secretary may issue a permit under this section notwithstanding any license issued under this chapter. The issuance of a license under this chapter shall not invalidate a permit under this section.''.

SEC. 104. GOVERNMENT ASTRONAUTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (22) as paragraphs (5) through (23), respectively;

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

''(4) 'government astronaut' means an individual designated as such by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, pursuant requirements established by the Administrator, who—

''(A) is an employee of—

''(i) the United States Government, including the United States Armed Forces; or

''(ii) a foreign government that is a party to the Intergovernmental Agreement Among the Government of Canada, Governments of Member States of the European Space Agency, the Government of Japan, the Government of the Russian Federation, and the Government of the United States of America Concerning Cooperation on the Civil International Space Station, signed on January 29, 1998; and

''(B) is carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle in the course of his or her employment, which may include performance of activities directly relating to the launch, reentry, or other operation of the launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.'';

(3) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''government astronaut,'' after ''crew,'';

(4) in paragraph (7)(A), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''government astronaut,'' after ''(including crew training),'';

(5) in paragraph (14), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''government astronauts,'' after ''crew,'';

(6) in paragraph (15)(A), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting ''government astronaut,'' after ''(including crew training),'';

(7) by amending paragraph (18), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, to read as follows:

''(18) 'space flight participant' means an individual, who is not crew or a government astronaut, carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.''; and

(8) in paragraph (22)(E), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''.

(b) RESTRICTIONS ON LAUNCHES, OPERATIONS, AND REENTRIES; SINGLE LICENSE OR PERMIT.—Section 50904(d) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''.

(c) LICENSE APPLICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATIONS.—Section 50905 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''crews and space flight participants'' and inserting ''crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(D), by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''to crew or space flight participants'' each place it appears and inserting ''to crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''.

(d) MONITORING ACTIVITIES.—Section 50907(a) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''crew or space flight participant training'' and inserting ''crew, government astronaut, or space flight participant training''.

(e) ADDITIONAL SUSPENSIONS.—Section 50908(d)(1) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''to crew or space flight participants'' each place it appears and inserting ''to crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''.

SEC. 105. INDEMNIFICATION FOR SPACE FLIGHT PARTICIPANTS.

Chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 50914(a)(4), by adding at the end the following:

''(E) space flight participants.''; and

(2) in section 50915(a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''or a contractor'' and inserting ''a contractor''; and

(B) by striking ''but not against'' and inserting ''or''.

SEC. 106. FEDERAL JURISDICTION.

Section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) FEDERAL JURISDICTION.—Any action or tort arising from a licensed launch or reentry shall be the sole jurisdiction of the Federal courts and shall be decided under Federal law.''.

SEC. 107. CROSS-WAIVERS.

Section 50914(b)(1) of title 51, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: ''(1) A launch or reentry license issued or transferred under this chapter shall contain a provision requiring the licensee or transferee to make a reciprocal waiver of claims with its contractors, subcontractors, and customers, the contractors and subcontractors of the customers, and any space flight participants, involved in launch services or reentry services or participating in a flight under which each party to the waiver agrees to be responsible for property damage or loss it or they sustain, or for personal injury to, death of, or property damage or loss sustained by its own employees resulting from an activity carried out under the applicable license.''.

SEC. 108. ORBITAL TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, as none currently exists, there may be a need for a framework that addresses space traffic management of United States Government assets and United States private sector assets to minimize the proliferation of debris and decrease the congestion of the orbital environment.

(b) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall enter into an arrangement with an independent, private systems engineering and technical assistance organization to study frameworks for the management of space traffic and orbital activities. The study shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of current regulations, Government best practices, and industry standards that apply to space traffic management and orbital debris mitigation.

(2) An assessment of current statutory authority granted to the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and how those agencies utilize and coordinate those authorities.

(3) A review of all space traffic management and orbital debris requirements under treaties and other international agreements to which the United States is a signatory, and other nonbinding international arrangements in which the United States participates, and the manner in which the Federal Government complies with those requirements.

(4) An assessment of existing Federal Government assets used to conduct space traffic management and space situational awareness.

(5) An assessment of the risk associated with smallsats as well as any necessary Government coordination for their launch and utilization.

(6) An assessment of existing private sector information sharing activities associated with space situational awareness and space traffic management.

(7) Recommendations related to the framework for the protection of the health, safety, and welfare of the public and economic vitality of the space industry.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the report required in subsection (b).

(d) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORITIES.—Congress recognizes the vital and unique role played by the Department of Defense in protecting national security assets in space. Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend authorities granted to the Department of Defense to safeguard the national security.

SEC. 109. STATE COMMERCIAL LAUNCH FACILITIES.

It is the Sense of Congress that State involvement, development, ownership, and operation of launch facilities can help enable growth of the Nation's commercial suborbital and orbital space endeavors and support both commercial and Government space programs. It is further the sense of Congress that State launch facilities and the people and property within the affected launch areas of those State facilities are subject to risks if the commercial launch vehicle fails or experiences an anomaly. To ensure the success of the commercial launch industry and the safety of the people and property in the affected launch areas, it is the further sense of Congress that States and State launch facilities should seek to take proper measures to secure their investments and the safety of third parties from potential damages that could be suffered from commercial launch activities.

SEC. 110. SPACE SUPPORT VEHICLES STUDY.

Not less than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a report on the use of space support vehicle services in the commercial space industry. This report shall include—

(1) the extent to which launch providers rely on such services as part of their business models;

(2) the statutory, regulatory, and market barriers to the use of such services; and

(3) recommendations for legislative or regulatory action that may be needed to ensure reduced barriers to the use of such services if such use is a requirement of the industry.

SEC. 111. STREAMLINE COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH ACTIVITIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that eliminating duplicative requirements and approvals for commercial launch and reentry operations will promote and encourage the development of the commercial space sector.

(b) REAFFIRMATION OF POLICY.—Congress reaffirms that the Secretary of Transportation, in overseeing and coordinating commercial launch and reentry operations, should—

(1) promote commercial space launches and reentries by the private sector;

(2) facilitate Government, State, and private sector involvement in enhancing U.S. launch sites and facilities;

(3) protect public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(4) consult with the head of another executive agency, including the Secretary of Defense or the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as necessary to provide consistent application of licensing requirements under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation under section 50918 of title 51, United States Code, and subject to section 50905(b)(2)(C) of that title, shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate—

(A) to identify all requirements that are imposed to protect the public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle; and

(B) to evaluate the requirements identified in subparagraph (A) and, in coordination with the licensee or transferee and the heads of the relevant executive agencies—

(i) determine whether the satisfaction of a requirement of one agency could result in the satisfaction of a requirement of another agency; and

(ii) resolve any inconsistencies and remove any outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the Secretary of Transportation determines no outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government exist, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the commercial space sector, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A description of the process for the application for and approval of a permit or license under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code, for the commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle, including the identification of—

(i) any unique requirements for operating on a United States Government launch site, reentry site, or launch property; and

(ii) any inconsistent, outmoded, or duplicative requirements or approvals.

(B) A description of current efforts, if any, to coordinate and work across executive agencies to define interagency processes and procedures for sharing information, avoiding duplication of effort, and resolving common agency requirements.

(C) Recommendations for legislation that may further—

(i) streamline requirements in order to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve inconsistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints; and

(ii) consolidate or modify requirements across affected agencies into a single application set that satisfies the requirements identified in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) any applicable definitions set forth in section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, shall apply;

(B) the terms ''launch'', ''reenter'', and ''reentry'' include landing of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

(C) the terms ''United States Government launch site'' and ''United States Government reentry site'' include any necessary facility, at that location, that is commercially operated on United States Government property.

SEC. 112. SPACE LAUNCH SYSTEM UPDATE.

(a) CHAPTER 701.—

*(1) AMENDMENT.—The chapter heading of chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**SPACE SHUTTLE**'' and inserting ''**SPACE LAUNCH SYSTEM**''.*

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Space Shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(b) SECTION 70101.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 70101 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**space shuttle**'' and inserting ''**Space Launch System**''; and*

(B) by striking ''space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating section 70101 in the table of sections for chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code is amended by striking ''space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(c) SECTION 70102.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 70102 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**Space shuttle**'' and inserting ''**Space Launch System**'';*

(B) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''space shuttle'' both places it appears and inserting ''Space Launch System'';

(C) in subsection (a)(1)(A)(i), by inserting ''directly to cis-lunar space and the regions of space beyond low-Earth orbit'' after ''human presence'';

(D) in subsection (a)(1)(B), by striking ''a shuttle launch'' and inserting ''a launch of the Space Launch System'';

(E) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''a space shuttle mission'' and inserting ''a mission of the Space Launch System'';

(F) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''space shuttle'' each place it appears and inserting ''Space Launch System''; and

(ii) by striking ''from the shuttle'' and inserting ''from the Space Launch System'';

(G) in subsection (c), by striking ''space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''; and

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

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'Space Launch System' means the Space Launch System authorized under section 302 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating section 70102 in the table of sections for chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code is amended by striking ''Space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(d) SECTION 70103.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 70103 of title 51, United States Code, is amended—

*(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**space shuttle**'' and inserting ''**Space Launch System**''; and*

(B) by striking ''space shuttle'' each place it appears and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating section 70103 in the table of sections for chapter 701 of title 51, United States Code is amended by striking ''space shuttle'' and inserting ''Space Launch System''.

TITLE II—SPACE RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND UTILIZATION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015''.

SEC. 202. TITLE 51 AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle V of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 513—SPACE RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND UTILIZATION

''Sec.
''51301. Definitions.

''51302. Commercialization of space resource exploration and utilization.
''51303. Legal framework.

''§ 51301. Definitions

''In this chapter:

''(1) SPACE RESOURCE.—The term 'space resource' means a natural resource of any kind found in situ in outer space.

''(2) ASTEROID RESOURCE.—The term 'asteroid resource' means a space resource found on or within a single asteroid.

''(3) STATE.—The term 'State' means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

''(4) UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL SPACE RESOURCE UTILIZATION ENTITY.—The term 'United States commercial space resource utilization entity' means an entity providing space resource exploration or utilization services, the control of which is held by persons other than a Federal, State, local, or foreign government, and that is—

''(A) duly organized under the laws of a State;

''(B) subject to the subject matter and personal jurisdiction of the courts of the United States; or

''(C) a foreign entity that has voluntarily submitted to the subject matter and personal jurisdiction of the courts of the United States.

''§ 51302. Commercialization of space resource exploration and utilization

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through appropriate Federal agencies, shall—

''(1) facilitate the commercial exploration and utilization of space resources to meet national needs;

''(2) discourage government barriers to the development of economically viable, safe, and stable industries for the exploration and utilization of space resources in manners consistent with the existing international obligations of the United States; and

''(3) promote the right of United States commercial entities to explore outer space and utilize space resources, in accordance with the existing international obligations of the United States, free from harmful interference, and to transfer or sell such resources.

''(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall submit to Congress a report that contains recommendations for—

''(1) the allocation of responsibilities relating to the exploration and utilization of space resources among Federal agencies; and

''(2) any authorities necessary to meet the international obligations of the United States with respect to the exploration and utilization of space resources.

''§ 51303. Legal framework

''(a) PROPERTY RIGHTS.—Any asteroid resources obtained in outer space are the property of the entity that obtained such resources, which shall be entitled to all property rights thereto, consistent with applicable provisions of Federal law and existing international obligations.

''(b) SAFETY OF OPERATIONS.—A United States commercial space resource utilization entity shall avoid causing harmful interference in outer space.

''(c) CIVIL ACTION FOR RELIEF FROM HARMFUL INTERFERENCE.—A United States commercial space resource utilization entity may bring a civil action for appropriate legal or equitable relief, or both, under this chapter for any action by another entity subject to United States jurisdiction causing harmful interference to its operations with respect to an asteroid resource utilization activity in outer space.

''(d) RULE OF DECISION.—In a civil action brought pursuant to subsection (c) with respect to an asteroid resource utilization activity in outer space, a court shall enter judgment in favor of the plaintiff if the court finds—

''(1) the plaintiff—

''(A) acted in accordance with all existing international obligations of the United States; and

''(B) was first in time to conduct the activity; and

''(2) the activity is reasonable for the exploration and utilization of asteroid resources.

''(e) EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction over an action under this chapter without regard to the amount in controversy.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the items for subtitle V the following:

''513. Space resource exploration and utilization ..... 51301''.

TITLE III—COMMERCIAL REMOTE SENSING

SEC. 301. ANNUAL REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 601 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 60126. Annual reporting

''The Secretary shall provide a report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the SPACE Act of 2015 and annually thereafter on—

''(1) the Secretary's implementation of section 60121, including—

''(A) a list of all applications received in the previous calendar year;

''(B) a list of all applications approved;

''(C) a list of all applications denied;

''(D) a list of all applications that required additional information; and

''(E) a list of all applications whose disposition exceeded the 120 day deadline established in section 60121(c), the total days overdue for applications that exceeded such deadline, and an explanation for the delay;

''(2) all notifications and information provided to the Secretary pursuant to section 60122; and

''(3) all actions taken by the Secretary under the administrative authority granted by section 60123(a)(4), (5), and (6).''.

SEC. 302. STATUTORY UPDATE REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with other appropriate Federal agencies and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Advisory Committee on Commercial Remote Sensing, shall report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on statutory updates necessary to protect national security, protect privacy (which is not to be taken as altering any condition or standards for licensing), protect the United States industrial base, and reflect the current state of the art of remote sensing systems, instruments, or technologies.

TITLE IV—OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE

SEC. 401. RENAMING OF OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCIALIZATION.

(a) CHAPTER HEADING.—

*(1) AMENDMENT.—The chapter heading for chapter 507 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**COMMERCIALIZATION**'' and inserting ''**Commerce**''.*

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to chapter 507 in the table chapters for title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commercialization'' and inserting ''Commerce''.

(b) DEFINITION OF OFFICE.— Section 50701 of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commercialization'' and inserting ''Commerce''.

(c) RENAMING.—Section 50702(a) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commercialization'' and inserting ''Commerce''.

SEC. 402. FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE.

Section 50702(c) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commerce.'' and inserting ''Commerce, including to—

''(1) foster the conditions for the economic growth and technological advancement of the United States space commerce industry;

''(2) coordinate space commerce policy issues and actions within the Department of Commerce;

''(3) represent the Department of Commerce in the development of United States policies and in negotiations with foreign countries to promote United States space commerce;

''(4) promote the advancement of United States geospatial technologies related to space commerce, in cooperation with relevant interagency working groups; and

''(5) provide support to Federal Government organizations working on Space-Based Positioning Navigation, and Timing policy, including the National Coordination Office for Space-Based Position, Navigation, and Timing.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114–127. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 18, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(3)''.

Page 14, lines 18 and 19, strike ''and shall be decided under Federal law''.

Page 15, line 18, insert '', in consultation with the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Department of Defense,'' after ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration''.

Page 17, line 18, insert ''(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—'' before ''It is the Sense''.

Page 18, after line 8, insert the following:

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the potential inclusion of all government property, including State and municipal property, in the existing indemnification regime established under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code.

Page 23, line 19, insert ''in the table of chapters'' after ''chapter 701''.

Page 31, line 22, amend subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) a list of all applications denied and an explanation of why each application was denied, including any information relevant to the interagency adjudication process of a licensing request;

Page 32, line 10, after paragraph (3), insert the following:

Such report may include classified annexes as necessary to protect the disclosure of sensitive or classified information.

Page 32, after line 10, insert the following:

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 601 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 60125 the following new item:

''60126. Annual reporting.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment contains minor corrections to the underlying bill and is generally technical in nature. The amendment provides clarity to some of the reports in the bill on the learning period, orbital traffic management, commercial remote sensing, and the inclusion of classified annexes.

Additionally, this amendment ensures that Federal courts handling legal disputes will look to substantive State law to resolve claims that arise from a federally licensed launch.

Finally, this amendment includes a reporting requirement from the Government Accounting Office about the inclusion of State and municipal launch facilities in the indemnification regime.

This technical amendment will improve the clarity of multiple sections of the bill and ensure continued support for the growing commercial space industry. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

The amendment partially addresses the concerns that we have had with the Federal jurisdiction provision in H.R. 2262. Maintaining ''under Federal law'' would have resulted in eliminating the rights of individuals to bring almost any type of legal action against companies related to commercial spaceflight accidents due to the lack of any applicable Federal law.

I would also like to highlight another change in the manager's amendment that goes beyond a technical remedy or a simple clarification. The amendment adds a requirement for the Secretary of Commerce to provide an annual report on its review of applications for licenses for commercial remote sensing. The manager's amendment now makes accommodation for the inclusion of classified annexes as necessary.

Mr. Chair, while this is a necessary addition to protect the disclosure of sensitive or classified information, it is only necessary because this amendment adds the requirement for the Secretary of Commerce to provide information related to the interagency adjudication process of a commercial remote sensing licensing request.

I highlight these two changes because they demonstrate that the process of developing H.R. 2262 has, in fact, been rushed and not very well thought out. Had we taken the time to hold hearings and sort things out, we actually could have had an opportunity to consider these changes as part of the committee process.

That said, I support the chairman's amendment to make some needed improvements to the bill, though I firmly believe it still needs an awful lot more work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A House Report 114–127.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, lines 18 through 20, amend paragraph (1) to read as follows:

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''that will be launched or reentered'' and inserting ''or reusable launch vehicles that will be launched into a suborbital trajectory or reentered under that permit'';

Page 10, lines 1 and 2, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows:

(3) in subsection (d)(3)—

(A) by striking ''prior to obtaining a license''; and

(B) by inserting ''or vehicle'' after ''design of the rocket'';

Page 10, line 5, insert '', or for a particular reusable launch vehicle or reusable launch vehicle design,'' after ''rocket design''.

Page 10, line 5, strike ''and''.

Page 10, line 6, redesignate paragraph (5) as paragraph (6).

Page 10, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) in subsection (e)(2), by inserting ''or launch vehicle'' after ''the suborbital rocket'';

Page 10, line 11, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 10, after line 11, insert the following new paragraph:

(7) in subsection (h), by inserting ''or reusable launch vehicle'' after ''suborbital rocket''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to support and facilitate innovation in cutting-edge American enterprises. My amendment will expand the eligibility for experimental permits for reusable rockets to include reusable launch vehicles.

Experimental permits currently have three uses: the research and development of new test designs, concepts, equipment, or operating techniques; to show compliance with requirements as part of the process for obtaining a license; or to train crews before they receive a license for launch or reentry. However, the FAA currently does not have the ability to grant experimental permits for launch vehicles.

□ 1130

Under current law, they are restricted to granting permits for reusable suborbital rockets. This can require industry and the Federal Government to go to extraordinary lengths to find ways to conduct tests. In some cases, there is no alternative for testing.

Expanding access to these permits will help innovators develop new and important technologies right here in America. These permits will create new opportunities for American businesses and will help harness the tremendous potential of our space exploration industry.

I want to thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH, Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and their staffs for their assistance with this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I don't oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment ensures that the commercial space industry is not pigeonholed into specific vehicle designs. By allowing different types of vehicles to be included in the launch license flexibility regime, we will allow the industry to grow, innovate, and continue to improve safety designs.

This amendment is reasonable and consistent with the spirit of the license flexibility provisions of the underlying bill. I support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 106. INDEPENDENT STUDY OF INDEMNIFICATION FOR SPACE FLIGHT PARTICIPANTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall provide to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report detailing the results of a study of the issues associated with space flight participants and potential third party claims that could arise from a potential accident of a commercial licensed launch vehicle or reentry vehicle that is carrying space flight participants. The study shall—

(1) identify the issues associated with space flight participants and third party liability;

(2) identify options for addressing the issues;

(3) identify any potential unintended consequences and issues associated with each of the options; and

(4) identify any potential costs to the Federal Government for each of the options.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment calls for a study analyzing our approach to third-party liability with regard to spaceflight participants. The study will identify issues, options to address those issues, consequences of those options, and the potential cost to the Federal Government for each option.

I would note that the idea for this study was originally put forward by Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, someone whom I deeply admire and listen to when she makes her points. We heard her make her points during discussion with our committee, and I felt it was a very good idea, and I am moving forward with it today.

The underlying bill includes a legislative fix for third-party liability and spaceflight participants. That is what our bill does. However, a study would see if there is even a better way or if we have covered all of our bases with the fix that is in this bill.

Right now, a spaceflight participant is financially at risk if the vehicle they fly on has some kind of an incident. It doesn't matter if you are a billionaire or someone who has scrimped for a long time to get one of these spaceflights, maybe a contest winner or a science teacher who wants to share his experience with students or a scientist accompanying their experiment.

Right now, these folks aren't just paying the fare; they are potentially risking everything that their family owns because they may be liable if something goes wrong.

As I say, we have a fix about that in the current bill, but this study would see if there is a better way, along with some other things we can do, to make that fix better. There is no reason at this point to believe that this approach is any worse than the other approaches, but let's keep our minds open.

Right now, we have a hole in the bridge, and this bill puts a patch on that hole. Let's see if there is a study to see if there is a better way to fix the bridge. In the meantime, we have got something in place in this bill—a study—to see if we can do a better job.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to note for the record, though I am not in opposition, I think the study is a good idea. Ideally, I would think that Congress would choose to study the thing before it actually passes the law, but that is not where we are today. I think it is a good idea to proceed forward with this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentlewoman for giving us the idea for this study in the first place, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank my colleague from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for yielding me time.

I simply want to say that this amendment requires an independent report about the inclusion of spaceflight participants in the indemnification regime. This is an important topic, and gathering additional information on this policy would be helpful for future legislation.

Requiring this study is reasonable and consistent with the spirit and the policies of the underlying bill, so I support it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 19, insert ''nonprofit,'' after ''independent,''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank my colleague from San Antonio, Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and also follow Texan EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, the ranking member, for their work on this bill and for consideration of my amendment.

My amendment amends the section of the bill concerning the orbital traffic management study. The bill, as written, has the Administrator of NASA enter into an agreement with an independent private systems engineering and technical assistance organization to study frameworks for the management of space traffic and orbital activities.

My amendment would include nonprofits, so that nonprofit independent research organizations can contribute to this critical work. In addition to allowing for private contractors to be part of this discussion, my amendment would also allow for nonprofits to do the same.

In Texas, we have become a hub for space research and exploration. Some of the private industries or private businesses doing work in this business include Lockheed and Boeing, but there are also wonderful nonprofits like the Southwest Research Institute, in our hometown of San Antonio, and the Universities Space Research Association, which is based in Houston. My amendment would allow these nonprofits to also be part of this work.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires the orbital traffic management study in the underlying bill to be conducted by an independent, nonprofit, private systems engineering and technical assistance organization.

Requiring the study to be done by a nonprofit is reasonable and consistent with the spirit of the study requirement in the underlying bill.

I appreciate the gentleman's amendment; I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, line 19, strike ''and''.

Page 22, line 23, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 22, after line 23, insert the following:

(iii) facilitate outreach to minority- and women-owned businesses on business opportunities in the commercial space industry.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the manager of the bill, the chairman of the full committee, and the ranking member of the full committee for the hard work they do on issues that are important to our Nation and their service to this country. Let me also thank the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for her astute leadership on many of these issues.

Let me as well indicate my commitment to space exploration. As I said earlier, I hope that we can work on a number of issues, but I hope we can work together on what I think is an important economic engine for the Nation, first starting with John F. Kennedy's challenge to all of us and developing, through President Johnson, the NASA centers across America, and the enormous research that has been done by NASA over the years.

I remember debating this question of funding for NASA really in the 1990s and 2000s, talking about the research of heart disease, cancers, HIV/AIDS.

I say that to say that, as we move into commercial space exploration, we certainly want to make sure that opportunities are given to all of America. This is commercial, yes; but the provisions of commercial space work are enhanced by the government in the resources that we have.

My amendment is to provide that recognition and to conduct outreach to the small-, minority-, and women-owned business community. It requires that the provisions of the bill that address future legislation should include work on how to effectively conduct outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities.

As we have all worked hard to encourage small-business owners to produce jobs, this is a great entrepreneurial effort, and therefore, I support the initiatives that would increase an outreach to small businesses and create more jobs.

There are approximately 6 million minority-owned businesses in the United States—representing significant aspects of our economy—and many, many more women and small businesses and other minority-owned businesses.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their efforts to advance our nation's space exploration horizon.

I am a firm believer that commercial and government unmanned and manned space exploration complement each other.

The Internet was initially a federal government research and development project that transitioned to a commercial and public resource that has in less than 2 decades fueled economic opportunities for thousands of U.S. companies large and small.

The transition to commercial space exploration will need the collaboration and support of the Federal government to be sure that it is inclusive, safe and profitable.

The commercial space industry must yield opportunities for all U.S. businesses, which is why I am offering Jackson Lee Amendment Number 5.

The Jackson Lee Amendment requires that the provisions of the bill that address future legislation also lay the foundation for the commercial space industry to include work on how to effectively conduct outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their current and future potential.

That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs.

These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing.

Outreach is key to developing healthy and diverse small businesses in all sectors of the economy.

There are approximately 6 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy.

According to the most recent available Census data, minority owned businesses employ nearly 6 million Americans and generate $1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% between 2002 and 2007, and currently total close to 8 million.

My home city of Houston, Texas, the home of the Johnson Space Center, is also home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

Just as the national highway system and rural electrification has led to opportunities for communities to participate in the national economy, so will federal investment in our nation's infrastructure and capacity in space exploration pave the way for a new era of economic growth and opportunity.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the Jackson Lee Amendments.

I would ask that my amendment be accepted, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I don't oppose it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires the launch license streamlining report to include recommendations on how the FAA should facilitate outreach to minority- and women-owned businesses about opportunities in the commercial space industry. I don't object to the gentlewoman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. May I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that women-owned businesses have increased 20 percent between 2002 and 2007. They currently total close to $8 million. According to the most recent available Census data, minority-owned businesses employ nearly 6 million Americans and generate $1 trillion in economic output.

My home city of Houston, the home of the Johnson Space Center, is also home to more than 60,000 women-owned businesses, 60,000 African American-owned businesses, and multitudes of minority-owned businesses.

I would offer to say that, if we can include this amendment, that outreach to these entities under this commercial space exploration legislation will be adding more jobs to the American economy.

I ask for the support of the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, line 19, strike ''and''.

Page 22, line 23, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 22, after line 23, insert the following:

(iii) facilitate the participation of the Emerging Researchers National Conference in STEM, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation Program (LAMP), Historically Black Colleges and Universities Undergraduate Program (HBCU-UP) of the National Science Foundation, Emerging Researchers National Conference in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, the University of Florida's Institute for African-American Mentoring in Computing Sciences, the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, the National Indian Education Association, and other institutions, organizations, or associations as the Secretary of Transportation determines to be useful in investigating the feasibility of developing programs for fellowships, work-study, and employment opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1145

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, my appreciation to all of those who are on the floor today.

My amendment speaks to discussions that this Congress has had over many, many years on the question of science, technology, engineering, and math and, in particular, working with more vulnerable communities.

My amendment would facilitate the participation of HBCUs, Hispanic Serving Institutions, National Indian Institutions, in fellowships, work-study, and employment opportunities in the emerging commercial space industry.

I remember some years ago that we developed a fellowship for graduate and Ph.D. candidates at Texas Southern University to interact at NASA Johnson. It was a very effective effort, and certainly, well-received by those who were able to participate.

That is, again, investing in universities and colleges that interact, again, with vulnerable populations or do outreach to minority students and expose them, again, at graduate level and undergraduate level to science, technology, engineering, and math.

For over two decades the Nation has known that the economy will be driven, not by the hammer and anvil, but by the ingenuity and hard work of our Nation. Therefore, the imagination that fuels invention is so valuable to the well-being of our Nation.

My amendment would follow in that spirit by increasing awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities and, I would hope, would create partnerships between the commercial space industry and our HBCUs, our Native American Institutions, Hispanic Serving, and allow work-study and employment opportunities in this growing and emerging commercial space industry.

I believe it would be an excellent partnership and would be an excellent contribution to the economic engine of this Nation. I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have Power to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts . . ."

Too often the interpretation of these words are only about patents and inventions, but it extends to our nation's federal investment in areas of science that open up new avenues for economic and technological advancements.

I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their work to advance the scientific horizon of our nation.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 6, made in order by the Rules Committee, would facilitate the participation of HBCU, Hispanic Serving Institutions; National Indian institutions, in fellowships, work-study and employment opportunities in the emerging commercial space industry.

For over 2 decades the nation has known that the economy will be driven by the hammer and the anvil, but by the ingenuity and hard work of our nation's people.

The imagination that fuels invention—is so valuable to the wellbeing of our nation that the founders placed it as a key responsibility of the legislative branch.

My amendment would follow in this spirit by increasing awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities in the commercial space industry.

One of the most enduring difficulties faced by underrepresented populations in the STEM field is a lack of awareness and understanding of the connection between STEM and employment opportunities.

In 2012, a survey found that despite the nation's growing demand for more workers in science, technology, engineering, and math grows, the skills gap among the largest ethnic and racial minorities groups remain stubbornly wide.

Blacks and Latinos account for only 7 percent, of the STEM workforce despite representing 28 percent of the U.S. population.

All of our nation's citizens must be able to tap into, what has been described in the Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program Report as, "The Hidden STEM Economy."

This report stated that in 2011, 26 million jobs or 20 percent of all occupations required knowledge in 1 or more STEM areas.

Half of all STEM jobs are available to workers without a 4 year degree, and these jobs pay on average $53,000 a year, which is 10 percent higher than jobs with similar education requirements.

Houston, Texas, the home of the Johnson Space Center, has the second highest concentration of engineers (22.4 for every 1000 workers according to the Greater Houston Partnership).

Houston has 59,070 engineers, the second largest population in the nation.

This Jackson Lee Amendment will open up an avenue to allow underrepresented groups in the STEM economy a means of learning about the commercial space industry through the development of fellowships, work study, and employment opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the Jackson Lee Amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I don't oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires the launch license streamlining report in the underlying bill to include recommendations on how the FAA might facilitate the participation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and National Indian Institutions in the emerging commercial space industry. I don't object to this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman for his support for both of my amendments. And I, again, would indicate that every opportunity we have to grow the economy and expand to those populations not fully included, this Congress should take an opportunity to do.

I see, in this amendment, opportunity for jobs, for partnerships, and certainly opportunities for growing the engineers and other talented persons whom we need for, in essence, a new America with a new economy, technologically-based.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 114–127.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 51, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 3. LIABILITY INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is in the public interest to update the methodology used to calculate the maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, with a validated risk profile approach in order to consistently compute valid and reasonable maximum probable loss values.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the commercial space sector and insurance providers, shall—

(1) evaluate and, if necessary, develop a plan to update the methodology used to calculate the maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code;

(2) in evaluating or developing a plan under paragraph (1)—

(A) ensure that the Federal Government is not exposed to greater costs than intended and that launch companies are not required to purchase more insurance coverage than necessary; and

(B) consider the impact of the cost to both the industry and the Government of implementing an updated methodology; and

(3) submit the evaluation, and any plan, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. LAUNCH LIABILITY EXTENSION.

Section 50915(f) is amended by striking "December 31, 2016" and inserting "December 31, 2020".

SEC. 5. COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH LICENSING AND EXPERIMENTAL PERMITS.

Section 50906 is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''launched or reentered'' and inserting ''launched or reentered under that permit'';

(2) by amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

''(1) research and development to test design concepts, equipment, or operating techniques;'';

(3) in subsection (d)(3) by striking ''prior to obtaining a license'';

(4) in subsection (e)(1) by striking ''suborbital rocket design'' and inserting ''suborbital rocket or suborbital rocket design''; and

(5) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(g) The Secretary may issue a permit under this section notwithstanding any license issued under this chapter. The issuance of a license under this chapter may not invalidate a permit issued under this section.''.

SEC. 6. LICENSING REPORT.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on approaches for streamlining the licensing and permitting process of launch vehicles, reentry vehicles, or components of launch or reentry vehicles, to enable non-launch flight operations related to space transportation. The report shall include approaches to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve inconsistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints.

SEC. 7. SPACE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, and the commercial space sector, shall—

(1) assess current, and proposed near-term, commercial non-governmental activities conducted in space;

(2) identify appropriate oversight authorities for the activities described in paragraph (1);

(3) recommend an oversight approach that would prioritize safety, utilize existing authorities, minimize burdens, promote the U.S. commercial space sector, and meet the United States' obligations under international treaties; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the assessment and recommended approaches.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall apply to the activities of the ISS national laboratory as described in section 504 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 18354), including any research or development projects utilizing the ISS national laboratory.

SEC. 8. SPACE SURVEILLANCE AND SITUATIONAL AWARENESS DATA.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation in concurrence with the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, study the feasibility of processing and releasing safety-related space situational awareness data and information to any entity consistent with national security interests and public safety obligations of the United States; and

(2) submit a report on the feasibility study to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SAFETY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SAFETY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 50905(c)(3) is amended by striking ''Beginning on October 1, 2015'' and inserting ''Beginning on October 1, 2020''.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Section 50905(c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary to discuss potential regulatory approaches with the commercial space sector, including observations, findings, and recommendations from the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, prior to the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking.''.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representative a report specifying key industry metrics that might indicate readiness of the commercial space sector and the Department of Transportation to transition to a regulatory approach under section 50905(c)(3) of title 51, United States Code, that considers space flight participant, government astronaut, and crew safety.

(d) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Beginning on December 31, 2016, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation and coordination with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report that identifies the activities, described in subsections (c) and (d) of section 50905 of title 51, United States Code, most appropriate for regulatory action, if any, and a proposed transition plan for such regulations.

SEC. 10. INDUSTRY VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS.

(a) INDUSTRY VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—Section 50905(c), as amended in section 9 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) The Secretary shall continue to work with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, to facilitate the development of voluntary consensus standards based on recommended best practices to improve the safety of crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants as the commercial space sector continues to mature.''.

(b) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Beginning on December 31, 2016, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation and coordination with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report detailing progress on the development of industry voluntary consensus standards under section 50905(c)(6) of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 11. GOVERNMENT ASTRONAUTS.

(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—Section 50901(15) is amended by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew'' each place it appears.

(b) DEFINITION OF GOVERNMENT ASTRONAUT.—Section 50902 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (22) as paragraphs (7) through (25), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) '*government astronaut*' means an individual who—

''(A) is either—

''(i) an employee of the United States Government, including the uniformed services, engaged in the performance of a Federal function under authority of law or an Executive act; or

''(ii) an international partner astronaut;

''(B) is identified by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

''(C) is carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

''(D) may perform or may not perform activities directly relating to the launch, reentry, or other operation of the launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.

''(5) 'international partner astronaut' means an individual designated under Article 11 of the International Space Station Intergovernmental Agreement, by a partner to that agreement other than the United States, as qualified to serve as an International Space Station crew member.

''(6) 'International Space Station Intergovernmental Agreement' means the Agreement Concerning Cooperation on the International Space Station, signed at Washington January 29, 1998 (TIAS 12927).''.

(c) DEFINITION OF LAUNCH.—Paragraph (7) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking ''and any payload, crew, or space flight participant'' and inserting ''and any payload or human being''.

(d) DEFINITION OF LAUNCH SERVICES.—Paragraph (9) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking ''payload, crew (including crew training), or space flight participant'' and inserting ''payload, crew (including crew training), government astronaut, or space flight participant''.

(e) DEFINITION OF REENTER AND REENTRY.—Paragraph (16) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking ''and its payload, crew, or space flight participants, if any,'' and inserting ''and its payload or human beings, if any,''.

(f) DEFINITION OF REENTRY SERVICES.—Paragraph (17) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking ''payload, crew (including crew training), or space flight participant, if any,'' and inserting ''payload, crew (including crew training), government astronaut, or space flight participant, if any,''.

(g) DEFINITION OF SPACE FLIGHT PARTICIPANT.—Paragraph (20) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended to read as follows:

''(20) 'space flight participant' means an individual, who is not crew or a government astronaut, carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.''.

(h) DEFINITION OF THIRD PARTY.—Paragraph (24)(E) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by inserting '', government astronauts,'' after ''crew''.

(i) RESTRICTIONS ON LAUNCHES, OPERATIONS, AND REENTRIES; SINGLE LICENSE OR PERMIT.—Section 50904(d) is amended by striking ''activities involving crew or space flight participants'' and inserting ''activities involving crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''.

(j) LICENSE APPLICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATIONS.—Section 50905 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''crews and space flight participants'' and inserting ''crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(D), by striking ''crew or space flight participants'' and inserting ''crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''crew and space flight participants'' and inserting ''crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''to crew or space flight participants'' each place it appears and inserting ''to crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants''.

(k) MONITORING ACTIVITIES.—Section 50907(a) is amended by striking ''crew or space flight participant training'' and inserting ''crew, government astronaut, or space flight participant training''.

(l) ADDITIONAL SUSPENSIONS.—Section 50908(d)(1) is amended by striking ''to crew or space flight participants'' each place it appears and inserting ''to any human being''.

(m) ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTY.—Section 50917(b)(1)(D)(i) is amended by striking ''crew or space flight participant training site,'' and inserting ''crew, government astronaut, or space flight participant training site,''.

(n) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, LAWS, AND INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS; NONAPPLICATION.—Section 50919(g) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) NONAPPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This chapter does not apply to—

''(A) a launch, reentry, operation of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle, operation of a launch site or reentry site, or other space activity the Government carries out for the Government; or

''(B) planning or policies related to the launch, reentry, operation, or activity under subparagraph (A).

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The following activities are not space activities the Government carries out for the Government under paragraph (1):

''(A) A government astronaut being carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle under this chapter.

''(B) A government astronaut performing activities directly relating to the launch, reentry, or other operation of the launch vehicle or reentry vehicle under this chapter.''.

(o) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed to modify or affect any law relating to astronauts.

SEC. 12. STREAMLINE COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH ACTIVITIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that eliminating duplicative requirements and approvals for commercial launch and reentry operations will promote and encourage the development of the commercial space sector.

(b) REAFFIRMATION OF POLICY.—Congress reaffirms that the Secretary of Transportation, in overseeing and coordinating commercial launch and reentry operations, should—

(1) promote commercial space launches and reentries by the private sector;

(2) facilitate Government, State, and private sector involvement in enhancing U.S. launch sites and facilities;

(3) protect public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(4) consult with the head of another executive agency, including the Secretary of Defense or the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as necessary to provide consistent application of licensing requirements under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation under section 50918 of title 51, United States Code, and subject to section 50905(b)(2)(C) of that title, shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate—

(A) to identify all requirements that are imposed to protect the public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle; and

(B) to evaluate the requirements identified in subparagraph (A) and, in coordination with the licensee or transferee and the heads of the relevant executive agencies—

(i) determine whether the satisfaction of a requirement of one agency could result in the satisfaction of a requirement of another agency; and

(ii) resolve any inconsistencies and remove any outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the Secretary of Transportation determines no outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government exist, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the commercial space sector, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A description of the process for the application for and approval of a permit or license under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code, for the commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle, including the identification of—

(i) any unique requirements for operating on a United States Government launch site, reentry site, or launch property; and

(ii) any inconsistent, outmoded, or duplicative requirements or approvals.

(B) A description of current efforts, if any, to coordinate and work across executive agencies to define interagency processes and procedures for sharing information, avoiding duplication of effort, and resolving common agency requirements.

(C) Recommendations for legislation that may further—

(i) streamline requirements in order to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve inconsistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints; and

(ii) consolidate or modify requirements across affected agencies into a single application set that satisfies the requirements identified in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) any applicable definitions set forth in section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, shall apply;

(B) the terms ''launch'', ''reenter'', and ''reentry'' include landing of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

(C) the terms ''United States Government launch site'' and ''United States Government reentry site'' include any necessary facility, at that location, that is commercially operated on United States Government property.

SEC. 13. OPERATION AND UTILIZATION OF THE ISS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) maximum utilization of partnerships, scientific research, commercial applications, and exploration test bed capabilities of the ISS is essential to ensuring the greatest return on investments made by the United States and its international partners in the development, assembly, and operations of that unique facility; and

(2) every effort should be made to ensure that decisions regarding the service life of the ISS are based on the station's projected capability to continue providing effective and productive research and exploration test bed capabilities.

(b) CONTINUATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.—

(1) MAINTAINING USE THROUGH AT LEAST 2024.—Section 70907 is amended to read as follows:

''§ 70907. Maintaining use through at least 2024

''(a) POLICY.—The Administrator shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the International Space Station remains a viable and productive facility capable of potential United States utilization through at least September 30, 2024.

''(b) NASA ACTIONS.—In furtherance of the policy under subsection (a), the Administrator shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the International Space Station, as a designated national laboratory—

''(1) remains viable as an element of overall exploration and partnership strategies and approaches;

''(2) is considered for use by all NASA mission directorates, as appropriate, for technically appropriate scientific data gathering or technology risk reduction demonstrations; and

''(3) remains an effective, functional vehicle providing research and test bed capabilities for the United States through at least September 30, 2024.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 709 is amended by amending the item relating to section 70907 to read as follows:

''70907. Maintaining use through at least 2024.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this substitute amendment because I think we have a unique opportunity this week to pass bipartisan commercial space legislation that actually stands a chance of becoming law. That is what we need to focus on this morning.

The choice before us is really quite straightforward. We can spend the morning, as we have, fighting over the provisions of H.R. 2262, several of which were opposed by all of the Democratic members of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee when its provisions were marked up just last week. And when we are done, Members can

vote, largely on party lines, to pass the bill.

But to what end, Mr. Chairman?

The Senate has already made it clear that H.R. 2262 has the proverbial snowball's chance of being adopted by the Senate.

Pursuing House legislation, House passage of a bill that is going nowhere in the Senate seems to me to be the ultimate exercise in futility, and one that does a real disservice to the commercial space launch industry that all of us are trying to help succeed. But we don't have to go down that path.

My amendment would replace the underlying text of H.R. 2262 with provisions of the bipartisan Senate commercial space bill, the one that was marked up in committee just yesterday.

Let me repeat that. The language in the substitute amendment, in my amendment, already has garnered bipartisan support in the Senate. It is language that is cosponsored by Senators TED CRUZ, BILL NELSON, CORY GARDNER, and GARY PETERS, which is not something you can say about many other bills that we consider in the House.

Now, the Senate bill doesn't have everything I would like to see in a commercial space bill. I am sure that is the same for my Republican colleagues and for some in the industry. That is actually how legislation is made.

However, it has a core set of provisions that I think we and the industry can support, and that is what good compromises are all about.

The amendment addresses key issues facing the industry. It extends the ''learning period'' for another 5 years. It extends third-party liability and indemnification of the entire regime for another 4 years.

It provides commercial space launch licensing and experimental permit flexibility. It provides a NASA-sought definition of ''Government Astronaut'' and provides a path for streamlining commercial space launch activities.

The Senate provisions also provide for a review of issues related to commercial activities in space, as well as matters related to space situational awareness data.

They provide encouragement for the FAA and the industry to work together to facilitate the development of voluntary consensus standards, and they also ensure the International Space Station can remain a viable and productive facility through 2024.

Mr. Chairman, that is what my amendment does. It doesn't give the commercial space industry anything or everything that some in the industry might want.

But I would remind colleagues that the Senate bill has been endorsed by the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, the National Space Society, Students for Exploration and Development of Space, SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic, among others. That is the Senate bill. That is the substitute that is being offered.

So Members today can feel perfectly comfortable that my amendment is one that the commercial space industry believes meets its legitimate needs.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, we have a clear choice today. We can maintain a counterproductive, partisan divide and hold out for provisions that won't move this legislation even 1 inch closer to becoming law.

Or we can step back, take a deep breath, and embrace the bipartisan compromise that our colleagues in the Senate have worked out. They have handed us a golden opportunity to move past partisan posturing and actually deliver legislation that can meet the needs of the commercial space industry and be enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, House Democrats support the provisions of my amendment. Democrats and Republicans in the Senate support the provisions of my amendment.

If my Republican colleagues here today in the House can join us in supporting this substitute amendment, the provisions in the amendment, we can pass bipartisan legislation that could be on its way to the President for enactment in a matter of weeks.

I can think of no better way to end this week, and I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment seeks to strike and replace the entire underlying bill with Senate legislation which differs with the House bill in many respects.

The Senate bill, S. 1297, is a work product of the Senate. It has not been negotiated with any Member of this Chamber. In fact, the Senate just marked up the bill yesterday. This amendment abdicates the House's legislative responsibilities to the Senate.

The SPACE Act paves the way for the next generation of explorers and innovators. This amendment prevents the House from providing any direction for the future of space exploration.

We must consider what we will forfeit if we accept this amendment. The amendment significantly shortens the extension of the regulatory learning period and the extension of the indemnification regime.

These changes reduce certainty in the commercial launch market and could threaten the jobs of thousands of Americans. These are hard-working men and women who depend on the extension of these laws for their jobs. They count on us to provide some certainty for their industry.

This amendment strikes all of the commonsense transparency provisions in the SPACE Act and significantly shortens the extension of the learning period. This extension is essential to the health of the commercial space industry.

Also, this amendment includes a significant reduction to the regulatory flexibility provided in the underlying bill. The underlying bill requires assessments from the FAA on the growth of the industry, constructive interactions between stakeholders and the FAA, a glide path to a safety framework that enables and encourages innovations, and improvements in safety.

These are all part of a development structure that combines lessons learned from the industry with the inherent government function to protect the public.

The underlying bill preserves FAA's ability to regulate commercial human spaceflight in order to protect national security, public health, and safety. It also preserves FAA's existing authorities to regulate spaceflight participant and crew safety.

This amendment does not include any comparable benchmarking tools for Congress to monitor the growth of the industry. The amendment removes the ability of stakeholders to work with the FAA to develop safety standards that will improve the industry as a whole.

The amendment will have a chilling effect on the industry and put stakeholders on the defense against an onslaught of government intervention and possible lawsuits. This does not support a dynamic space economy or encourage innovation.

This amendment assumes that the commercial space industry has not placed a priority on safety. It is unfortunate that the minority looks at the American entrepreneurial spirit in this way.

Under the Senate bill, spaceflight participants would be exposed to significant financial risk and liability. This amendment strikes the vital provisions of the underlying bill which help ensure that human spaceflight is available to anyone who wants to participate.

The minority talks a lot about safety. I appreciate that. I think everyone involved in the space industry places a high priority on these endeavors being as safe as possible. I just wish the minority had a higher opinion of the scientists, engineers, and technicians building these systems.

Let's be clear. Space is inherently risky. America's memory is imprinted with tragic events such as the Apollo 1 fire, Challenger, and Columbia. The appropriate way to improve safety systems and reduce risk is to test, launch, learn, study, and repeat.

The entire space industry is behind this bill.

I do not oppose the gentlewoman's amendment simply because the Senate bill has no good qualities. I oppose the gentlewoman's amendment because it would abdicate the responsibilities of the House.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and not turn their backs on so many space companies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman.

I rise in strong support of Ms. EDWARDS' amendment. This amendment offers the possibility of actually accomplishing something worthwhile today and is an amendment that should garner bipartisan support.

Just last week, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee reported out H.R. 2262 and H.R. 1508 on party-line votes. Of course, we had moved to markup without any hearings on commercial space issues in the 114th Congress, nor a legislative hearing on either bill, nor a subcommittee markup. It is, thus, not surprising that they could not garner any significant bipartisan support for these bills.

And yet, now here we are on the floor, with these same bills. If we take the same path we took in yesterday's consideration of the COMPETES legislation, we will get a similar result, a partisan vote, and a bill that will never become law.

Ms. EDWARDS offers us another way forward. Just yesterday, the Senate Commerce Committee favorably reported out S. 1297, the Senate's bipartisan commercial space bill, a bill introduced by Senators TED CRUZ and BILL NELSON.

□ 1200

As I said, it is a bipartisan bill that was endorsed by a large segment of the commercial space industry when it was introduced. The gentlewoman from Maryland's (Ms. EDWARDS) amendment simply incorporates provisions of S. 1297 into her amendment.

Mr. Chairman, instead of engaging in a meaningful exercise, we could vote today to approve bipartisan legislation that Senate Democrats and Republicans are supporting.

While the Senate bill is not the bill I would have written, it is a vast improvement over the bill we have before us today.

As the gentleman said earlier, America is exceptional. And that is why we have a Congress. That is why we have committee structure. That is why we have subcommittees that examine issues and listen to witnesses. That is why we have committee work. It provides really a means for us to come together.

The bill that is in the Senate provides constructive updates to the Commercial Space Launch Act.

I know that some Members want to go further than the Senate bill in some areas, but the reality is, there is no bipartisan consensus to doing so. And if we proceed to pass H.R. 2262, we will have passed a bill that the Senate probably will not take up. We did that with the COMPETES bill yesterday. Do we really want to continue to waste our time in the same way again this morning?

Holding out hope that somehow these contentious provisions will find favor in a House-Senate conference is also an exercise in futility. Time is not on our side in dealing with the two expiring authorities in this bill, and we know from experience that Congress can act to extend them without passing a commercial space bill.

I think that outcome would be unfortunate, but I see little likelihood that the Senate will do anything with H.R. 2262 in its current form. And in a conference, I think that House Democrats will be disinclined to support provisions that we are opposing today.

Ms. EDWARDS' amendment offers us an opportunity to avoid months of pointless back-and-forth between the two Chambers. We can pass legislation that we already know has bipartisan support in the Senate, and if we do, we can look forward to seeing a bill head to the President's desk within weeks. All it takes is my Republican colleagues being willing to forgo the temptation to posture for that last extra bit of advantage and, instead, accept a reasonable compromise bill that will do much to meet the legitimate needs of the commercial space launch industry.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), who is a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and is also the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I thank the chairman of the Science Committee for yielding and for his strong leadership on working this bill through regular order so that all of the amendments that we have made, all the Members have had their voices heard in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentlewoman from Maryland.

The language she is proposing to insert into our House bill is authored by Senator CRUZ of Texas, and it does have bipartisan support with Senator NELSON of Florida. But there are provisions that we got included because of the open process that we went through that are not included in that bill.

I would like to just run through a few of those that I, myself, got included into this bill, starting with section 110, which was an amendment I offered at markup that will require a GAO report to capture the role of space support vehicles—training vehicles, if you will—in the commercial space industry; regulatory and statutory barriers to the services these vehicles offer and recommendations for updates that will address these barriers. This is critically important in my neck of the woods. In the State of Oklahoma, we have a spaceport at Burns Flat. There are businesses there that are very interested in doing training for commercial crew and commercial spaceflight participants.

This was a provision of the bill that went through an open process. It was an amendment that was accepted in a very bipartisan way. And I am hopeful that when the full bill gets to the floor, it also will be accepted in a bipartisan way.

Additionally, title III of this bill incorporates H.R. 2261, the Commercial Remote Sensing Act, which was also bipartisan legislation that I introduced with my friend from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER). This title sets metrics to give Congress a full picture of the workload facing the Department of Commerce when licensing remote sensing activities and what issues are preventing them from meeting statutory deadlines.

Title III also recognizes the importance of seeking input from the Advisory Committee for Commercial Remote Sensing, which is largely made up of private sector representatives. This legislation will be crucial as industry expands beyond traditional remote sensing satellites and activities and as Congress looks to update the statutes governing these activities for the first time since the 1990s.

My case for this being bipartisan is that I worked very hard with the other side on the amendments that I ultimately got into this bill. There were some amendments that maybe were not as bipartisan. But I would attest that there is support on the other side of the aisle for a lot of the provisions that we got into this bill.

I look forward to taking a vote on this bill. I oppose the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I encourage all my colleagues to pass the bill that went through regular order in the House of Representatives. I hear a lot of people talking about regular order. This was a very open process. Everybody had their voice heard. I encourage passage of the bill but not passage of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, we have offered my amendment in the nature of a substitute because we are interested not just in making speeches here on the House floor, but we are interested in passing law and good policy that will be signed by the President, that will set the commercial space industry onto a pathway of continued innovation and success.

As has been described, the Senate yesterday, out of committee, marked up a bill that is bipartisan in nature. And because of the negotiations, there are not going to be any changes.

We want to make law for the industry, and we believe that this amendment in the nature of a substitute is good policy. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this substitute amendment and to support the underlying bill, which has significant improvements to the Senate bill, and that is why we should pass it.

I will now enter into the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology regarding H.R. 2262.

MAY 18, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I write concerning H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 2262, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

MAY 18, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2262, the ''Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015.''

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional interests in matters pertaining to the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Transportation Safety Board, and that your Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 2262. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation, if in your jurisdiction, should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 236, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
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
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—23

Allen
Bera
Beyer
Blackburn
Brat
Butterfield
Capps
Carter (GA)
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Crawford
Davis, Danny
Donovan
Lewis
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Rush
Smith (WA)
Tsongas

□ 1233

Messrs. GROTHMAN and TED LIEU of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. MASSIE, JONES, Ms. KUSTER, Messrs. DOGGETT and GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 261, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Thursday, May 21, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 261. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Edwards Amendment to H.R. 2262, Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015.

Stated against:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 261 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 261 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 261 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. STEWART, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 273, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 274.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 284, nays 133, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

YEAS—284

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—133

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Neal
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bera
Blackburn
Capps
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Crawford
Davis, Danny
Donovan
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Smith (WA)
Tsongas

□ 1243

Mr. MOULTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 21st, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 262. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on passage of H.R. 2262, Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1335, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 174, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—237

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
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
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
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—174

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

NOT VOTING—21

Bera
Blackburn
Capps
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Courtney
Crawford
Davis, Danny
Donovan
Duncan (TN)
Hinojosa
Kind
Lowenthal
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Russell
Smith (WA)
Tsongas

□ 1252

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.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 21st, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 263. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 274, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on May 20 and May 21, 2015 and would like the record to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 250: "no," rollcall No. 251: "no," rollcall No. 252: "yes," rollcall No. 253: "no," rollcall No. 254: "yes," rollcall No. 255: "yes," rollcall No. 256: "yes," rollcall No. 257: "yes," rollcall No. 258: "no," rollcall No. 259: "yes," rollcall No. 260: "yes," rollcall No. 261: "yes," rollcall No. 262: "yes," rollcall No. 263: "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on May 20th and May 21st, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 258, "yes" on rollcall No. 259, "no" on rollcall No. 260, "yes" on rollcall No. 261, "no" on rollcall No. 262, and "no" on rollcall No. 263.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1622

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative ADAM SCHIFF be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1622.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On May 20, 2015, pursuant to sections 3307 and 3315(b) of Title 40, United States Code, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider two building project survey resolutions and one resolution that amends a resolution approved by the Committee on February 12, 2015, and which was included in the General Services Administration's (GSA) Fiscal Year 2015 Capital Investment and Leasing Program.

The Committee continues to work to cut waste and the cost of federal property and leases. The two building project surveys establish clear timetables on reviews GSA is currently undertaking to address space emergencies. The amended resolution incorporates additional information provided to the Committee by GSA with respect to leased space that will ultimately be released and consolidated into government-owned space.

I have enclosed copies of the resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on May 20, 2015.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

BUILDING PROJECT SURVEY—UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3315(b), the Administrator of General Services shall investigate the feasibility and need to construct or acquire a replacement facility to house the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and other Federal agencies, located in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. The analysis shall include a full and complete evaluation including, but not limited to:(i) the identification and cost of potential sites and (ii) 30–year present value evaluations of all options, including Federal construction, exchange, purchase (including lease with an option to purchase or purchase contract), and lease. The Administrator shall submit a report to Congress within 120 days of the date of adoption of this resolution.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

BUILDING PROJECT SURVEY—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to Title 40 U.S.C. §3315(b), the Administrator of General Services shall investigate and identify a long-term space solution for the courthouse located at 1 N. Palafox Street in Pensacola, Florida to address the space emergency of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida. The analysis shall include a full and complete evaluation including, but not limited to: (i) the identification and cost of potential options and (ii) 30 year present value evaluations of all options, including acceptance of the offer to donate the current building, repair and acquisition. The Administrator shall submit a report to Congress within 120 days.

AMENDED COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE—FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, 85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for lease extensions of up to 168,000 rentable square feet of space for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force currently located at 85 10th Avenue in New York, New York at a proposed total annual cost of $14,616,000 for a lease term of up to 5 years, a prospectus, as amended by this resolution, for which is attached to and included in this resolution. This resolution amends amounts authorized in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure resolution of February 12, 2015.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agencies agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 218 square feet or less per person.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 218 square feet or higher per person.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-02-NY15
Congressional District: 8

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes lease extensions of up to five years for 168,000 rentable square feet of space for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force (FBI) currently located at 85 10th Avenue in New York, NY. FBI has occupied space in the building since 2005 under two leases that will expire January 17 and June 5, 2015. The long-term plan is to relocate FBI from 85 Tenth Avenue to government-owned space; a lease extension is needed as space is vacated and readied at the Government-owned location. GSA will attempt to secure flexibility and the right to terminate the entire lease periodically within the five year term.

Extension of the current leases will enable FBI to provide continued housing for its personnel and meet its current mission requirements. FBI will maintain its current office utilization rate of 148 USF per person and its overall utilization rate of 218 USF per person.

Description

Occupants:	Federal Bureau of Investigation
Lease Type:	Lease Extension
Current Rentable Square Feet (RSF):	168,000
Proposed Maximum RSF:	168,000
Expansion/Reduction RSF:	0
Current Usable Square Feet/Person:	218
Proposed Usable Square Feet/Person:	218
Proposed Maximum Lease Term:	5
Expiration Date of Current Leases:	1/17/ 2015 and 6/5/ 2015
Proposed Delineated Area:	85 Tenth Avenue New York, NY
Number of Official Parking Spaces:	0
Scoring:	Operating Lease
Maximum Proposed Rental Rate[1]:	$ 68.00 per RSF
Proposed Total Annual Cost[2]:	$ 11,424,000
Current Total Annual Cost:	$ 7,589,152 (leases effective 1/18/2005 and 6/06/2005)

[1]This estimate is for fiscal year 2015 and may be escalated by 1.9 percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for negotiating this lease extension to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the government. Lease award shall not exceed the maximum rental rate as specified in this prospectus.

[2]Any new lease may contain an annual escalation clause to provide for increases or decreases in real estate taxes and operating costs.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-02-NY15
Congressional District: 8

Justification
The leases at 85 10th Avenue will expire January 17 and June 5, 2015. FBI requires continued housing at this location to carry out its mission until it can relocate its personnel and operations to government-owned space. A five-year lease extension is needed to protect occupancy until such time as space is vacated and readied for FBI at a government-owned facility.

Resolutions of Approval
Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing
GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the extension. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on September 29, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

April 2014

Housing Plan
Federal Bureau of Investigation

PNY-02-NY15
New York, NY

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
85 10th Avenue, New York, NY	542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173						
Proposed Lease							542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173
Total	542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173	542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173

Office Utilization Rate (UR)[2]		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	148	148

UR=average amount of office space per person
Current UR excludes 22,612 usf of office support space
Proposed UR excludes 22,612 usf of office support space

Overall UR[3]		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	218	218

R/U Factor[4]	Total USF	RSF/USF	Max RSF
Current	118,173	1.42	168,000
Proposed	118,173	1.42	168,000

Special Space	USF
ADP	1,977
Break Room	731
Conference/Training	2,367
Health	488
Mug and Fingerprint	244
Physical Fitness	2,560
Mail Room	366
Interview rooms	512
Restroom	146
Total	9,391

NOTES:

[1]USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.
[2]Calculation excludes Judiciary, Congress and agencies with less than 10 people
[3]USF/Person = housing plan total USF divided by total personnel.
[4]R/U Factor = Max RSF divided by total USF

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
U.S. House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515

Bill Shuster
Chairman

Christopher P. Bertram, Staff Director

Peter A. DeFazio
Ranking Member

Katherine W. Dedrick, Democratic Staff Director

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY
PNY-02-NY15

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, that pursuant to 40 U.S.C. §3307, appropriations are authorized for lease extensions of up to 168,000 rentable square feet of space for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force currently located at 85 10th Avenue in New York, New York at a proposed total annual cost of $13,776,000 for a lease term of up to 5 years, a prospectus, as amended by this resolution, for which is attached to and included in this resolution.

Approval of this prospectus constitutes authority to execute an interim lease for all tenants, if necessary, prior to the execution of the new lease.

Provided that, the Administrator of General Services and tenant agencies agree to apply an overall utilization rate of 218 square feet or less per person.

Provided that, except for interim leases as described above, the Administrator may not enter into any leases that are below prospectus level for the purposes of meeting any of the requirements, or portions thereof, included in the prospectus that would result in an overall utilization rate of 218 square feet or higher per person.

Provided that, to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall include in the lease contract(s) a purchase option that can be exercised at the conclusion of the firm term of the lease.

Provided further, that the Administrator shall require that the delineated area of the procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives prior to exercising any lease authority provided in this resolution.

Provided further, that the General Services Administration shall not delegate to any other agency the authority granted by this resolution.

Adopted: **February 12, 2015**

Bill Shuster, M.C.
Chairman

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-02-NY15
Congressional District: 8

Executive Summary

The General Services Administration (GSA) proposes lease extensions of up to five years for 168,000 rentable square feet of space for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Force (FBI) currently located at 85 10th Avenue in New York, NY. FBI has occupied space in the building since 2005 under two leases that will expire January 17 and June 5, 2015. The long-term plan is to relocate FBI from 85 Tenth Avenue to government-owned space; a lease extension is needed as space is vacated and readied at the Government-owned location. GSA will attempt to secure flexibility and the right to terminate the entire lease periodically within the five year term.

Extension of the current leases will enable FBI to provide continued housing for its personnel and meet its current mission requirements. FBI will maintain its current office utilization rate of 148 USF per person and its overall utilization rate of 218 USF per person.

Description

Occupants:	Federal Bureau of Investigation
Lease Type:	Lease Extension
Current Rentable Square Feet (RSF):	168,000
Proposed Maximum RSF:	168,000
Expansion/Reduction RSF:	0
Current Usable Square Feet/Person:	218
Proposed Usable Square Feet/Person:	218
Proposed Maximum Lease Term:	5
Expiration Date of Current Leases:	1/17/ 2015 and 6/5/ 2015
Proposed Delineated Area:	85 Tenth Avenue New York, NY
Number of Official Parking Spaces:	0
Scoring:	Operating Lease
Maximum Proposed Rental Rate[1]:	$ 68.00 per RSF
Proposed Total Annual Cost[2]:	$ 11,424,000
Current Total Annual Cost:	$ 7,589,152 (leases effective 1/18/2005 and 6/06/2005)

[1]This estimate is for fiscal year 2015 and may be escalated by 1.9 percent annually to the effective date of the lease to account for inflation. The proposed rental rate is fully serviced including all operating expenses whether paid by the lessor or directly by the Government. GSA will conduct the procurement using prevailing market rental rates as a benchmark for negotiating this lease extension to ensure that lease award is made in the best interest of the government. Lease award shall not exceed the maximum rental rate as specified in this prospectus.

[2]Any new lease may contain an annual escalation clause to provide for increases or decreases in real estate taxes and operating costs.

GSA PBS

PROSPECTUS – LEASE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
85 10TH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY

Prospectus Number: PNY-02-NY15
Congressional District: 8

Justification
The leases at 85 10th Avenue will expire January 17 and June 5, 2015. FBI requires continued housing at this location to carry out its mission until it can relocate its personnel and operations to government-owned space. A five-year lease extension is needed to protect occupancy until such time as space is vacated and readied for FBI at a government-owned facility.

Resolutions of Approval
Resolutions adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works approving this prospectus will constitute approval to make appropriations to lease space in a facility that will yield the required rentable area.

Interim Leasing
GSA will execute such interim leasing actions as are necessary to ensure continued housing of the tenant agency prior to the effective date of the extension. It is in the best interest of the Government to avert the financial risk of holdover tenancy.

Certification of Need

The proposed project is the best solution to meet a validated Government need.

Submitted at Washington, DC, on September 29, 2014

Recommended: _____
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service

Approved: _____
Administrator, General Services Administration

April 2014

Housing Plan
Federal Bureau of Investigation

PNY-02-NY15
New York, NY

Locations	CURRENT						PROPOSED					
	Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)[1]				Personnel		Usable Square Feet (USF)			
	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total	Office	Total	Office	Storage	Special	Total
85 10th Avenue, New York, NY	542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173						
Proposed Lease							542	542	102,782	6,000	9,391	118,173
Total	**542**	**542**	**102,782**	**6,000**	**9,391**	**118,173**	**542**	**542**	**102,782**	**6,000**	**9,391**	**118,173**

Office Utilization Rate (UR)[2]		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	148	148

UR=average amount of office space per person
Current UR excludes 22,612 usf of office support space
Proposed UR excludes 22,612 usf of office support space

Overall UR[3]		
	Current	Proposed
Rate	218	218

R/U Factor[4]	Total USF	RSF/USF	Max RSF
Current	118,173	1.42	168,000
Proposed	118,173	1.42	168,000

Special Space	USF
ADP	1,977
Break Room	731
Conference/Training	2,367
Health	488
Mug and Fingerprint	244
Physical Fitness	2,560
Mail Room	366
Interview rooms	512
Restroom	146
Total	**9,391**

NOTES:

[1]USF means the portion of the building available for use by a tenant's personnel and furnishings and space available jointly to the occupants of the building.
[2]Calculation excludes Judiciary, Congress and agencies with less than 10 people
[3]USF/Person = housing plan total USF divided by total personnel.
[4]R/U Factor = Max RSF divided by total USF

There was no objection.

HONORING BRAVE SOUTHERN ARIZONANS WHO MADE THE ULTIMATE SACRIFICE IN SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women from southern Arizona who have given their lives in service to our country.

Countless southern Arizonans have bravely raised their right hands and volunteered to make the defense of our Nation their responsibility. Some have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Their stories of bravery and selflessness are remembered every day by those who knew and loved them—stories like that of U.S. Army Command Master Sergeant Martin R. Barreras, who graduated from Sunnyside High School and was killed in Afghanistan in 2014; or of U.S. Army Specialist Christian M. Adams, a native of Sierra Vista, who was killed in Afghanistan in 2010; or of U.S. Air Force Senior Airman Benjamin D. White, who was based at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and was killed when his helicopter was shot down in Afghanistan in 2010.

These are just some of the many stories of brave southern Arizonans who fought and died to preserve our way of life. Their sacrifices remind us this weekend and every day that freedom is never free.

Have a meaningful Memorial Day.

BRAIN TUMOR AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Brain Tumor Awareness Month.

Every single year, nearly 70,000 people in our country will be diagnosed with a brain tumor. Tragically, over 4,000 of them will be children. By the end of this year, roughly 14,000 Americans will lose their lives due to a brain tumor.

Like many others across this country, my family has also been touched by this painful disease, but for patients and their loved ones, hope persists, whether through increased funding for NIH research, which just passed the Energy and Commerce Committee this morning, or through the tireless efforts of nonprofit organizations like the National Brain Tumor Society.

We should not and cannot accept the notion that a brain tumor is untreatable any longer. This month and every month, we must support the efforts of our scientists, doctors, and advocates as they search for new treatment options to develop new cures.

HONORING OUR MEN AND WOMEN OF THE ARMED FORCES ON MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on what Memorial Day means to our country and to honor our men and women of the Armed Forces.

Our Nation has always stood strong on its founding principle of freedom, but it has taken wars and generations of brave, selfless individuals to preserve and defend it.

For their service, we are eternally grateful. We are especially mindful of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country and of the fact that freedom is not free. Their valiant acts in the line of duty have kept our families safe, both at home and abroad, and there are no words for the gratitude we hold in our hearts today and always.

As we spend time this weekend with our loved ones on this great American holiday, please keep our active and fallen servicemen and -women in your thoughts and prayers, and we pray for those currently serving that they return home safely.

Happy Memorial Day, and God bless the United States of America.

□ 1300

CONGRATULATIONS TO FORT WORTH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT'S HUSBAND AND WIFE TEACHER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mario Pureco-Razo and Maria Ceron-Ponce, the first husband and wife to have ever been named as teachers of the year at their respective schools. Mario and Maria immigrated to the United States from Mexico to become bilingual educators.

Maria, who teaches dual language for third grade at Glen Park Elementary School, and Mario, who teaches dual language pre-K at Mitchell Boulevard Elementary School, one of the many elementary schools I attended in Fort Worth ISD, have both proudly served the district for 7 years.

While each present a different style of teaching in the classroom, both exemplify the dedication and passion needed to shape the minds and lives of our youngest members of society.

Although we should recognize the hard work of all the teachers that perform on behalf of their students each and every day, today I want to recognize Maria and Mario's unique achievement.

It brings me great pride to represent the teachers of Texas' 33rd Congressional District, and I wish Mario and Maria continued success.

Congratulations on this outstanding achievement.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

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

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Foster Care Month.

Before I came to Congress, I was the CEO of a home for abused, neglected, and abandoned children called HomeSafe. In addition to providing a caring home for children in need, our staff and volunteers helped connect them with foster families, whom we also helped certify.

I saw firsthand the struggles that children face when they don't have a safe and permanent home. I saw what a remarkable difference it could make when they found a stable and loving family, and I saw the incredible joy that these children brought to the lives of their foster families, our staff and volunteers, and everyone who worked to support them.

All children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent home. We must continue to work together to make that goal a reality for the 400,000 children in our foster care system.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING TAX CREDIT OF 2015

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, since taking office, my top priority has been to support policies that improve our economy and strengthen the Inland Empire's middle class.

Last month I released my jobs plan, summarizing what I have heard from small-business owners, job seekers, and community leaders throughout San Bernardino County. Among the many issues people face is the skills gap, the disconnect that exists between potential employees and the available job market demands of those who possess specific or technical skills. That was one of the biggest problems that I heard.

That is why yesterday I introduced the On-the-Job Training Tax Credit of 2015, a bill that creates a temporary tax credit for employers to use to help pay for the costs of training new hires. This will enable local owners to expand their businesses and empower employees with critical skills to help them succeed in the 21st century economy.

Through apprenticeship programs, vocational schools, community colleges, and more, job seekers who have been locked out of today's economy will be retrained and brought back into the fold in the Inland Empire's economy.

Studies tell us that approximately 3½ million manufacturing jobs will be open over the next 10 years, but we will only be able to fill 2 million of them due to the skills gap. It is time to retrain our workforce and build up the middle class. This bill will help us do just that.

CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS SECTION 702 OF THE FISA AMENDMENTS ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the PATRIOT Act was designed to protect us from terrorists abroad. Now we have learned that section 215 of the PATRIOT Act has been abused by the NSA, and it is spying on Americans, taking metadata.

But there is more. There is another law. The FISA Amendments Act of 2008, section 702, allows the seizure, without a warrant, of the content of emails, text messages, and phone calls by our government. Congress must address this, as it has addressed section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. It also allows, under 702, the backdoor search; in other words, NSA can go into Google and seize information about Americans without a warrant.

NSA cannot be trusted to protect and follow America's laws that protect our privacy. This Soviet-style surveillance on Americans has got to stop. The right of privacy is sacred.

I have introduced, along with ZOE LOFGREN, a bipartisan bill to eliminate section 702 so that Americans are protected. We cannot allow the bruising of the Fourth Amendment by the snooping NSA under the false claim of national security. If you have probable cause to seize that information, get a warrant under the Constitution of the United States.

And that is just the way it is.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Head Start program, which has served more than 30 million American children.

As a former Head Start teacher, I know firsthand what access to education and a hearty breakfast can do for a child. Head Start has introduced millions of children to learning; and, as a result, many of them have gone on to earn college degrees and become teachers, lawyers, doctors, and even elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, without Head Start, many children from low-income families would not receive the nutritional and educational services that are so important to early childhood development.

I stand with my colleagues in the House and on the Committee on Education and the Workforce calling for continued funding for this vital program, which has been crucial in improving the lives of countless deserving children across the country.

RECOGNIZING PHILIP KIRKWOOD

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a real American hero who risked his life to preserve the freedoms we all enjoy today. Yesterday, Navy Ace Commander Philip Kirkwood of Seminole, Florida, accepted the Congressional Gold Medal presented to our American Fighter Aces.

Born in New Jersey, Mr. Kirkwood enlisted in the U.S. Navy in 1942. Earning his Navy wings a year later, Mr. Kirkwood joined the VF–10 flying Hellcats off of the USS *Enterprise*. Mr. Kirkwood recorded his first air victory over the Caroline Islands in 1944, but it would be far from his last. Over his distinguished career, Commander Kirkwood recorded 12 confirmed victories and 1 probable.

One of fewer than 80 living fighter aces, Commander Kirkwood is decorated with the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Air Medal with five Gold Stars.

I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Commander Kirkwood for his years of service and his bravery.

May God bless Philip Kirkwood, and may God bless each of our American Fighter Aces.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF BISHOP CURTIS MONTGOMERY

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Bishop Curtis Montgomery of Tacoma, Washington.

He was a key leader who shepherded Tacoma's Hilltop neighborhood through civil rights struggles and troubled times. His steadfast leadership and staunch belief in the power of community involvement will be remembered in the revitalization of this historically significant neighborhood.

His contributions to the Hilltop include the establishment of Christ Temple Church, which later became Greater Christ Temple Church, and the Oasis of Hope Center, a faith-based community outreach center that was the culmination of Bishop Montgomery's longstanding vision to provide a safe and stable place for the community.

Scripture tells us that God loves a cheerful giver, and it is safe to say that God loves Curtis Montgomery and his parishioners, who have given so much to so many.

On behalf of his congregation and the people of the Hilltop neighborhood in Tacoma, Washington, I honor the lifetime achievements of Bishop Curtis Montgomery of Greater Christ Temple Church in the Congress of the United States.

HONORING OUR VETERANS

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, the way that we show gratitude to those who have served in our military, the men and women, is to honor them, and we will join as a country doing so on Memorial Day.

But we also can show our gratitude by making sure that they get the care that they need. It has been over a year since the long waiting lists at the VA were exposed in alarming numbers all across the country. We have learned just this week that at least $6 billion in taxpayers' money has been lost in illegal contracts at the VA and of VA employees improperly receiving gifts, including room upgrades, meals, limousine services, golf, spa, helicopter rides, tickets for the Rockets.

This week the House passed six bills that give American veterans the support they need, and demands accountability at the VA. We must get answers, and I am committed to being a part of the solution.

Next week, I will visit the Spokane Veterans Hospital and recognize those who do work hard to serve our veterans. Every day we are working to support veterans in eastern Washington. This week my team attended the VA2K relay for homeless veterans with military and community and VA staff. We are going to continue to work with county leaders to address the needs of our veterans throughout eastern Washington.

May God bless all those who have served.

FIRST COUNTY OF VETERANS

(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 Friday, May 29, I will have the privilege of attending a ceremony and play in Warren County, Pennsylvania, titled, ''Beyond Glory,'' which will highlight the stories of eight Medal of Honor recipients in the wars of the 20th century.

The theme of the evening is First County of Veterans, recognizing the fact that Warren County, Pennsylvania, has the largest veteran population per capita of any county in Pennsylvania. I am looking forward to celebrating this special evening with local veterans who have sacrificed so much.

Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is right around the corner, and as the proud father of an Army soldier and a daughter-in-law who is now a veteran, it is my privilege to serve our Nation's veterans and my honor to recognize those who have lost their lives in service to our country.

Memorial Day for many Americans has become the holiday that marks the

start of the summer season, but for the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces, and in doing so gave their lives, we owe them our remembrance and demonstrated appreciation.

It is my sincere hope that you will pause this Memorial Day in remembrance of our fallen soldiers, whose courage and bravery sustain our liberty.

HONORING JASON KORTZ

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is a day to honor those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation. I can think of no better time to remember one of those brave, young men who made the ultimate sacrifice as he trained to protect the values that we as a nation hold so dear.

An elite member of the Naval Special Warfare Group 1, Special Warfare Operator 3rd Class Jason Kortz distinguished himself consistently throughout his life and during his short military career.

Hailing from Highlands Ranch, Colorado, he graduated from the University of Denver. Most recently, Jason set himself apart when he was selected as the honor man of his basic underwater demolition SEAL class.

Tragically, this true patriot and consummate professional gave his life in defense of our Nation when he died during a training accident on March 18, 2015.

On this Memorial Day, please join me and the family of Jason Kortz to pause and reflect on the ultimate sacrifices that warriors like Jason have made to uphold all that we value as a nation.

□ 1315

ASTHMA AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, May is Asthma Awareness Month. As co-chair of the Congressional Asthma and Allergy Caucus and a senior member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce's Health Subcommittee, I want to take this opportunity to bring attention to the prevalence of asthma in the United States, as well as what must be done to control its growth.

Asthma is one of the most serious chronic diseases in the country. It affects almost 26 million Americans and nearly 7 million children. It can cause shortness of breath, coughing, wheezing, chest pain, and even death.

In my home State of New York, asthma takes a particularly heavy toll, especially in my home county of the Bronx. About 390,000 children and 1.4 million adults in New York have asthma. The total cost of asthma-related hospitalizations in New York in 2007 was a staggering $535 million.

I have been a strong supporter of the Centers for Disease Control's National Asthma Control Program, which helps States implement systems to monitor and treat asthma. This program's work has resulted in $23.1 billion in asthma healthcare costs since 2001.

We must continue to increase awareness and preventative measures to help people manage their disease. We must work collaboratively across sectors to address the burden that asthma creates.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that adults and children across the United States can live healthier and more successful lives and that we can conquer the scourge of asthma.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL R. MARTIN UMBARGER

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Hoosier and American, Major General R. Martin Umbarger, the Adjutant General of Indiana, who is retiring after 11 years as the leader of the Indiana Guard Reserve and the Indiana Army and Air National Guard.

Major General Umbarger's distinguished career in the military spans five decades and began when he enlisted as a soldier in the Indiana Army National Guard in 1969.

As secretary of state, I had the privilege of working with Major General Umbarger to protect Hoosiers serving in the military, both out of State and overseas, by promoting and improving absentee voting processes.

As Indiana's Fourth District Representative, I have also worked with Major General Umbarger on legislation which would study the structure of our military and how Reserve components can be best utilized.

In short, Major General Umbarger is one of the most accomplished adjutant generals in the country and a valuable leader in Indiana and the USA. He has led our National Guard and served our State and Nation with integrity and distinction over his 45-year military career.

I would like to thank Major General Umbarger for his selfless service and wish him well in his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO JOE GALUSKI

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Joe Galuski, a beloved central New York broadcaster who spent more than 25 years on air on WSYR radio.

Known for his ability to discuss with knowledge any topic presented to him, Joe faithfully kept our community updated on the latest local stories and provided us with news from around the Nation.

A legend in central New York radio, Joe Galuski is fondly recognized by the thousands of listeners who tuned in religiously on morning commutes and to hear him on SU football's pre- and postgame talk shows.

Joe was more than a radio host; he had the power to communicate and entertain and became a large part of the lives of many of his listeners. He was a gracious and tough interviewer who was quick with a joke. His personality, sense of humor, and intelligence could always be heard in his voice.

Joe Galuski was loved by central New York, a community he cared deeply about. His spirit as the voice of our community will not be forgotten by his family, friends, colleagues, and listeners.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM THOMAS KIRCHHOFF, JR.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today, I pay homage to the legacy of a man who not only resided in Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, but much more importantly, a man who served the Commonwealth and our Nation with pride, as an exemplary businessman, phenomenal athlete, and true patriot.

William Thomas Kirchhoff, Jr., was a standout quarterback for Lafayette College, eventually being inducted into their hall of fame. After college, Tom continued on to the NFL, being signed by the Philadelphia Eagles.

While he is known in Pennsylvania as a great athlete, Tom is know by his family and community as a great man. His fierce quest to live a full life and raise a happy family, despite his struggle with ALS, is beyond inspirational. In fact, his attitude and drive should inspire every citizen to live fully, completely, and with a purpose, despite the challenges that may confront them.

Tom physically may have left us on March 10, 2015, but his soul, spirit, and legacy will endure. To his devoted wife, Staci, and their four children—Tommy, Sam, Brynley, and Ty—on behalf of the Commonwealth and the Nation, thank you. Thank you for sharing Tom's all too short but extremely meaningful life with us.

I am truly honored and humbled to be even a small part of the recognition of a truly great American.

Tom, we wish you Godspeed.

CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION AND CHOICE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of

the bill (H.R. 2496) to extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I do want to thank my colleague from Colorado concerning what will be a short time to continue negotiations to finish our hospital in the Denver area.

As we come into this Memorial Day weekend, veterans in the Rocky Mountain West have waited 15 years for this hospital to be built. Substantial construction has taken place. Any further delay just delays delivering good services—great services—to our veterans.

We need to continue to move this along. The fact that we are moving beyond Memorial Day, keeping this project going forward, without mothballing it, is a step in the right direction; but, Mr. Speaker, I ask the majority and the Republican leadership to work with the VA to get this finished, so that we can provide the best medical care possible, similar to what Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS was talking about at her hospital in Washington. We want that same thing in Denver, Colorado.

We need to finish this hospital as soon as possible.

I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws his reservation.

Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN)?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2496

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 ''Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, in fiscal year 2015, in an amount not to exceed $900,000,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 8104(c) of title 38, United States Code, or any other provision of law, funds may not be obligated or expended for the project described in subsection (a) in an amount that would cause the total amount obligated for that project to exceed the amount specified in the law for that project (or would add to total obligations exceeding such specified amount).

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF DISTANCE REQUIREMENT FOR EXPANDED AVAILABILITY OF HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES FOR VETERANS THROUGH THE USE OF AGREEMENTS WITH NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(b)(2) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''(as calculated based on distance traveled)'' after ''40 miles''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking subclause (II), and inserting the following new subclause (II):

''(II) faces an unusual or excessive burden in traveling to such a medical facility of the Department based on—

''(aa) geographical challenges;

''(bb) environmental factors, such as roads that are not accessible to the general public, traffic, or hazardous weather;

''(cc) a medical condition that impacts the ability to travel; or

''(dd) other factors, as determined by the Secretary.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to care or services provided on or after such date.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

BENGHAZI ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 years, on September 11 and 12, 2012, the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, were the target of terrorist attacks. These attacks resulted in the deaths of four Americans: Sean Smith; Tyrone Woods; Glen Doherty; and the U.S. Ambassador to Libya, Chris Stevens, as well as two other Americans critically injured.

It comes at a time close to Memorial Day, when this country can honor these individuals that gave their life and their service not just for this country, but for the freedom and democracy around the world of others.

The gravity of the attacks raise serious questions regarding the U.S. presence in Benghazi, Libya, particularly as those questions related to the policies, decisions, and activities of the administration and relevant executive branch agencies before, during, and after the attacks.

For nearly 2 years, Congress sought answers to these questions. However, the administration's valid response has exposed the limits encountered by our standing committees.

□ 1330

These responses revealed a less than competent or transparent accounting about the attacks. Consequently, the House created, with the support of our Democratic colleagues, the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attacks in Benghazi, Libya.

Everywhere I go, Mr. Speaker, I have people ask me: What is taking so long? What is taking so long for us to get the facts about what happened in Benghazi?

We are going to do our best today to explain to the American people and to the public and to you, Mr. Speaker, why it has taken so long, why it is requiring us to continue to subpoena and beg and plead for the information that we need to be able to deliver this report to this body and to the American people.

The Speaker appointed me and six of my Republican colleagues to this committee. The minority leader appointed five of our Democratic colleagues. We have been directed by the House to conduct a complete investigation across the spectrum of all, A-L-L, all relevant executive branch agencies and issue a definitive final report on the events surrounding the September 11–12, 2012, terrorist attacks in Benghazi, Libya.

Specifically, we are directed to investigate and report on: all policies, decisions, and activities that contributed to the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11 and 12, 2012, as well as those that affected the ability of the United States to prepare for those attacks; number two, all policies, decisions, and activities to respond to and repel the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11 and 12, 2012, including efforts to rescue United States personnel; number three, internal and public executive branch communications about the attacks on the United States facility in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11 and 12, 2012; number four, accountability for policies and decisions relating to the security of facilities in Benghazi, Libya, and the response to the attacks, including individuals and entities responsible for those policies and decisions; number five, executive branch authorities' efforts to identify and bring to justice the perpetrators of these attacks on the U.S. facilities in Benghazi, Libya, September 11 and 12, 2012; number six, executive branch activities and efforts to comply with congressional inquiries into the attacks on the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11 and 12, 2012; recommendations for improving executive branch cooperation and compliance with congressional oversight investigations; information related to lessons learned from the attacks and executive branch

activities and efforts to protect United States facilities and personnel abroad; and any other relevant issues relating to the attacks, the response to the attacks, or the investigation by the House of Representatives into the attacks.

I think that number nine is a particularly relevant point. It says ''all other relevant issues.'' That is one of the questions that we have been receiving: Are we stepping out of bounds on what this committee was supposed to do? The answer is absolutely not.

Using these instructions as a guide, the committee requested and reviewed a substantial volume of information that was previously produced to the House, and new information never before produced to Congress.

The committee has reviewed more than 20,000 pages of emails and documents produced by the State Department never before released to Congress. This new material includes emails that were sent to or received by the former Secretary of State relevant to Benghazi, as well as documents and emails that were part of the State Department's Accountability Review Board proceedings.

In addition, hundreds of pages of emails never before seen by Congress have been produced by the White House. The Department of Justice and the intelligence community have also produced documents never before seen by Congress.

Further, the committee has interviewed executive branch personnel, including survivors of the Benghazi terror attacks, none of whom have ever been interviewed by previous committees. The committee has also interviewed others who have been able to provide indispensable firsthand details of the U.S. presence in Benghazi, Libya.

We know that this is not a complete universe of information held by the executive branch. Our investigation has uncovered new witnesses, new documents, and new facts related to the Benghazi terror attacks.

Ironically, the largest impediment to getting this investigation done in a timely manner and being able to write a final, definitive accounting of what happened before, during, and after the terrorist attacks in Benghazi is the executive branch itself.

The committee has issued letters, subpoenas, has threatened to hold and has held public compliance hearings, with slow to little to no action at all.

Take the State Department, for example—the State Department is a necessary focus of this investigation; yet their compliance posture with the committee and Congress has proved unpredictable at best.

When this committee was formed 1 year ago, the State Department had yet to fully comply with two outstanding subpoenas issued in 2013 by another committee. One subpoena dealt specifically with documents pertaining to the State Department's Accountability Review Board, known as the ARB.

The other subpoena dealt with documents that had previously undergone limited congressional review, where Members' access to the documents and information was restricted to certain dates and times set by the State Department. These subpoenas were still legally binding on the State Department when this committee was created; yet the Department had not fulfilled them.

In an effort to expedite the Department's fulfillment of these subpoenas, the select committee prioritized the Department's production of documents under these two subpoenas, as opposed to issuing new requests.

In addition, by directing the Department to identify documents under these existing subpoenas, the committee was better positioned to receive new documents in a more expeditious manner while, at the same time, judiciously reviewing the work of past committees.

These negotiations resulted in the State Department providing 15,000 pages of new documents to the committee in August and September of last year. This production also fulfilled the Department's obligation for one of the two subpoenas.

The review of these documents was enlightening, both in what it disclosed and what it did not. Here is what it did disclose. For the first time, the Department produced eight emails, eight to or from former Secretary Clinton.

Additionally, the committee became aware that former Secretary Clinton had used a private email account to conduct official State Department business. Importantly, the committee did not release the existence of the private email account because of its commitment to investigate all the facts in a fair and impartial manner.

Here is what it didn't disclose. From the review of the 15,000 pages, however, the committee recognized that there were significant omissions in the documents. Notably, there were very few emails between and among former Secretary Clinton's senior staff and the Secretary.

As a result, last November, the committee requested the State Department produce specific documents and emails related to Benghazi and Libya for the Secretary and 10 of her senior staff. In the 2 months following the committee's request, committee staff consistently relayed to the Department that its new top priority was all of Secretary Clinton's emails.

Almost 3 months later, on February 13, 2015, the Department produced approximately 300 emails to and from the former Secretary during her time as the head of the State Department. Remember, these are emails of which the State Department never possessed and didn't have to look for; yet it took that length of time.

They didn't produce a single document to the committee related to the remaining portions of the November request. What was the State Department doing during the time the former Secretary was going through her emails?

After they produced these emails, the State Department asked what our priority was. We continued to inform them that the 10 senior officials identified in the November request were our priority, including Cheryl Mills, Jake Sullivan, Huma Abedin, and Susan Rice. The State Department told committee staff that this request was too broad and that it was unable to search for these documents.

On March 4, 2015, the committee issued a subpoena for the documents and emails first requested in November. This subpoena sought documents and emails for the 10 senior State Department officials, including those named previously.

Despite the committee indicating emails and documents from the subpoena were its top priority, the Department informed the committee that it would instead begin producing documents pursuant to the outstanding ARB subpoena. Remember, this subpoena was first issued in August of 2013 and reissued on January 28, 2015, since it expired at the end of the previous Congress.

I would also point out that the law requires that these records—and this is the records from the ARB—and, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that you understand this, that the law says that these ''records shall be separated from all other records of the Department of State and shall be maintained under appropriate safeguards to preserve the confidentiality and classification of information.''

This means the records should have been sitting on a shelf somewhere, easily identifiable. Unfortunately, it took them 2 years to find where this ARB report was supposed to be segregated and put up. The committee continued to indicate that its priority was for the emails from the senior State Department personnel that were first requested in November.

The Department's response: it could not search for these documents. Instead, the Department ignored the committee's request; and, on April 15, 2015, nearly 2 years after Congress first issued a subpoena for the ARB's documents, the State Department finally produced more than 1,700 pages of documents related to the ARB.

Again, instead of responding to the committee's request, on April 23, 2015, the Department produced an additional 2,500 pages of documents related to the ARB. The Department has said that, with minor exceptions, it has now fulfilled the requirements of that subpoena.

Notwithstanding the ARB production, the committee continued to press the Department. Its top priority is the documents from the original November 2014 request and the March subpoena.

The State Department, however, has done little but talk about the breadth

of the subpoena and the inability to adequately search for documents.

The Department continues to state that it does not have the technical capabilities to do such a wide search without specific search terms; yet the Department never used any search terms to conduct in its search, nor has the Department ever suggested any search terms to the committee.

To help the committee better understand the Department's technical capabilities—or lack thereof—the committee has taken several different steps. We asked the State Department to bring its technology expert and its records officer to a meeting to discuss how records were kept, retrieved, and produced.

Specifically, we requested a meeting ''with the relevant people from within the State Department who can explain in detail how the State Department maintains its records and how it has researched for documents pursuant to this committee's November request and further detail the limitations of the Department's ability to fully respond to the Chairman's document request. These people would likely include individuals from Legislative Affairs, Office of the Legal Adviser, Bureau of Information Resource Management, and possibly the records officer and any other individual who will be able to answer detailed questions on the topic. This meeting will help us further sequence and prioritize the information and issues in the committee's request, as you suggested we do in your letter of February 13 to Chairman Gowdy,'' that the State Department sent us.

We also included a list of 13 questions to the Department to help guide the discussion. Samples of these questions include ''the size of the universe of potentially relevant hard copy and/or electronic field for each person from the data range period, keyword or phrase searches the Department plans to use for production,'' and ''any limitations imposed on the type of data to be searched.''

These are some pretty straightforward questions.

□ 1345

When the State Department appeared for the meeting, they did not only bring those subject matter experts with them, the staff they did bring could not answer these basic questions. In fact, it was during this meeting for the first time that the committee learned that the State Department was not in possession of the former Secretary's emails. However, there was no mention of her use of a private server.

The committee again asked the Department to meet with these individuals. Again, the Department did not provide them. At an April 10 meeting between committee staff and the Department, the State Department brought in an individual. Yet when pressed by committee staff on these specific questions, the Department refused to provide the specific answers.

Last week, we continued the pressure. We told the Department that members of the committee, including myself, would travel to the State Department to view firsthand how they search for documents and have a discussion about the shortcomings they claim to have.

But what did the Department do when we told them that we were coming? They scrambled and did everything possible to deter our visit.

Earlier this week, however, we did learn more about the Department's internal process for identifying and reviewing documents, but we didn't get this information from the Department. Instead, we had to learn it from a lawsuit.

This past week, on May 18, the State Department's Acting Director for its Information Programs and Services filed a sworn declaration in a FOIA lawsuit, the Freedom of Information lawsuit. That declaration outlined the steps the State Department had taken since it received approximately 55,000 pages of emails from former Secretary Clinton in December of 2014 to review those documents for public release under the Freedom of Information rules.

Also, in that sworn statement, the State Department asserted that it had dedicated, on a full-time basis, a project manager, two case analysts, and nine Freedom of Information reviewers to review all 55,000 pages of emails since April. These 12 individuals are precisely the 12 FTE positions that were recently funded by the State Department's $2.5 million reprogramming request.

Let me say that again. The State Department repeatedly complained to the committee that a lack of staff and other resources prevented it from making more timely production of documents to the committee, so the committee supported a reallocation of funds to enable the State Department to hire additional staff to work on document production to provide to this committee.

However, we continued to press the State Department for answers. Last month, we went so far as to put in writing 27 specific questions that the State Department needed to answer regarding its ability to produce documents to the committee and the use of the private email account by Secretary Clinton.

These were simple questions that fell into three simple categories. These categories are: the State Department's initial approval, if any, of Secretary Clinton's email server arrangement; the State Department's knowledge about this email server arrangement, its attempt to retrieve her email, and the lack of candor by the Department towards the committee about this, despite the committee's persistent requests for these emails; and number 3, details of the Department's review of her emails to ensure the Department is properly marshaling resources to respond to our requests.

Yet here we are, more than 1 month later, and the Department hasn't even been able to answer a single one of the 27 questions in writing.

In addition, we have attempted on multiple occasions to direct the Department toward specific key documents that we are after. We have prioritized our subpoena from 10 names down to 4 names, and then again down to 3 names. We have prioritized dates of documents from 2 years, down to 1 year, down to 3 months.

But again, here we are, 2½ months after we issued a subpoena and 6 months after we first sent the letter, and the Department has still not produced any of these priority documents. First, we moved a foot, then we moved a yard, and now we have moved our position one mile, but the State Department has not budged 1 inch.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to show a little chart that shows the noncompliance that the State Department has done so far:

On 11/18 of 2014: The committee requests from the Secretary 10 senior officials' documents and emails—response, nothing.

On 12/17, we got a response: Let's meet. No documents produced.

2/13/2015: State produced Clinton emails acquired from her attorney.

3/4/2015: We subpoenaed the documents and emails of the 10 senior officials.

The State Department response: Let's meet. No documents produced.

3/26/2015: Three outstanding requests, ARB documents, 10 senior official documents and emails and server questions.

4/10: Briefing on document retention policies and procedures. No documents produced.

4/14: Compliance needed on both subpoenas.

4/15: Part of ARB documents produced 2 years after requested.

4/18: Two subpoenas outstanding. Full ARB compliance and documents. Emails of 10 senior officials.

4/22: Subpoenas outstanding for full ARB compliance and documents and emails of 10 senior officials.

State response: Just beginning to assess volume of emails. No documents produced.

4/24/2015: Response, second part of ARB documents produced 2 years after requested.

4/27/2015: Reminder of priority of 10 senior officials.

4/29: Response: Estimate given for volume of emails for 2 of the 10 senior officials. No documents produced.

5/4/2015: Lack of compliance on document request is unacceptable.

Response from the State Department: State responds but fails to identify any steps taken to produce documents. No documents produced.

Mr. Speaker, we have done everything we know to do to get these documents so we can finish this investigation. I don't know that anybody has any more right to know what has gone on than the American people and especially those families of those four great Americans that lost their lives.

The only thing holding us up from getting a definitive report of those actions before, during, and after those attacks is this executive branch and their Department of State. We are begging them. And as we have said before, we have moved an inch, we have moved a foot, we have moved a yard, we have moved a mile, and they have not moved one iota.

So our request to them is to listen, to give us the documents and let us finish this report.

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

CONGRESSIONAL ROLE IN TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 12 years since the last debate over trade promotion authority, the last time we considered the role of Congress in trade negotiations. Much has changed since then: the world has changed; trade negotiations have changed; and the role of Congress in trade negotiations has changed.

We all recognize that trade can be beneficial. The issue is not whether Congress could pass an Econ 101 class, as President George W. Bush's chair of the Council of Economic Advisers, Gregory Mankiw, recently put it. The issue is whether we are going to face up to the fact that our trading system today is much more complex than the simplistic trade model presented in an Econ 101 class.

A growing number of prominent economists today recognize those complexities, from Nobel Laureate economists like Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman, to Columbia professor Jeffrey Sachs, former IMF chief economist Simon Johnson, and former White House adviser Jared Bernstein. But too many want to pretend the question of a trade agreement is a ''no-brainer,'' as Professor Mankiw suggests; or that the benefits of trade ''flows from the classic theory of trade gains first expounded by David Ricardo in 1817''—from a Council of Economic Advisers report in May 2015—because, as Charles Krauthammer recently wrote: ''The law of comparative advantage has held up nicely for 198 years.''

What do David Ricardo and Adam Smith have to say about the inclusion of investor-state dispute settlement in our trade agreements? Nothing, to my knowledge. What do they have to say about providing a 12-year monopoly for the sale of biologic medicines? about the need to ensure that our trading partners meet basic labor and environmental standards? How about the issue of currency manipulation? What does the theory of comparative advantage have to say about those issues? Absolutely nothing. And yet those are the issues at the crux of the TPP negotiations today.

So how do the old ideas on trade fall short? Let me mention a few examples:

First, as Joseph Stiglitz pointed out recently, 19th century economics and the theory of comparative advantage assumed a fixed level of technology—no technological changes—and full employment. Those assumptions don't fit very well in today's world.

Second, one of the most critical economic issues facing our country today is growing inequality and a stagnant middle class. Many trade economists believe that trade contributes to that inequality. But some try to downplay that fact by pointing out that other factors may contribute more to the problem, as if that means we should not worry about the impact trade is having. Consider this from Dani Rodrik, a Harvard University economist: ''The gains from trade look rather paltry compared to the redistribution of income . . . In an economy like the U.S., where average tariffs are below 5 percent, a move to complete free trade would reshuffle more than $50 of income among different groups for each dollar of efficiency or 'net' gain created . . . We are talking about $50 of redistribution for every $1 of aggregate gain. It is as if we give $51 to Adam, only to leave David $50 poorer.''

David Rosnick of the Center for Economic and Policy Research expects TPP will have a very small but positive impact on U.S. economic growth—0.13 percent of GDP by 2025. However, he notes that economists today generally agree that trade contributes to growing economic inequality in the United States, with estimates ranging from 10 to 50 percent of the total inequality growth. When he combines these two concepts, GDP growth but rising inequality from trade, he concludes: ''under any reasonable assumptions about the effect of trade on inequality, the median wage earner, and therefore the majority of workers, suffers a net loss as a result of these trade agreements.'' In other words, the economic pie may grow slightly as a result of our trade agreements, but the average American worker gets a smaller slice of that pie.

Similarly, in September The Brookings Institution published an economic research paper by three economists, two affiliated with the Federal Reserve system, that found that trade and globalization accounts for the vast majority of labor's declining share of income in the United States over the past 25 years. Specifically, they found that ''increases in import exposure of U.S. businesses can explain about 3.3 percentage points of the 3.9 percentage point decline in the U.S. payroll share over the past quarter century.''

This underscores that the substance of the trade agreements, the international rules, matter. Our trade agreements must be designed to shape trade, to spread its benefits more broadly.

Third, we need to stop pretending that trade only has benefits and few costs. We need to stop talking exclusively about exports and downplaying the negative impact that some imports have, as the Council of Economic Advisers did in a recent paper.

□ 1400

Of course, imports can help to lower prices for manufacturers and consumers. But lower prices don't do you much good if you have lost your job or seen your wage decline or stagnate. Again, as Jeff Sachs has said, ''It is true that the benefits outweigh the costs, leading to the argument that winners can compensate losers. But in America, winners rarely compensate losers; more often than not, the winners attempt to trounce the losers.''

Mr. Speaker, the old economics models are based in part on trade between countries with similar economic structures. This is no longer the case.

The 12 parties involved in the TPP negotiations—accounting for 40 percent of the world GDP—include economies ranging from some of the world's largest market-oriented economies to some of the smallest, least developed command economies. We have never been able to establish a level playing field with Japan—after decades of trying, and multiple ''agreements'' to solve various problems—and the Japanese market stands virtually closed today in key areas like agriculture and automobiles. We have never negotiated a free trade agreement with a communist country like Vietnam where state-owned enterprises are a major concern and the Communist Party and the once so-called labor union are one and the same.

The issues involved in trade negotiations have also changed dramatically. We are no longer simply negotiating tariff levels. As Professor Jeff Sachs of Columbia University said recently, ''Both TPP and TTIP would be better described as multinational business agreements involving three distinct areas: international trade, cross-border investment, and international business regulation.

The TPP negotiations cover a range of subjects far beyond those negotiated in any previous multilateral negotiation, concerning everything from intellectual property and access to medicines, to financial regulations, food safety measures, basic labor and environmental standards, cross-border data flows, and state-owned enterprises. So the economics of trade have changed, and the trade negotiations themselves have changed, and so too has the congressional role.

In recent years some of us have had to take it upon ourselves to rewrite the rules of trade negotiations. In 2006 when the Democrats took the majority in the U.S. House, we made it clear to the Bush administration that we were not going to consider the Peru, Panama, Colombia, and Korea Free Trade Agreements as negotiated. Each of them would need to be fixed.

CHARLES RANGEL and I worked with our House Democratic colleagues to coauthor what became known as the May 10th Agreement on labor and environmental standards in trade agreements. For the first time, fully enforceable labor and environmental standards would be placed in our trade agreements on equal footing with every other commercial provision. The May 10th Agreement also included important provisions on medicines, investment, and government procurement.

After decades of leading the fight to include worker rights provisions in trade agreements, I considered at the time, and still do today, the May 10th Agreement to be a major breakthrough. In the case of our trade agreements with Peru, Panama, and Colombia, their labor laws were changed to come into compliance with ILO standards before the Congress voted.

Then in 2011, with the Korea FTA, working on a bipartisan basis with then-chairman Dave Camp, with Ford Motor, and the UAW, we urged the Obama administration to go back and renegotiate the specific automotive market opening measures with Korea. And they did so, helping to garner broad bipartisan support in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we established the foundation for progressive trade policy. We saw the value of intense congressional involvement to improve trade agreements. We want to make sure it is built upon, not eroded.

Mr. Speaker, now we are facing the largest multilateral trade negotiations since the Uruguay Round. The TPP has the potential to raise standards and open new markets for U.S. businesses, workers, and farmers—or lock in weak standards, uncompetitive practices, and a system that does not spread the benefits of trade, affecting the paychecks of American families. Once the U.S. lowers its own tariffs as broadly as contemplated in TPP, we will no longer have the leverage to bring about lasting change in other countries.

In January, I described what I believed to be an effective way to resolve outstanding issues in the TPP negotiations. I believed that achieving these outcomes could lead to a landmark TPP agreement worthy of major bipartisan support and mine. Unfortunately, in 4 months, none of these suggestions has been taken on by our negotiators.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Hatch-Wyden-Ryan trade promotion authority fails to put TPP on the right track or to help Congress do so. Chairman RYAN and Senator CRUZ wrote an op-ed entitled, ''Putting Congress in Charge on Trade.'' Senator HATCH declared TPA to include ''strict negotiating objectives'' that give the American people a voice on trade priorities. But saying it is so doesn't make it so.

On all the major issues in the negotiations, the negotiating objectives are obsolete or woefully inadequate. They are basically a wish list. And even worse, at the end of the negotiation, TPA allows the President to certify whether his own negotiators achieved the wish list. And the provisions relating to congressional withdrawal of TPA are meaningless. They are never going to be used because they are unusable.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA gives up congressional leverage at exactly the wrong time. Instead of pressing USTR to get a better agreement or signaling to our negotiating partners that Congress will only accept an agreement that ensures reciprocity and helps to spread the benefits of trade, the Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA puts Congress in the backseat and greases the skids for an up-or-down vote after the fact. Real congressional power is not at the end of the process; it is right now, when the critical outstanding issues are being negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, we must meaningfully address currency manipulation—protracted, large-scale, official, one-way intervention in the currency markets to weaken a currency for the purpose of boosting exports and limiting imports. Currency manipulation has cost the U.S. millions of jobs over the past decade and a half. Many people had trouble finding new jobs or had to accept jobs at lower wages.

China manipulated its currency most dramatically in this time period, accumulating the largest stock of foreign exchange reserves the world has ever known. In earlier episodes, Japan, South Korea, and others manipulated their currencies on a protracted, grand scale. Japan's currency manipulation and other trade-distorting practices kept its auto and other markets closed while Japan had access to a very open U.S. market. This one-way trade decimated the U.S. tool and die industry and seriously injured other segments of the auto industry, including U.S. automakers themselves.

The International Monetary Fund has up-to-date guidelines that define currency manipulation and are intended to prevent it. There is nothing wrong with the spirit or even the letter of those guidelines. Unfortunately, the IMF cannot enforce those guidelines because currency manipulators are able to essentially stall action in that forum.

Arguments that prohibiting currency manipulation in TPP is impossible, for technical or political reasons, remind us of previous claims about trade agreements not being able to help defend forests or discourage child labor. For example, some people—prominent people—have asserted that U.S. monetary policy would be put at risk if currency is included in TPP. I responded to that argument in a highly detailed blog months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include that in the RECORD.

[From the Huffington Post Blog Post, Feb. 6, 2015]

THE NEED TO ADDRESS CURRENCY MANIPULATION IN TPP, AND WHY U.S. MONETARY POLICY IS NOT AT RISK

(By Rep. Sander Levin)

Over the past decade, currency manipulation by foreign governments has resulted in an increase in unfairly traded imports into the United States and has made it more difficult for U.S. exporters to compete in foreign markets. The practice has cost U.S. workers between one million and five million jobs—and is responsible for as much as half of excess unemployment in the United States. It has contributed to stagnant wages and to inequality in the United States. And it contributed to the global financial crisis.*

Bipartisan majorities in the House and the Senate have urged the Administration to include strong and enforceable currency obligations in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which includes a number of former currency manipulators, such as Japan. Other countries interested in joining TPP in the future—such as China, Korea, and Taiwan—are also current or former currency manipulators.

The IMF already prohibits currency manipulation and has developed guidelines to define when it occurs. The problem is that the IMF lacks an enforcement mechanism.

I have proposed taking the existing IMF guidelines, building upon them, and establishing an enforcement mechanism through the TPP. Other groups and economists, such as the American Automotive Policy Council (AAPC) and Fred Bergsten of the Peterson Institute, have tabled similar proposals. Economists on the right and left support including currency disciplines in TPP. And the Commission on Inclusive Prosperity recently stated: ''New trade agreements should explicitly include enforceable disciplines against currency manipulation that appropriately tie mutual trade preferences to mutual recognition that exchange rates should not be allowed to subsidize one party's exports at the expense of others.'' Currency manipulation must become a subject in the TPP negotiations.

A chief concern about including strong and enforceable currency disciplines in TPP is that U.S. monetary policy could be successfully challenged by our trading partners, given that our expansionary monetary policy (in the form of 'quantitative easing') may have had the secondary effect of weakening the dollar. What follows is a factual response to that concern.

Again, my proposal is to take the IMF guidelines and make them enforceable. Under the IMF guidelines, currency manipulation is about government interventions in the foreign exchange markets, not about other policies that may have a secondary impact on foreign exchange rates. The IMF guidelines clearly distinguish between currency manipulation—government intervention in foreign exchange markets—and monetary policy.

Article IV of the IMF's Articles of Agreement states that ''each member shall . . . avoid manipulating exchange rates . . . to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other members.'' The IMF has gone on to provide seven factors in its Guidelines to determine whether a country is manipulating its currency. The following review of each factor identified in those guidelines demonstrates that U.S. monetary policy, including quantitative easing, cannot be described as a form of currency manipulation.

Factor 1: Protracted Large-Scale Intervention, in One Direction, in Currency Markets.

The United States intervenes in the currency market less than almost any other

country in the world. The United States has only intervened in the currency markets a total of three days since the late 1990s: June 17, 1998 (during the Asian exchange rate/financial crisis); September 22, 2000 (after the euro was introduced and concerns grew over the euro's significant depreciation against the dollar); and March 18, 2011 (in connection with a Japanese earthquake and tsunami). These three interventions over nearly 20 years cannot be described as ''protracted'' interventions. Compare this record with, for example, China's interventions over the past decade, which have occurred almost daily, and almost always in the same direction, to weaken their currency.

The circumstances surrounding these three interventions are consistent with the Federal Reserve's Foreign Currency Directive: interventions ''shall generally be directed at countering disorderly market conditions.'' They are therefore not consistent with the objective of ''gaining an unfair competitive advantage'' over its trading partners, which is what currency manipulation is about. In fact, the IMF recommends and encourages members to intervene ''to counter disorderly conditions.'' It is also worth noting that in these three instances, the United States coordinated its intervention with the other countries involved, again demonstrating that the action was not taken to gain a competitive advantage. Indeed, in all three cases the other country requested the intervention of the United States.

While the United States has a flexible exchange rate (i.e., it lets the market determine its value), it is also important to note that the IMF Guidelines do not prevent other countries from establishing a fixed or managed exchange rate. The Guidelines only provide that the rate cannot be set at a consistently artificially low level (i.e., countries may engage in ''protracted, large scale'' interventions, so long as all of these interventions are not all in the same ''direction'').

Factor 2: Excessive Accumulation of Foreign Exchange Reserves.

Despite the fact that the United States has the largest or second largest economy in the world, the United States holds fewer foreign exchange reserves than Thailand, Algeria, and Saudi Arabia, among others. Further, China has 25 times as many foreign exchange reserves (nearly $4 trillion) as the United States ($126 billion).

Economists generally use four benchmarks, cited by Treasury in 2006 and 2014 reports, to determine whether a country's reserves are excessive. U.S. reserves are well below each benchmark:

Benchmark #1—Reserves may be excessive if they exceed 100% of short-term external debt (commonly referred to as the ''Guidotti-Greenspan Rule''). U.S. reserves are equal to 2% of its short-term external debt ($1.2 trillion). If only taking into account debt denominated in foreign currencies, U.S. reserves would equal 38% of short-term debt. Note, however, that this benchmark was designed with emerging markets in mind, not the U.S. economy.

By way of comparison, China's reserves are about 700% (i.e., seven times greater than) its short-term external debt.

Benchmark #2—Reserves are excessive if they exceed 5–20% of money supply, commonly referred to as M2. U.S. reserves are 1.1% of U.S. M2 ($11.7 trillion). China's reserves are 43% of its M2.

Benchmark #3—Reserves are excessive if they exceed 20% of GDP. U.S. reserves are less than 1% of U.S. GDP (around $17 trillion). China's reserves are 42% of its GDP.

Benchmark #4—Reserves are excessive if they exceed 3–4 months of imports. U.S. reserves equal less than a single month of U.S. imports (about $200 billion). China's reserves equal 23 months of its imports.

Factor 3: Restrictions on/Incentives for Transactions or Capital Flows for Balance of Payments Purposes.

The United States has one of the least restrictive regulatory structures in the world concerning the free flow of capital. In fact, the World Economic Forum ranks the United States first in the world in terms of capital account liberalization and second in the world under a more general 'financial development' index.

Factor 4: Encouragement of Capital Flows through Monetary Policy for Balance of Payments Purposes.

This is the only guideline that even mentions monetary policy. And while the United States—and every other country in the world—does have a monetary policy, the purpose of U.S. monetary policy is neither to encourage capital flows nor to achieve a balance in payments. The goals of U.S. monetary policy are spelled out in the Federal Reserve Act, which specifies that the Board of Governors and the Federal Open Market Committee should seek ''to promote effectively the goals of maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates.''

Indeed, the IMF has explicitly supported U.S. monetary policy (including each round of quantitative easing since the ''Great Recession''). As the IMF said in its most recent report ''[IMF] Directors agreed that the current highly accommodative stance of monetary policy is appropriate, consistent with the Federal Reserve's objectives of maximum employment and price stability.'' The IMF has also noted that U.S. monetary policy has been good for other nations ('positive spillover effects') because it has helped to sustain global growth. Similarly, the G-20 (which includes China, Japan, Korea, the United States, and three other TPP countries) has distinguished between monetary policy and exchange rate policy—and has recognized ''the support that has been provided to the global economy in recent years from accommodative monetary policies, including unconventional monetary policies.''

Factor 5: Fundamental Exchange Rate Misalignment.

If anything, the U.S. dollar is properly valued or even overvalued, not undervalued, according to the most recent IMF data and estimates. Further, given the continued weakening of the yen and euro, many expect the dollar to further strengthen in value in 2015.

Factor 6: Long and Sustained Current Account Surpluses.

The United States has had just one current account surplus since 1981. In fact, the United States has been running large current account and trade deficits for almost four decades. Indeed, those imbalances are a major cause of concern to many economists—and currency manipulation by other countries has contributed substantially to the U.S. trade deficits in recent years.

Factor 7: Large External Sector Vulnerabilities from Private Capital Flows.

While the United States does have external sector vulnerabilities (i.e., private and public sector debt owed to foreigners), as reflected in the large current account deficit, much of those vulnerabilities stem from purchases of U.S. debt by foreign governments—not private capital flows. And much of those purchases by foreign governments are the result of foreign government intervention in the currency markets that result in the accumulation of foreign reserves. Thus, if anything, this factor, like Factor 6, tends to suggest that the United States is a casualty of other governments' currency manipulation, not that it is manipulating itself.

The IMF Guidelines demonstrate that the United States is not manipulating its currency and would not be at risk of losing a dispute. The far greater risk is that more middle class jobs will be lost in the United States as a result of foreign governments' currency manipulation. We need strong and enforceable disciplines in TPP to help prevent that from happening.

ENDNOTE

*China's currency manipulation ''is arguably the most important cause of the financial crisis. Starting around the middle of this decade, China's cheap currency led it to run a massive trade surplus. The earnings from that surplus poured into the United States. The result was the mortgage bubble.'' Sebastian Mallaby, ''What OPEC Teaches China,'' Washington Post op-ed (Jan. 2009). The Bush Administration White House also drew the connection: ''the President highlighted a factor that economists agree on: that the most significant factor leading to the housing crisis was cheap money flowing into the U.S. from the rest of the world, so that there was no natural restraint on flush lenders to push loans on Americans in risky ways. This flow of funds into the U.S. was unprecedented.'' Statement by White House Press Secretary Dana Perino (Dec. 2008). Most of the cheap money flowing into the United States came from foreign governments (not the private sector) accumulating foreign exchange reserves and other official assets. See Joseph E. Gagnon, ''Global Imbalances and Foreign Asset Expansion by Developing-Economy Central Banks,'' Peterson Institute for International Economics (Mar. 2012).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have seen no serious rebuttal of the points I made in that post or to similar and related points made by Simon Johnson, Fred Bergsten, and many other notable economists ranging from Art Laffer to Paul Krugman. Nevertheless, those who oppose currency disciplines continue to raise this false argument.

Mr. Speaker, TPP should address instances in which countries buy large amounts of foreign assets over long periods of time to prevent an appreciation of their exchange rate despite running a large current account surplus. The Federal Reserve does not engage in such practices. That is why the U.S. already agreed to and even insisted upon what is in the current IMF guidelines.

And now there is the claim that including currency disciplines in TPP would be a poison pill and that our trading partners would walk away from the table. There is no way to accurately judge this issue until it is properly brought to the negotiating table. To the contrary, the fact is that the administration says this only creates the risk of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

□ 1415

It is irresponsible to make this claim. Indeed, our trading partners in TPP would greatly benefit from these disciplines. Many of them are the victims of manipulation in every bit as much as we are.

A progressive trade agreement for workers and the middle class must address currency manipulation, which has caused millions of job losses and contributed to waste stagnation over the last decade. President Obama is right that we should write the rules and not accept the status quo; but, if

we fail to do address currency manipulation in TPP, we are essentially letting China write the rules and are accepting an unacceptable status quo.

It is vital that our trade agreements balance strong intellectual property rights and access to affordable, lifesaving medicines. Absent a change in course, the final TPP text is likely to provide less access to affordable medicines than provided under the May 10 agreement. My staff has just reviewed a new version of the text that raises some serious new questions; but even the last version of the text raised serious concerns.

For example, developing countries would likely be required to ''graduate'' to more restrictive intellectual property rights standards before they become developed, a clear inconsistency with May 10. There are also a number of concerns that the TPP agreement will restrict access to medicines in the U.S. and other developed countries, for example, by encouraging second patents on similar products, by having long periods of data exclusivity for biologic medicines, by allowing drug companies to challenge government pricing and reimbursement decisions.

Oxfam, a coalition of 17 international development organizations, recently said:

> TPP would do more to undermine access to affordable medicines than any previous U.S. trade agreement, and the intellectual property provisions in TPP reverse the positive step taken under the May 10 agreement in 2007 . . . and thus are a step backwards for public health.

And amFAR, the Foundation for AIDS Research, said this:

> Our gains in reducing global HIV infections would never have been realized if the proposed provisions under the TPP were the intellectual property standard in 2001.

For most of the past 15 years, our trade deficit with Japan has been second only to our deficit with China, and over two-thirds of the current deficit is in automotive products.

Japan has long had the most closed automotive market of any industrialized country, despite repeated efforts by U.S. negotiators over decades to open it. At a minimum, the U.S. should not open its market further to Japanese imports, through the phaseout of tariffs, until we have time to see whether Japan has truly opened its market.

The administration has not stated a specific period of time for when the phaseout in U.S. tariffs for autos, trucks, and auto parts would begin or when they would end. The parties are also still working to address certain nontariff barriers that Japan utilizes to close their market.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA bill broadly states that the U.S. should ''expand competitive market opportunities for export of goods.'' Such a broad negotiating objective provides no guidance regarding how to truly open the Japanese automotive market.

On the related issue of rules of origin, there are a number of rules of origin being negotiated in the TPP for different products, including in the sensitive textile and apparel, agricultural, and automotive sectors. Some of the rules are largely settled while others, including the rules for automotive products, remain open and controversial.

Rules of origin define the extent to which inputs from outside the TPP region—for example, China—can be incorporated into an end product for that product to still be entitled to preferential/duty-free treatment under the agreement.

The rule should be restrictive enough to ensure that the benefits of the agreement accrue to the parties to the agreement. The automotive rule of origin in TPP should be at least as stringent as the rule in NAFTA, given that TPP involves all three of the NAFTA countries, plus nine others.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA bill provides no guidance whatsoever on any rule of origin on any product in the TPP negotiations. It appears that the U.S. and Japan will agree that Japan will reduce tariffs, but never eliminate them, on hundreds of agricultural products, far more carve-outs than under any U.S. trade agreement in the past.

Canada, on the other hand, has not put any offer on the table for dairy products, which is causing some concern in the dairy industry.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA bill has as its objective, ''reducing or eliminating'' tariffs on agricultural products; thus even Japan's opening offer, to reduce but never eliminate tariffs on nearly 600 products, satisfied this objective, demonstrating that it is meaningless.

The TPP negotiations are taking a different approach on environment than we did in the May 10 agreement and in our FTAs with Peru, Panama, Colombia, and Korea, where we stated simply that each country was obligated to implement seven multilateral environment agreements.

TPP negotiators are trying to build the same obligations from scratch, and we still do not know if they have succeeded. Words like ''endeavor'' and ''take steps to'' are not going to lead to the revolutionary changes we have been told to expect.

The President said at Nike recently that the TPP environmental chapter would ''help us do things that haven't been done before.'' Actually, we have done these things before. In May 10, Peru included a special annex on deforestation. It needs more vigorous enforcement.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA bill is obsolete in providing instructions since the TPP is already taking a different approach. The TPA bill also does not address whether or how climate change issues should be handled in TPP, an issue raised by other countries in the TPP negotiations.

There are now more cases of private investors challenging environmental, health, and other regulations in nations, even nations with strong and independent judicial systems and rule of law.

Just last month—just last month—an investor won a NAFTA ISDS case in which the government of Nova Scotia denied a permit to develop a quarry in an environmentally sensitive area.

Other investment disputes involve ''plain packaging'' of tobacco products in Australia aimed at protecting public health and pharmaceutical patent requirements in Canada. This issue is receiving heightened scrutiny among negotiators and from a broad range of interested parties.

Some of our TPP partners do not support ISDS or are seeking safeguards to ensure that nations preserve their right to regulate. The Economist magazine, the Cato Institute, and the Government of Germany—the birthplace of ISDS—have also recently expressed concerns with ISDS.

As far back as 2007, when the May 10 agreement was reached, we recognized growing concerns over investment and ISDS. We insisted that our trade agreements with Peru, Panama, Colombia, and Korea include new preambular language clarifying that the investment obligations in those agreements are not invented to provide foreign investors with greater substantive rights than investors have under U.S. law.

Over the past few years, our concerns over the investment text and ISDS have become even greater. Nevertheless, our negotiators have refused to include the May 10 preambular language in TPP, and the text of the investment chapter in TPP is basically the same model as adopted 10 years ago, even though conditions have changed dramatically in the past 10 years and calls for changes to or elimination of the chapter have intensified.

Despite proposals to include new safeguards in the ISDS mechanism, the administration has not made any attempts to incorporate them.

The Hatch-Wyden-Ryan TPA investment negotiating objective is the same as it was 12 years ago and, again, is obsolete.

TPP does not ensure compliance by TPP parties that have labor laws and practices that fall short of international standards contained in the May 10 agreement, even though TPP is expected to include the May 10 language.

Vietnam presents the greatest challenge we have ever had in ensuring compliance. Workers there are prohibited from joining any union independent of the Communist Party. While the administration is discussing these issues with Vietnam, Members of Congress and stakeholder advisers have not yet seen any proposal to address these critical areas.

On a recent trip to Vietnam, I met a woman who had been thrown in jail for 4 years for trying to organize workers into an independent union. We cannot simply have the right written obligation in the agreement and expect that

some future dispute settlement panel is going to ensure meaningful change on the ground for workers.

The administration has not committed to ensuring that all changes to laws and regulations are made before Congress votes, as was true with Peru, Panama, and Colombia.

The administration also does not make available to Members of Congress any ''consistency plan'' they are discussing with Vietnam so that we can evaluate the changes to Vietnamese laws and practices they are seeking.

From what I understand, any plan will fall far short of bringing Vietnam into compliance with basic ILO standards, as required under the May 10 agreement. For example, I am concerned Vietnam may refuse to allow industrywide unions to form, a clear inconsistency with ILO standards. Our negotiators also have refused to accept our suggestion that an independent panel be established from the beginning to ensure compliance with the labor obligations and expedite a dispute.

Without such a structure, future cases will need to be built from scratch by outside groups and submitted to the U.S. Government, a process which has taken several years for the Department of Labor to act on in Honduras and Guatemala.

The President said recently that Vietnam ''would even have to protect workers' freedom to form unions, for the first time,'' but the TPP that USTR is negotiating seems far from ensuring those words will become real.

□ 1430

Mexico also has a long way to go. Americans know that Mexico competes in manufacturing. According to Professor Harley Shaiken at UC Berkeley:

''Under NAFTA, the auto industry in Mexico has grown rapidly, and it is in the midst of an unprecedented expansion. Mexico assembled over 3 million vehicles in 2013—more than Canada—and exported over 80 percent of them, mostly to the U.S. Global automakers plan to invest $6.8 billion in Mexico between 2013 and 2015. As a result, Mexico is on track to become the leading source of imported vehicles for the U.S. market by 2015, surpassing both Canada and Mexico. Moreover, Mexico exported $44.8 billion in auto parts to the U.S. last year, more than Japan, Korea, and Germany combined.''

The wage rate in Mexico is about 20 percent of a comparable rate in the U.S.

The administration likes to say that TPP will renegotiate NAFTA. I am all for that, but, again, words in the agreement are not enough. Mexico has to change their laws and their practices. For example, they have to get rid of so-called ''protection contracts'' that serve to block real representation in the workplace, and they need to fundamentally reform or replace the conciliation and arbitration boards that are responsible for resolving disputes over workplace representation and other labor issues. This is vitally important because U.S. workers compete directly with Mexican workers in critical manufacturing and other sectors. While I understand the administration has started conversations with Mexico, I am not informed of any consistency plan that would detail the changes Mexico needs to make to their laws.

TPP negotiators are also working on disciplines for state-owned enterprises, or SOEs. Countries that rely heavily on state-controlled and state-funded enterprises are able to give those champions an enormous and unfair advantage over private companies that compete against them in the marketplace.

The TPP would include disciplines on SOEs that are expected in language to go beyond anything we have ever included in past agreements, but the extent to which an SOE provision will help to level the playing field will be determined by the degree to which parties seek very broad, country-specific carve-outs for particular SOEs. As concerning, the definition of ''SOEs'' is too narrow, allowing enterprises that are effectively controlled by foreign governments—but where the government owns less than 50 percent of the shares—to circumvent the obligations.

There are several other TPP issues that need to be addressed. Food safety is one of them. There is a very broad consensus that not enough resources are being devoted to ensure the safety of our imports. What are we going to do about this issue? It is a real issue in the debate. Unfortunately, specific portions of the negotiations and the shortcomings in TPP are often difficult to discuss because the documents are classified.

I have not argued that the entire negotiations should be open to the public. I understand that, in a wide range of contexts, from peace negotiations to labor negotiations, it is widely assumed that negotiations at times need to be held behind closed doors, and at this point, I am not convinced that trade negotiations are different. The negotiators need to communicate frequently and effectively with stakeholders to ensure that they are seeking the right provisions in negotiations. In a number of respects, our negotiators were not doing that when the TPP negotiations were in the early or even not so early stages.

Thanks to constant pressure from Members of Congress over the past several years, we have made some progress in this regard. For example, just a couple of years ago, USTR refused to share the bracketed text—laying out the positions of various parties—with any Member of Congress. We got them to change that. Much more recently, they refused to let staff from personal offices assist their Members with the text even where the staff member had a top secret security clearance. We got them to change that.

Still, there remain unreasonable and burdensome restrictions on access to the text. For example, Congress created a system of stakeholder advisers many years ago to provide advice to our negotiators and to Congress on the negotiations, but those advisers still can only see U.S. negotiating proposals. They cannot see the proposals of our trading partners. It is very difficult, if not impossible, for them to provide negotiating advice if they can't know what the other side is seeking. Moreover, personal office staff with top secret security clearances still cannot see the negotiating text until the Member is present.

Let me say a few more words about this.

I am not at all confident that our negotiators are sharing with Members of Congress or the stakeholder advisers all of the texts that are being exchanged with other TPP countries. For example, we know our negotiators, as I have said, have been discussing a labor consistency plan with Vietnam for many months now at least, but there is still no text for Members of Congress to review. This is one of the major outstanding issues in TPP, and yet there is no text to review despite the fact that USTR has told us for at least a year now that the negotiations were nearly complete. At a recent meeting to discuss Vietnam, it was classified so that the status of negotiations on this issue cannot be discussed publicly. Many of us left less confident that there has been any progress in the negotiations.

Or take currency manipulation. For years, literally, we have pressed what the administration's position is on the issue given that majorities in both the House and the Senate have urged that strong and enforceable currency disciplines be included in TPP. For years, the administration said it was still deliberating on the issue and had no answer. Now, when pushed through the TPA debate in Congress, the administration claims that they could not possibly include enforceable disciplines in TPP because they would be a poison pill.

Finally, I do not understand why the administration is selectively able to reveal to the public certain aspects that they think the public will like, but those of us who have concerns cannot reveal them. We have examples of officials revealing to the press very specific things from the negotiating text, like when tariffs will be eliminated on a particular product. In my view, as to the Environment Chapter, the problem with that chapter is that many of the verbs used in those obligations—the essence of the commitments—are very weak, but I, presumably, can't tell you what those verbs are.

So one has a hard time understanding the rationale for this process. The way it has been handled by the administration does not make Members and other key parties real participants with a meaningful role, understanding and impacting decisions undertaken in this important negotiation.

Let me say a word regarding an issue that has come up recently. In addition to falling short in getting TPP on the right track, the TPA bill also presents dangers with other agreements. This TPA will be, essentially, in place for 6 years. It gives the President a great deal of latitude in deciding which agreements to negotiate with whatever trading partners the President wants and covering whatever subject the President wants.

Recently, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN drew heavy criticism for expressing the concern that TPA could be used by a Republican President to undermine Dodd-Frank. The concern was dismissed as speculative and desperate, but as explained below, the concern is genuine and legitimate.

In ongoing trade agreement negotiations to establish a TTIP, European officials, U.S. and European banks, and some congressional Republicans have expressed an interest in harmonizing U.S. and EU financial services in a way that would water down U.S. laws and regulations. Similarly, some Republican Presidential candidates have expressed an interest in weakening or in repealing Dodd-Frank, although not simply through the TTIP negotiations. Of course, doing so through TTIP negotiations would give the President the excuse that agreeing to weaken Dodd-Frank was simply part of a quid pro quo to get something we wanted from Europe.

According to an article from Politico: ''White House and pro-trade officials on the Hill say that the fast-track bill currently before Congress includes language that expressly forbids changing U.S. law without congressional action.'' But this language is nothing new. Legislation to implement trade agreements typically includes similar language. The purpose of the language is simply to make clear that, under U.S. law, our trade agreements do not have ''direct effect'' and are not ''self-executing,'' meaning that domestic laws and regulations need to be amended to give effect to any obligation in an international agreement.

Implementing bills typically make changes to U.S. tariff laws to comply with the tariff obligations of trade agreements, but some implementing bills make more substantial, behind-the-border changes to U.S. laws to comply with the obligations in our trade agreements. That has been true of changes to U.S. patent laws and changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With all of these concerns in mind—and, above all, my determination to do everything I can to get TPP in shape to garner broad, bipartisan support in Congress—the Ways and Means Democrats offered a substitute amendment during the markup of the TPA bill. That amendment, the Right Track for TPP Act, includes negotiating instructions, not merely ''negotiating objectives'' like the TPA bill, on each of the 12 major outstanding issues, some of which I have described earlier. It provides that the President will not get an up-or-down vote unless and until Congress determines that the instructions have been followed. It also includes real mechanisms to ensure that a poorly negotiated TPP agreement will not be placed on a fast track.

Regrettably, our substitute amendment was blocked in committee based on a highly questionable procedural determination from the chair. In essence, while the Republican majority was free to mark up a bill that was in both the jurisdiction of our committee and the Rules Committee, we were denied the right to do the very same thing. Our chair was concerned about stepping on the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee, and yet the Rules Committee has waived jurisdiction over the TPA bill.

As is often the case with trade debates, they become about something they are not. This debate is not about being for TPP or against. I am for the right TPP, and that is why I want Congress to be in a position to press negotiators to secure a better outcome.

This debate is not about letting China write the rules. I wrote the amendments to the bill granting China PNTR to try and ensure China did not write the rules when they entered the WTO.

□ 1445

This debate is not about isolationism. Neither I nor any colleague of mine is arguing that we should pull up the drawbridge and isolate ourselves. Indeed, most of us who currently oppose TPA right now have demonstrated on a broad range of issues that we are internationalists, perhaps more so than those who support TPA.

This debate is not about national security or the pivot to Asia. I understand the national security issues. Indeed, what happened was years ago Wilbur Mills said let's take trade negotiations out of the State Department and put them in USTR in order to be sure that the economic advantages were not traded away for political advantages.

In the world today, I don't see how a trade agreement can be in our national security interest if it isn't in our economic interest. Fifty years ago, when the U.S. was an economic superpower, unlike any other nation in the world, maybe we could grant our trading partners disproportionate and nonreciprocal conditions in exchange for political advantages. That is what Wilbur Mills said. That is not the case today. Our economic security is critical to our national security.

Proponents of TPA are trying to sell TPA by selling TPP itself. Unfortunately, that is the problem. TPP is not yet on the right track. It has not earned ''the most progressive trade agreement in history'' moniker that the President has given it. The best course for Congress is to withhold fast track until we know TPP is on a better course, to press the administration to work with us and really respond to our concerns by changing the course of negotiations, to send a signal to our negotiating partners that the Congress has set a high bar for negotiations, that we are demanding the best deal; and, in a number of areas, I think these countries will welcome the improvements I have suggested.

At the end of the day, the goal is to achieve a Trans-Pacific Partnership worthy of support, a TPP that spreads the benefits of trade to the broadest swath of the American public and addresses trade's negative impacts. That is really what this negotiation is all about. This is what really, really very much motivates my concern to get TPP right, not to give away our leverage until TPP is correct.

Voting now for TPA, when there is so much yet to be done to make TPP right, essentially gives away our leverage, essentially is a kind of a blank check to the administration. I feel so deeply about the importance of trade, the importance of getting it right, that I really urge that should be our focus.

So I urge my colleagues not to give away our leverage, not to vote for TPA until TPP is done correctly. That is the challenge before us. That is the challenge likely to be before the House of Representatives the week after next. That is a challenge that we must surmount. That is a challenge that we must meet. That is a reflection of the years of many of us in trying to make trade be put on the right track.

That motivated us years ago when we put together the May 10 agreement; that motivated us when we negotiated the agreement with Peru, we who negotiated it. That is our dedication. We support trade when expanded trade is shaped so that all benefit. That is not true today of this TPP, and therefore I hope my colleagues will join together in voting ''no'' on TPA until TPP is gotten right. That is our goal; that is our purpose—that is our only purpose—and I think that is our challenge, and I hope the week after next we are going to meet it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, America is a beacon of hope and opportunity to the world for a reason. Our military veterans, whom we honor this Monday during Memorial Day, put their lives on the line for our freedoms and constitutional rights. Our Founders put in place a Constitution that is inspired by the fundamental Judeo-Christian belief that men and women are created in God's image, with the right to life, property, freedom to worship, and carry out their

religious convictions without government interference or persecution.

We may take this idea for granted today, with 250 years of history at our backs, but at the time of our Nation's founding, the idea of religious freedom was radical. The world was a different place then. God-fearing, peaceful citizens around the world were commonly persecuted for their beliefs. They were tortured and thrown in prison without a fair hearing. In short, they did not have freedom. These are rights and freedoms that many in our country take for granted. They were denied what our Founders held to be basic human rights.

So at a great risk to themselves and their families, but with deeply held optimism for a new and better future, they sailed the Atlantic Ocean for the shores of the New World, for America.

Here they planted a new society based on freedom. Centuries later, we in this legislative body, are the guardians of this legacy. We are here to advance freedom and protect liberty. But we must be vigilant in this task.

President Ronald Reagan once said:

> Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States where men were free.

I agree with President Reagan, and that is why I rise today. Our basic freedoms are under attack. We must stand up and fight. We don't need to search long to find the wreckage of a society that does not value freedom.

I recently met with a group of constituents, Syrian Americans who live in Charleston, West Virginia. Many of them have family members and loved ones in Syria. Their stories provide a strong warning to us. In Syria, a cruel and brutal dictator, al-Assad, is attempting to silence opposing views. He has resorted to chemical weapon attacks on his own people. He has gunned down his own citizens. He has bombed hospitals and apartment complexes full of women and children. We can learn an important lesson from Syria: once tyranny grabs hold, it will grow and expand its reach. And the consequences can be drastic. In Syria, 4 out of 5 people live in poverty, more than 200,000 have been killed, a million wounded, and more than 3 million have fled the country.

But we should not be so arrogant as to think that our liberties here at home in the United States are safe. The evidence that our basic freedoms are under siege is growing, and I would like to share just a few stories that have recently come to my attention. For example, an 8-year-old second grade student in a New Jersey public school wanted to sing ''Awesome God'' at her after-school talent show, but she was told she couldn't because of the song's religious lyrics.

The Arizona Republic reported in July of 2012 that the pastor of a church in Phoenix, Arizona, was jailed and fined $12,000 for hosting a Bible study meeting in his private home. They outrageously claimed it violated zoning and fire code ordinances.

Five men in Richmond, Virginia, were threatened with arrest by local police officers for sharing their faith on a public sidewalk.

The University of Missouri threatened to withhold a student's diploma because she refused to participate in a class assignment that required her to write a letter to the Missouri legislator in support of homosexual adoption.

In a New York hospital, a pro-life nurse was coerced into providing a late-term abortion, even though her workplace had agreed in writing to honor her religious beliefs.

And in the beautiful Second Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the honor of representing, Joe Holland, a businessowner, is currently being pushed to violate his religious views and values by an ObamaCare regulation that requires him to provide abortifacient drugs to his employees as a part of so-called health care. A regulation commonly known as the HHS mandate requires him to provide the drugs or face a penalty of $100 per day per employee. For a company of 150 employees, that is about $5.5 million a year, or about $36,000 per employee.

These are just a few of the alarming stories about the religious freedoms of peaceful, God-fearing Americans being snatched away by a government that has lost its way. It is no coincidence that the very First Amendment to the United States Constitution says: ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.''

Religious freedom was protected in the First Amendment to the Constitution. Our Forefathers valued that. They knew what could happen if we didn't protect our religious freedom.

We must take action and recommit ourselves to this basic right. Congress actually has taken action in the past on a bipartisan basis. In 1993, Congress passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, signed by President Clinton. The law says the government should not force anyone to violate their sincere religious beliefs, whether those beliefs are considered widely shared or not. This legislation unanimously passed this Chamber, United States House of Representatives, and it passed the Senate by a vote of 97–3 on October 27, 1993.

The broad support is because the legislation simply affirms our constitutionally endowed rights. But now support for this formerly bipartisan, widely supported law is eroding to the point that it has come under attack around the country, the recent events in Indiana being the recent highest profile example.

I believe that this Congress must be a Congress of action in defending religious freedoms. I understand that my good friend and colleague from Idaho, Mr. LABRADOR, is working on a bill to protect institutions and individuals who believe that marriage is between one man and one woman. I support this effort, and I look forward to being an original cosponsor when he introduces the bill.

I am also a proud cosponsor of the Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act, which will ensure that adoption and foster care providers are not excluded by States for offering their services based on their religious beliefs. Unfortunately, some States have already begun punishing faith-based organizations that provide these services because of their religious beliefs. These religious freedom protections are needed now, and I hope they will be allowed a vote in this Chamber.

We can't do this alone. We do need the President, President Obama, to join with us to protect religious freedom. The President said on June 26, 2013, regarding the U.S. Supreme Court decision to strike down the Defense of Marriage Act the following about religious freedom: ''On an issue as sensitive as this, knowing that Americans hold a wide range of views based on deeply held beliefs, maintaining our Nation's commitment to religious freedom is also vital.''

□ 1500

If the President really believes that religious freedom is ''vital,'' he must back his words up with action. That hasn't happened. In fact, just the opposite has occurred, with the administration's attack on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which attacks those who believe in religious freedom, through its HHS mandate and its attack on the Defense of Marriage Act. He is not protecting religious freedom. We have to do that here.

We have a sacred obligation to pass on to our children and grandchildren a country that has the same love for liberty and religious freedom as the one we inherited, but this won't happen on its own. We need to stand up and fight with courage and conviction, fight right here and right now.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF ALBERT MELVIN MILLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable life and accomplishments of Mr. Albert Melvin Miller, who passed away on Sunday, May 10, at Inova Alexandria Hospital.

Melvin was a well-known political and community leader in the city of Alexandria, Virginia. One of his crowning achievements was his work with the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority, protecting and expanding affordable housing programs across the city.

Mel was a civil rights advocate, a mentor, and a beloved father. He was also a character: kind, interested, ever present, honest, hard-working, inspirational, and—above all—witty. Mel Miller was a person you wanted to spend time with.

Mel grew up in Haddonfield, New Jersey, but his heart belonged to Raleigh, North Carolina, where his alma mater, Saint Augustine's University, is located, and to his adopted hometown of Alexandria, Virginia.

Graduating from Saint Aug's in history and political science, he remained deeply involved with the school by serving on the board of trustees for 35 years and encouraging Alexandria's students to attend his beloved university.

After earning his JD from Howard University School of Law, Melvin was admitted to the Virginia State Bar and moved to Alexandria in 1958. Early in his Alexandria life, Melvin begin his civil rights activism and community involvement by doing pro bono work on school desegregation issues.

This work led him to join an underground association unofficially named the ''Secret Seven,'' which met to discuss possible ways to discuss civil rights and liberties in Alexandria and the surrounding areas. This early local involvement led him to become a prominent figure in Alexandria's education system and the authority and champion for affordable housing.

Melvin's work for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority helped to provide housing for hundreds of Alexandria's poor. His crowning achievement was a deal by Melvin between the city of Alexandria and ARHA, which required any affordable housing that was destroyed to be matched one-for-one with new developments. That deal still stands largely untouched today.

Mel was a tireless mentor of Alexandria's students and an avid high school sports fan. He could often be seen and heard giving advice to local students and cheering at high school sporting events. He also served on the Alexandria school board from 1986 to 1993, serving as board chair from 1990 to 1992.

Mel is survived by his daughter, Ericka Miller; his son, Marc Miller, and wife, Mary; his grandchildren, Max, Chris, Zachary, and Bennett Miller; his daughter-in-law, Vicky McCauley; and a host of other relatives and many friends.

Melvin was preceded in death by son, Eric. His wife of nearly 5 years, Eula Miller, passed away in 2011. Eula was also a tremendous advocate for education in northern Virginia, having helped create many programs supporting caregivers and young mothers in local high schools and Northern Virginia Community College.

I offer my condolences to his family and all the people who have been affected by the loss of this amazing man. Mr. Albert Melvin Miller is a shining example of the effect one person can have on so many local lives. I hope his memory lives as an inspiration for local leaders to come.

At his funeral yesterday, former T.C. Williams High School legendary football coach Herman Boone ended his eulogy with the call to ''Remember the Titan,'' Melvin Miller.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

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

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 18, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1191. A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 606. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

Karen L. Haas. Clerk of the House, further reported that on May 19, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2252. To clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 22, 2015, at 2:30 p.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. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program to cover recipients of Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2488. A bill to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice by restoring and expanding the Medicare open enrollment and disenrollment opportunities repealed by section 3204(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; 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. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 2489. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to establish a program to provide grant assistance to States for the rehabilitation and repair of deficient dams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 2490. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the prohibition against interment or memorialization in the National Cemetery Administration or Arlington National Cemetery of persons committing Federal or State capital crimes is consistently carried out, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disinter the remains of George E. Siple from Indiantown Gap National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 2491. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to require consultation with State and local elected officials and a public hearing before awarding grants or contracts for housing facilities for unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GRAHAM (for herself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 2492. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to provide for modification of certain Federal water resources development

projects on the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2493. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage the use of assistance dogs by certain members of the Armed Forces and veterans; 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. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BASS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2494. A bill to support global anti-poaching efforts, strengthen the capacity of partner countries to counter wildlife trafficking, designate major wildlife trafficking countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. HAHN, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2495. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for the TIGER Discretionary Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2496. A bill to extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. considered and passed.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 2497. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to eliminate duplicative environmental reviews and approvals under State and Federal law of rail and highway projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require that the Congressional Budget Office prepare long-term estimates for reported bill and joint resolutions that would have significant fiscal impact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BOST, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 2499. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs, to help create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2500. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 2501. A bill to require certain States to retain the Congressional redistricting plans in effect as of the first day of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress until such States carry out a redistricting plan in response to the apportionment of Representatives resulting from the regular decennial census conducted in 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 2502. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for bundled payments for certain episodes of care surrounding a hospitalization; 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. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 2503. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to prevent the payment of unemployment benefits to incarcerated individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2504. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2505. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans; 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. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2506. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings; 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. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2507. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage; 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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 2508. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit further reductions in sodium levels and to reinstate the grain-rich requirements applicable to the national school lunch and breakfast programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 2509. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Social Security Act relating to demonstration projects designed to promote the reemployment of unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DOLD, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 2510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2511. A bill to condition the eligiblity of disabled children aged 16 or 17 for supplemental security income benefits on school attendance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2512. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that Federal employees who receive back pay for a period during which they are furloughed due to a lapse in appropriations may not also receive unemployment compensation for the same period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 2513. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of hospitals under the Medicare program, 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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent veterans from being disqualified from contributing to health savings accounts by reason of receiving medical care for service-connected disabilities under programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to eating disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and 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. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JONES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of health care professionals to treat veterans via telemedicine; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2517. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring energy tax incentives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 2518. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to update reporting requirements for institutions of higher education and provide for more accurate and complete data on student retention, graduation, and earnings outcomes at all levels of postsecondary enrollment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 2519. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of audiologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing audiology services under the Medicare program, to improve access to the audiology services available for coverage under the Medicare program and to enable beneficiaries to have their choice of a qualified audiologist to provide such services, 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. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of excise tax on distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 2521. A bill to reinstate Federal Pell Grant eligibility for individuals incarcerated in Federal and State penal institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2522. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to award grants for the provision of furniture, household items, and other assistance to homeless veterans to facilitate their transition into permanent housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2523. A bill to make improvements to the antidumping and countervailing duty laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KIND, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DOLD, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitations for deductible new business expenditures and to consolidate provisions for start-up and organizational expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VELA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COSTA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YODER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. TORRES, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BOST, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 2525. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of Hero Street USA; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 2526. A bill to require automobile manufacturers to disclose to consumers the presence of event data recorders, or ''black boxes'', on new automobiles, and to require manufacturers to provide the consumer with the option to enable and disable such devices on future automobiles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2527. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, as the ''Jeanne Sobelson Manford Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2528. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to States to pay the Federal share of carrying out full-day prekindergarten programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2529. A bill to establish limitations on the quantity of inorganic arsenic in rice and rice products under chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. TAKAI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr.

LIPINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 2530. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COOK, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2531. A bill to amend section 701 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to clarify the period of eligibility during which certain spouses are entitled to assistance under the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 2532. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 2533. A bill to amend the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 relating to local guard contracts abroad under the diplomatic security program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 2534. A bill to amend the Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006 (the SAFE PORT Act) to administer a pilot program for 100 percent scanning of cargo containers at domestic ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 2535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a $1,000 refundable credit for individuals who are bona fide volunteer members of volunteer firefighting and emergency medical service organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2536. A bill to provide access to medication-assisted therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 2537. A bill to provide for higher education reform; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 2538. A bill to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 2539. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the amount of monthly dependency and indemnity compensation payable to surviving spouses by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2540. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to raise awareness of, and to educate breast cancer patients anticipating surgery, especially patients who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, regarding the availability and coverage of breast reconstruction, prostheses, and other options; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2541. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2542. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish requirements for releasing a cosigner from obligations of a private education loan, for the treatment of the loan upon the death or bankruptcy of a cosigner of the loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2543. A bill to establish a State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2544. A bill to amend the USEC Privatization Act to require the Secretary of Energy to issue a long-term Federal excess uranium inventory management plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2545. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to educational organizations to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2546. A bill to prohibit the sale of a firearm to, and the purchase of a firearm by, a person who is not covered by appropriate liability insurance coverage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2547. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the development of accelerated approval development plans for investigational drugs and biological products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2548. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to a national pediatric research network; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2549. A bill to amend the HITECH Act with respect to accessing, sharing, and using health data for research purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2550. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare payment incentives to transition from traditional x-ray imaging to digital radiography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BLUM, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BOST, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 2551. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that veterans may attend pre-apprenticeship programs using certain educational assistance provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 2552. A bill to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from procuring certain items directly related to the national security unless the items are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 2553. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct coastal community vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2554. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to designate the Tenmile Recreation Management Area and Porcupine Gulch Protection Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2555. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to award grants to nonprofit veterans service organizations to upgrade the community facilities of such organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2556. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to repeal the authorization for program development and implementation grants for coastal recreation water quality monitoring and notification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 2557. A bill to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 2558. A bill to authorize the provision of health care for certain individuals exposed to environmental hazards at Atsugi Naval Air Facility, to establish an advisory board to examine exposures to environmental hazards at such Air Facility, and for other purposes; 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. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2559. A bill to designate the ''PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway'' in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 2560. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to waive any emission standard or other requirement under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412) applicable to the control of asbestos emissions in the demolition or renovation of a condemned building for which there is a reasonable expectation of structural failure; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 2561. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Paul A. Smithhisler for acts of valor in November 1918 during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special expensing rules for certain film and television productions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 2563. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow States to regulate tow truck operations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 2564. A bill to accelerate the adoption of smart building technologies in the private sector and key Federal agencies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 2565. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to restore the regular Medicaid matching rate for newly eligible individuals under the Affordable Care Act and to apply up to $15 billion of the savings each year to the Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2566. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. STEWART, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 2567. A bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith in recognition of their contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MICA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution recognizing the daisy as the flower for military caregivers; 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. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an appropriate site in the Memorial Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker to honor the memory of those who have been awarded or are eligible for the Korean Defense Service Medal who are missing in action, are unaccounted for, or died in-theater; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylli, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 280. A resolution honoring the House music genre and its ''Godfather'', the late Frankie Knuckles of Chicago, Illinois, for valuable and longstanding contributions to the culture of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia):

H. Res. 281. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the success of Operation Streamline and the importance of prosecuting first time illegal border crossers; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DELANEY):

H. Res. 282. A resolution expressing support for designation of May as ''National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BERA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 283. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month in May as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Res. 284. A resolution recognizing the significance of National Caribbean American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. Res. 285. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should become an international human rights leader by ratifying and implementing certain core international conventions; to the Committee on Foreign

Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Clause 12, 13 or 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constititution''.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 2488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Ms. GRAHAM:

H.R. 2492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 2493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8: to provide for the Common Defense

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18 (the necessary and proper clause).

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 2497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''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 . . .''

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 2500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 2501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to determine the boundaries of districts for the election of Representatives in Congress pursuant to the authority given to make or alter regulations of the times, places and manner of holding elections for Representatives by Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).''

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 2506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 2509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution—''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . . .''

By Mr. TIBERI

H.R. 2510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7 and Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2513.

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 the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2514.

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 Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18

The Congress shall have Power***to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 2517.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution. he Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:
H.R. 2518.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional Authority for the Act is derived from Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:
H.R. 2519.
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.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:
H.R. 2520.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debt and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. EDWARDS:
H.R. 2521.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.'' Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, ''to promote the general welfare.''

By Mrs. BEATTY:
H.R. 2522.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S Constitution

By Mr. BOST:
H.R. 2523.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUCHANAN:
H.R. 2524.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:
H.R. 2525.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:
H.R. 2526.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:
H.R. 2527.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: ''The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To establish Post Offices and post roads;''

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:
H.R. 2528.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 2529.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:
H.R. 2530.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section I of the Constitution of the United States of America:
''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:
H.R. 2531.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:
Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:
H.R. 2532.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 & 18.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:
H.R. 2533.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which allows the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce.

By Ms. HAHN:
H.R. 2534.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.
Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. HANNA:
H.R. 2535.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is enumerated in Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides that ''The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imports and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. HIGGINS:
H.R. 2536.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HIMES:
H.R. 2537.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 2538.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
H.R. 2539.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8; Article IV, Section 3.

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 2540.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution
This states that ''Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. LANGEVIN:
H.R. 2541.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 2542.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 2543.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

By Mrs. LUMMIS:
H.R. 2544.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes and Article 1 Section 8, Clause 1 to provide for the common defense

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 2545.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Spending Authorization:
Article I Section 8 Clause 3: ''Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;''

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 2546.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes'';

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:
H.R. 2547.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through administering of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:
H.R. 2548.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through the administration of the National Institutes of Health under the Public Health Service Act.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through the regulations and provisions under Title 42 of the United States Code.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through administering of the Social Security Act.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''

Article 1, Section 8, Clasue 12; ''The Congress shall have the power to . . . raise and support armies . . .

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13 ''To provide and maintain a navy'' And,

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18; ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution''

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 2552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 2553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

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. SALMON:

H.R. 2556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 2557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §1;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 12;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 13;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 14; and

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 18.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution; and Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 2560.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14. To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the ''power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . .''

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 2563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2564.

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. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 2565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII. Clause VII

To establish post offices and post roads;

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 2566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce among the several states.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 2567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 24: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 139: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 167: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 220: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 235: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MICA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 292: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 381: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 413: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 427: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 456: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 465: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 475: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 486: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 539: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 578: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 607: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 616: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 627: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 628: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 662: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 703: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 721: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 727: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 745: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 765: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 766: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 768: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 793: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 815: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 828: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 837: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 845: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 864: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 879: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 893: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. BASS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN,

Mr. BARTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 913: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 915: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 923: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 970: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 973: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 985: Mr. TURNER, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 986: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1089: Mr. KILMER and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1141: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1150: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1151: Mr. JONES, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1170: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1178: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1192: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1197: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOST, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1202: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1211: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1214: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1218: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1256: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1270: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 1284: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1300: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1309: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1312: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1342: Mr. KATKO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1401: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1413: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1434: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1482: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1537: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1550: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1559: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1565: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1567: Mr. PERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1572: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1575: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1576: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1598: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1603: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1604: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1608: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1611: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1644: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1655: Mr. REED.
H.R. 1680: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1692: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1716: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1717: Mr. KILMER and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1718: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1734: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1736: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1737: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1784: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1786: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1801: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1814: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1830: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1842: Mrs. NOEM and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1858: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1859: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1877: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1893: Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1905: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1908: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1910: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1911: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1919: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1924: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1942: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1953: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1964: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1969: Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1986: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1989: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1994: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1996: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2008: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2013: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2016: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2017: Mr. SIRES and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2025: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2042: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2043: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2058: Mr. LONG, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2061: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2070: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 2082: Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2096: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2100: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KNIGHT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2123: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2124: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2132: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2193: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2200: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2205: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2213: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 2218: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2221: Ms. ESTY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2233: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. JONES, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2244: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2251: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2259: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2280: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2289: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2290: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2295: Mr. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2300: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2302: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2304: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2318: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2328: Mr. BARR and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2330: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2341: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2350: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2371: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2379: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2391: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2393: Mr. BRAT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2398: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2403: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2404: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2407: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KIND, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2410: Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2429: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2449: Mr. POCAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2481: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.J. Res. 22: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. SIRES.
H.J. Res. 25: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. POLIS and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 28: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 54: Mr. MACARTHUR and Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 230: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 233: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 262: Mr. TONKO and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 268: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 279: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. YOHO, Ms. MENG, Ms. BASS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1622: Mr. SCHIFF.