United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015 No. 98

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

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

God our Father, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of the people's House as they gather at the end of another week in the Capitol. Endow each with the graces needed to attend to the issues of the day with wisdom, that the results of their efforts might benefit the citizens of our Nation and the world.

We also ask Your blessing leading into this weekend upon fathers throughout our country. May they be their best selves, and may their children appreciate fully the blessing their fathers have been to them.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANCE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

FEDERAL OBSTACLES TO SAVING FOR RETIREMENT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot in this Chamber about the negative impacts of overly burdensome rules and regulations handed down by bureaucrats in Washington.

Nowhere are the potential negative consequences more evident than the 700-page rule proposed by the Department of Labor. Among other things, it expands the Department's complex pension rules to cover IRAs as well as changes the definition of who is classified as a financial adviser. Ultimately, I believe this rule will restrict access to advice and drive up costs for small businesses.

It also illustrates a fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats. Democrats want everyone to end up in the same place with identical outcomes, and Republicans believe in providing individuals with the same level of opportunity. This rule seeks guaranteed outcomes for everyone, but there are inherent risks associated with investing.

While I am open to modernizing current rules in order to protect consumers against predatory practices that pose unnecessary risks, I will not support efforts that make it harder for American families to save and plan for retirement.

HONORING J.C. KILMER

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, Tom Brokaw once said:

> It's easy to make a buck. It's much harder to make a difference.

Today I rise to honor someone who made a difference as a schoolteacher for 50 years. He began his career a half century ago at Roosevelt Junior High School in Port Angeles, Washington, where he taught seventh grade homeroom and coached football.

I have met so many people who had him as a teacher; I think he may have taught my entire hometown. But the common themes from his former students that I have met have been these: He was a great teacher. He cared about me as a student. He didn't just teach me English and geography; he taught me to be a better student and a better person.

Earlier this week, he finished out his career at the Chrysalis School in Woodinville, Washington, and yesterday he had his first well-deserved day of retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the teacher that I rise to honor today is named J.C. Kilmer, and he is my dad.

Mark Twain remarked that the two most important days in a person's life are the day he is born and the day he figures out why. My father was born to teach. And like so many fantastic educators, he has affected so many lives in so many ways.

So today I hope you will join me in thanking a teacher. I want to congratulate him for being a great educator, a difference maker, and a terrific dad.

Happy retirement, Dad.

REPEALING THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of repealing the medical device tax, a burdensome tax on medical devices that increases costs, stifles investment, slows the race for cures, and ultimately makes health care more expensive for patients.

The tax has resulted in less spending on research and development, escalating costs on the newest technologies, a reduction in capital investments, and, ultimately, is a factor in the loss of jobs in our Nation's vital life science sector, which is critical to keeping the United States a leader in the world and is crucial to my home State of New Jersey.

One of the major newspapers in our area editorialized recently in support of our efforts, the Easton Express-Times, pointing out that the medical device tax is having a depressing effect on a sector of the economy that until recently was doing well. Some are looking to relocate overseas.

I thank my close friend, Congressman ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota, and the Ways and Means Committee for sponsoring this legislation. I urge the House to pass repeal of the medical device tax and work with our Senate colleagues to send this measure to the President.

GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the night before last, with the whole world watching, my home team, the Golden State Warriors, brought the O'Brien Trophy back to Oakland.

The Warriors, led by NBA MVP Stephen Curry, showed the power of persistence and teamwork both on and off the court.

The finals against the well-matched and talented Cleveland Cavaliers were a thrill to watch. These games were basketball at its best, with both teams showing real passion on the court.

It has been 40 years since Oakland last brought home the championship, and throughout this long journey, Warrior fans have stayed loyal and faithful.

Thank you to the Warriors team for making our dreams of another championship a reality. I have no doubt that this remarkable team will go down in Oakland's history. Thank you to head coach Steve Kerr, Stephen Curry, Clay Thompson, finals MVP Andre Iguodala, and all of the talented players who brought this championship home.

I can't wait to celebrate this win with all the Warriors fans and players at the victory parade tomorrow morning in Oakland.

Go Warriors. Go Oakland. Go Dub Nation.

IN HONOR AND MEMORY OF CLEMENTA PINCKNEY

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor and memory of my former South Carolina General Assembly colleague, State Senator Clementa Pinckney.

Tragedy shot through the hearts of every family and community last night in South Carolina. It is important in times like these to remember that we are all made in the image of God. We are all brothers and sisters in Christ and are there to shoulder the burden of tragedy and loss.

Please pray for the 180-year-old Emanuel AME Church, who suffered the loss; the city of Charleston, tormented with distress; the State of South Carolina and its law enforcement personnel. We all need to come together with compassion and love.

Remember from the Book of Matthew:

> Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.
>
> Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted.
>
> Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the Earth.
>
> Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied.
>
> Blessed are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy.
>
> Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.
>
> Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.
>
> Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

May God comfort the city of Charleston and the State of South Carolina this morning.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight the familiar predicament Congress has found itself in because the Republican leadership continues to govern by crisis.

As of today, we have only 4 legislative days until the Export-Import Bank expires. This bank helps American businesses of all sizes and markets around the world.

China's businesses have the support of their country's export-import bank, and we need to give our businesses the same certainty.

For years, the Ex-Im Bank has helped level the playing field for businesses in my district and across this Nation, empowering and supporting them to grow and conduct business overseas.

I have had the opportunity to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support businesses and create jobs in my home district in San Bernardino County.

There is no reason we can't continue working together to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank so American workers and businesses have the opportunity to play a role in the global economy.

We cannot force American businesses and workers to pay the price for Congress' inaction. The Ex-Im Bank doesn't cost taxpayers a cent and has created or maintained 1½ million private sector jobs since 2007. We need to stop the political games and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the 21st century workplace where women account for nearly half of the workforce, it is vital that our policies reflect today's new realities. Specifically, the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act, PDA, is in need of modernization.

Recently, the act was litigated before the Supreme Court, but even the Justices were unable to fully resolve how to apply the PDA. That is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I have introduced the Pregnancy Discrimination Amendment Act. It says working moms-to-be should have access to reasonable accommodations from their employers if health issues arise from pregnancy.

Unlike other proposals that will create more mandates, confusion, and litigation, my bill simply clarifies existing law to ensure the 21st century workplace works for families, employers, and expectant mothers.

IRAN

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we approach the deadline of negotiations with Iran to stress that any agreement must unequivocally guarantee that Iran cannot obtain nuclear weapons.

While a diplomatic solution is the ideal method of stopping Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program, we owe it to the American people of this country to end up with not just a good deal, but a great deal.

A great deal means giving inspectors robust access to nuclear facilities to promptly verify compliance. A great deal means Iran acknowledges the full extent of its nuclear weapons program. A great deal would remove tools that

could leave Iran with a pathway toward nuclear weapons and provide a long-term solution. Finally, a great deal phases in sanctions relief so we aren't rewarding Iran for deception and noncompliance.

A nuclear Iran is one of the greatest threats to the United States; our greatest ally, Israel; and to regional stability in the Middle East. I cannot stress enough how important it is that Iran must not, under any circumstance, be able to obtain a nuclear weapon.

COMMEMORATING AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again rise to join in commemorating June 20, 2015, as American Eagle Day and celebrate the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

On June 20, 1782, the eagle was designated as a national emblem of the United States by the Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress. The bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States and is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government.

The bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and democracy of the United States. Since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the eagle have played a significant role in art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and the culture of the U.S. The bald eagle's habitat only exists in North America.

I hope my colleagues will join in celebrating June 20, 2015, as American Eagle Day, which marks the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle.

□ 0915

INTERNATIONAL YOGA DAY

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution to commemorate the first ever International Yoga Day.

This day is occurring on Sunday, June 21, and it was a day that was designated by the United Nations with over 177 countries in support. Over 24 million Americans and 250 million people around the world practice some form of yoga, and, on Sunday, people all around the world will be celebrating the benefits of living a yoga lifestyle.

India's Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, addressed the UN General Assembly on September 27, 2014, stating:

> Yoga is an invaluable gift of India's ancient tradition. It embodies unity of mind and body, thought and action, restraint and fulfillment, harmony between man and nature, a holistic approach to health and well-being. It is not about exercise, but, rather, it is about discovering the sense of oneness within yourself, the world, and nature.

As a longtime yoga practitioner myself, I have experienced firsthand the positive impact of yoga on my own life, and I am honored to be introducing this resolution today and sharing with others the true meaning of yoga.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2146, DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 321 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 321

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 321.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same Act.

House Resolution 321 states that it "shall be in order . . . to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion . . . that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution."

Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to section 426 that this resolution may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentlewoman from New York makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to take a moment, if I may, to mourn the horrific loss of life in Charleston, South Carolina.

Places of worship used to be places of sanctuary, but there are no more sanctuaries in the United States from gun violence. Whether it is an elementary school, a college, a hospital—anywhere in the world—gun violence is there among us. We want to all give our condolences to our colleague JIM CLYBURN, who represents that area in Charleston.

I have a personal interest in it as a very good friend of mine, who had been pastor of Baber AME Church for decades in Rochester, left us to go to pastor that church and is still an elder there. So our hearts go out to all of them for all of the grief. We hope that we will see brighter days when people can go to a sanctuary place of worship in peace.

Now to the matter before Congress today, Mr. Speaker, our Chamber and our Nation are off balance. There is something drastically wrong when Members of the people's House are asked to vote on greasing the skids for a trade deal they are discouraged from reading and, even if they do read, cannot discuss with their constituents, the people who sent them here.

That is what we are being asked to do today regarding a massive trade deal: abdicate our authority by approving fast track and to give the simple vote of "yea" or "nay" on an issue that is not simple at all. In fact, it could not be more complex or more far-reaching. Unlike the Senate action on this measure, Members of the House were totally unable to have any amendment or very much discussion of what is going on here.

Mr. Speaker, fast track is an anachronism that needs to die. There is no longer any need for it at all. It came as a matter of convenience in the seventies when the United States was the biggest manufacturer on the face of the Earth and when we were pretty sure we always would be. So it was decided by the powers that were in place then that the Congress would just hand it over to the administration to go ahead and negotiate whole trade agreements despite the fact that the Constitution of the United States gives us that power. We allowed the administration to do it. One committee, Ways and Means, got to see it. There was no amendment, and the only vote we can take on a trade bill is "yea" or "nay."

Mr. Speaker, it is not just we who are forbidden, basically, to see what is in this bill and to talk about it. It is also the countries of Australia and New Zealand. Let me read from a report on that.

They are very much concerned there with the fact that this TPP—what they had found leaked out, that what PhRMA is doing here is to extend all of their patents for 12 years so that they can not only raise those prices here in this country but for all of those countries involved in the trade agreement.

Jane Kelsey, who is on the faculty of law of the University of Auckland, described what was happening here as one of the most controversial parts—that is, the pharmaceutical part—because the U.S. pharmaceutical industry used a trade agreement to target New Zealand's Pharmaceutical Management Agency, PHARMAC, which is their health system.

This transparency act will erode the process and decisions of agencies that decide which medicines and medical devices to subsidize with public money and by how much. The leaked test shows that TPP will severely erode PHARMAC's ability to continue to deliver affordable medicines and medical devices as it has for two decades.

The parliamentarians in Australia and New Zealand are under the same restriction as we are, only theirs is even worse. A member of that Parliament who goes to read the trade agreement has to sign a paper that he will not discuss it for 4 years.

I make this point because two of the great democracies on this planet—the United States of America and Australia—have given over the right of the people's elected Representatives to know what is in these trade deals that will have such devastating effects on all of the people they represent. How in the world can this continue, and how can we let it go on?

If we don't do anything in this Congress—and we may not—I would really like to see us do away with the whole idea of fast track. We can't afford it any longer. At least I am sure, when it began, there was no problem with certain corporations deciding that they were going to make the main decisions as we have had made known by leaks here. I have not gone to read the bill. I do not want to be hamstrung by anything that I can discuss and concerns that I have with the people whom I serve. This is one of many reasons, I think, this trade bill is bad.

Let me say I have a few more here that I would like to go over, and I need to make sure that everybody understands this. When you vote for TPA today, you are voting for things that were in that Customs bill. Again, hardly any of us knew anything about it.

Let me just tell you what they are:

Preventing action on climate change. This is going to be written in this bill. Nobody anywhere can even bring up climate change. It is a great step backward, and they managed to get this in, and the Pope is in sync, too. That is very interesting.

Secondly and most grievous to many of us who have worked so hard on human trafficking, including Members on both sides of this House with whom I have worked, it weakens the language on human trafficking. They had to do that because the nation with the worst standards on human rights and human trafficking is Malaysia, which is one of the countries with whom we want to be allied.

Third, they ignore currency manipulation, which we have been told for a decade or more is one of the most serious acts against the United States from countries that trade with us, which is changing their currency. As one of my colleagues has pointed out, Mrs. DINGELL, one automobile company made more money from its trade manipulation than it did by selling its cars. We don't want to expand that. We don't want that to go on.

There is also a strong anti-immigration provision that we are being asked to vote on today, and we won't do that—giving up our rights as the elected Representatives of the people of the United States. It says that trade agreements do nothing to address the immigration. They may not.

Then Democratic priorities, such as ensuring that Dodd-Frank would not be affected by the trade agreement, because we have heard that financial services is very heavily involved here, were rejected in the Senate and were not included in this bill. We are very much concerned about that.

We are very much concerned about where we are going, but the fast-track deal will be an absolute rubber stamp to disaster.

As I mentioned before, it has been negotiated in a cloud of secrecy by multinational conglomerates and the financial services industry and pharmaceutical companies that have one priority, and that is the bottom line. What we know, again, is all we have heard from leaks. Not a lot has made its way to the light of day, but what has has been appalling, and it does certainly give anyone who wants to vote pause to think about what that vote means before he gives it, because we don't know what is in that bill.

One of the things that some of us are very much concerned about is food safety and prescription drugs, the erosion of environmental protections, and the degradation of the financial sector. This deal is headed down the wrong path. Not only would the TPP certainly ship good-paying American jobs overseas, but it would endanger the food on our tables by weakening the safety standards. Ninety percent of the seafood consumed in America is imported, but only 1 to 2 percent is inspected, much of it from countries with little controls on sanitation and water quality that American consumers expect.

One of the biggest threats comes from shrimp imported from Vietnam, a TPP partner. The dangerous bacteria in Vietnamese shrimp is really ubiquitous and has included shrimp contaminated with MRSA, which is fatal, and drug-resistant salmonella. What is more, the TPP report includes due deferential preference to rules negotiated by drug companies extending their patents, as I have said, in an unfair way for 12 years. They are rigging the system in a way that would make it harder for people in TPP countries to have access to life-saving drugs.

Now, we have got a history to warn us about this. This thing has been modeled after NAFTA, which cost us over 5 million jobs. My part of the country is just now recovering from NAFTA a little bit, and we don't want to see this happen again. All over this country, there are factories that are closed and cities that are gone—places where there, literally, is no work.

Even doing TAA, which is very important to us, would be training people for jobs, in most cases, that don't even exist; but this has been hidden away from the American people and certainly has been hidden away from the Congress, the people who represent them. It is causing a stir all the way around the world. As I pointed out, other countries are looking at this with great interest.

Let's follow what our minority leader said last week. Let's put this thing to rest and negotiate openly a trade agreement that we can be proud of. We all believe in trade. Everybody talks about free trade. I want to change that now to fair trade that will be enforceable and that will benefit everybody involved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise with a sad heart regarding the occurrences and the things which happened in South Carolina last night. I know, I join the gentlewoman as well as all the Members of this body to express our condolences and our sorrow with the things that have happened. I know that later in the day we will take time to offer those formally by the members of the South Carolina delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is, should the House now consider House Resolution 321. That is what we are here for. While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the motion to concur with the amendment, the committee is not aware of any violations of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This is simply a dilatory tactic that the gentlewoman wants to use to talk further about the issue at hand. I get that.

We have spent weeks talking about this. The United States Senate spent weeks talking about this issue. The gentlewoman wanted to use her time to talk about all the things that she believes are wrong with the bill, and that is okay. That really doesn't bother me.

But the bottom line to the entire matter is that we are using our responsibility under the Constitution for the Congress of the United States to establish the laws and to direct the President of the United States that we believe is very constitutional to say to the President of the United States, we want you to go engage the world in a trade deal, and we are going to tell you the parameters, some 160 different parameters about how we believe you should engage the foreign countries in these trade deals.

The gentlewoman is right, there are some difficult piece parts in there, as the gentlewoman mentions about immigration. Yes, I made sure that was in there because I don't believe this should be about immigration or visas. I believe this should be about trade. And, yes, there is language that is in there about climate change because I don't believe this should be about the United States in a political circumstance trying to push our ideas on a trade deal about global warming or these considerations that might be related to that issue.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is right, there are piece parts of this agreement, the trade promotion authority, that not everybody likes, but let's not act like you didn't have an opportunity to read the bill or understand the bill. But much like any contract—and that is what we are engaging here in. We are engaging in saying to the President, we want you to go sign a contract, an agreement with these foreign countries that are in the Far East who have not only large populations, but growing economic circumstances to buy our products, and us to make sure that we lower tariffs or taxes on those products to where they are available to us.

Yes, we understand currency manipulation is a problem, and primarily that is a problem with perhaps two countries. Neither of those countries do we have a free trade agreement with, and one of them we want to have a free trade agreement with. Another country simply, I don't believe, understands rule of law or intellectual property, and I think they are thugs and don't care. They are a country that steals openly hundreds of billions of dollars from the United States, and they do not respect any rule of law or international agreements. So we probably won't sign an agreement with them.

But this is a good deal. It is a good deal. The last 10, 20 countries that America has had a trade agreement with, we have a $10 billion surplus with those countries because those countries want American products, because the American worker does a great job, and we have the best engineering and manufacturing and pricing, but the product is worthy in the world market and will sell.

The State of Texas, which I am from, sells $289 billion of Texas-made products overseas every year. That is an example of how important trade is.

This trade deal contract that we are wanting to empower the President—whoever that may be for the next 7 years—is to say let's go cut a deal that is good to that country and to America. In the process, Mr. Speaker, we added some language for those of our friends that are watching along with you, Mr. Speaker, as I address my comments to you.

Section 8, subsection A on page 101 says:

> United States law to prevail in event of conflict.

Mr. Speaker, it lays it out right here:

> No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 3(b) nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality in the United States shall have effect.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to suggest to you is, there are a lot of things about this bill; some that some people like, some things that others don't like. But we had a chance to read it; we had a chance to understand it. This is a contract that we have not even agreed to yet. Why would someone go and publicly talk about a deal that they haven't made?

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what is happening right now is that we should say that this point of order should not prevail. I think that what we should do is move to the direct discussion that we are going to have to allow the House to continue its business, and I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question under consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry: In the underlying bill, is there anything to prevent taxpayers from having to pay out hundreds of millions of dollars for the privilege of enforcing the very laws that the gentleman from Texas says this agreement would preserve, any local ordinance, any State agreement like happened in Canada recently, that the taxpayers end up having to pay the bill for simply enforcing existing law?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. I urge a ''yes'' vote. I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I need to inquire from you, if my colleague was reading from the trade bill, what he had read and is forbidden to speak about. It is classified, you know. Did he reveal classified information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry. Now, if the gentlewoman has a parliamentary inquiry, please state it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. My concern is that he is reading from a classified document. I need to know if that is the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Section 8 of the TPA. I did not say TPP.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have pretty well beaten this dead donkey to its point. Its logical conclusion is we now move forward. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the question of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, I believe that our comments this morning should be tempered with a reminder about the events of South Carolina and how much this body and its Members offer their prayers and consideration not only of our colleagues but all the people of South Carolina, the men and women, law enforcement, and people of faith all across this country. I want to, once again, express my consideration of those ideas.

Mr. Speaker, before I go through my opening statement, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Irvine, California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent considerable time debating the merits of TPA in this body. I want to bring us back to the fundamentals of this debate. I want to talk about why trade is so important to our economy, why trade is a conservative cause, and why trade is so vital to our Nation. Simply put, free trade empowers the individual to make decisions in his or her best interest without undue government influence.

Look around at your house or at your car. Without question, there are imported products. Free trade allows you, as an individual, to make the best economic choice for your family. When economic enterprise is free from unnecessary government interference and all enterprise is treated equally, the most competitive actors will rise to the top.

That means higher quality products and lower prices, which translates to improved standards of living and economic growth.

Opponents of free trade will say we need protectionist measures to maintain certain industries, but that is a flawed argument. Protectionist measures may benefit a few in select industries, but ultimately protectionism is more harmful to the Nation's economic health. Protected industries become inefficient. Consumers are denied choice, and American businesses face retaliatory trade measures overseas. Bottom line, protectionism is an abandonment of the free market in favor of government intervention.

I believe that when American businesses and entrepreneurs are placed on an equal playing field, when we eliminate tariffs and protectionist barriers at home and abroad, American businesses can compete and win against any of their foreign competitors. The famed economist Milton Friedman said: Free trade ultimately forces competitors to put up or shut up.

Mr. Speaker, let us set the table for free trade. Let us pass TPA. I know American businesses will put up.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has been so effective on this bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this fast-track bill, which is only made worse by a gimmick of it being attached to unrelated legislation designed to help Federal public safety professionals. I might add, as has already been mentioned, the general president of the International Association of Firefighters, which this rule addresses as well, has said: We urge you to oppose this rule.

For 20 years, our Nation's trade policy has been failing American workers and the businesses that want to invest in this country. It has driven away jobs, pushed down wages, and exacerbated inequality. A vote for fast track is a vote to continue that bad trade policy for another generation because if we approve fast track today, we rubberstamp the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership asks American workers to compete with labor in developing countries like Vietnam, where the minimum wage is 56 cents an hour. It does nothing to combat the biggest source of lost jobs—currency manipulation—which The Economist's Fred Burcksen has said has cost us in the United States up to 5 million jobs. People lost their jobs and lost their livelihoods. It allows thousands of foreign corporations to challenge U.S. laws on food safety, drug safety, environmental protection, health care, labor rights, the minimum wage, and, indeed, any domestic law on any subject.

□ 0945

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle said that that is not the case. Just witness what happened last week when the majority in this body voted to repeal country of origin labeling so that we know where our meat, our poultry, and our pork comes from because the World Trade Organization and Canada and Mexico ruled against us. So we are going to give up our domestic law.

This is a trade agreement that has been crafted by lobbyists for the special interests and industries that stand to gain the most by weakening U.S. regulation and shipping jobs overseas, yet the administration has shown absolutely no interest in improving this deal or even listening to our concerns. That means that when the Trans-Pacific Partnership comes to this House, we need the ability to amend it. At the very least, it must include sanctions against currency manipulation, enforceable labor, environmental standards, and include a transparent process.

If we vote for fast track today, we throw away our ability to make any of those amendments, and we turn our backs on our commitment to American workers: to their jobs, to their families, and to their economic security.

We must make this a vote, and this vote must be a turning point so that at long last the American public can say that those of us in this House opposing fast track demand policies.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. The vote last Friday and today's vote are critical in letting the American public know where we stand and that, in fact, we prioritize their economic security, their jobs, their increased wages and that we are opposed to special interests. And that is what this Trans-Pacific Partnership is all about.

We must reject this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of confusion down here. Everybody thinks we are now talking about ObamaCare, and we are not.

The gentlewoman talked about diminishing wages, diminishing job opportunities for the future, diminishing opportunities for American workers to have higher wages. There is no bill that I have ever seen that diminished wages or people's opportunity to work the hours that they would like to work more than ObamaCare. But we are not debating that today.

Mr. Speaker, we are here—and I want to be clear—about trade promotion authority, TPA—not TPP, not any of the other bills. We are here for TPA today, exactly the same bill that this House passed last week. That is what we are here for.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Sunnyside, Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying trade promotion authority bill.

Look at my State of Washington. We have jobs, economic growth, and increased exports because of trade. Those benefits and the example of that can be applied to our entire Nation.

By passing TPA, Congress will set priorities to ensure that any agreement levels the playing field with our trading partners and creates jobs here at home. Without it, the administration will be setting those priorities, and we, Congress, will have no say and little oversight.

In my State, we export coffee, many agricultural products, aircraft, footwear, and software. We export, fully, 30 percent of our apples, 60 percent of our hops, and over 85 percent of our wheat.

TPA is about instructing our trade negotiators to reduce the trade barriers that American farmers and manufacturers face so that we can create and sell openly around the world.

Right now, our American wines face very stiff tariffs in Japan, but Chilean and Argentinean wines face none. Our beef faces a 38 percent tariff; oranges, 16 percent. TPA will instruct our trade negotiators to work on lowering these tariffs.

The reason to vote on TPA and why it is so important is that it will make the deal public and give the American people several months to review any negotiated deal. Without passing this, there is no review period. The deal can stay secret.

Some have objected that their voices have not been heard on this matter, but for months, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Rules Committee have considered dozens of amendments to three different trade-related bills. There has been ample time for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill are critical to our economy. Without it, our country will continue to face enormous barriers; but with it, we can grow our businesses, create more jobs, and ensure the American economy remains the most competitive and strongest in the world for decades to come.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The administration seems to think the Democrats and the coalition that is opposing the TPP would reject any trade deal. We are called protectionists. We are called unreasonable. But that is not true. Rather than these fancy parliamentary manipulations, we should take the time now to fix it.

Some of the most odious positions that we know that are in the TPP which this fast track will speed us to are U.S. negotiating positions. Our trading partners are not clamoring for the extrajudicial investor dispute resolution authority, allowing huge corporations to challenge their hard-fought consumer protections, worker and environmental laws, et cetera. These are our negotiating positions. We could drop them and that would be welcomed abroad among our trading partners.

Countries want the opportunity and the right to protect their food supplies—and that includes us. Decrease smoking; promote Buy America; increase the minimum wage; control the cost of drugs; protect our environment. We could reset the balance of the intellectual property rights and access to lifesaving, affordable medicines by rewriting the pharmaceutical chapter, which I did look at.

More than a trade bill, this establishes a new regulatory regime that favors the wealthiest and the most powerful corporations. We could change that.

These votes we are taking today are not the end of the track. It is beginning the track to a new negotiation. It is the beginning of an opportunity for us to sit down and make sure that we get the best for workers, consumers, and our trading partners, and that we benefit our economy not just for the very few at the top that can go to some extrajudicial court and challenge our regulations, but for everyone. This is a bill that we can make better.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman knows that in the TPA agreement there is an agreement that she can go and attend every single round of the discussions and negotiation, by law. She can be right there. She can watch it as it happens. We can be engaged in this, as Members of Congress, the entire way. That is what this agreement is about. This is about TPA, not TPP.

The fear factor, Mr. Speaker, is incredible. Let's go and do the right thing for the American worker and our future. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Raleigh, North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Here we go again, Mr. Speaker, debating what should be the United States' future role in the global economy.

We have heard a lot over the past few months about the economic benefits associated with free and fair trade, but trade is just as important to our Nation's foreign policy as it is to our bottom line. There is no question that trade is an important, strategic soft-power tool.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think for one second China isn't watching this very debate right now, waiting to see how serious we, the Congress, are about America's economic future and commitment to retaining our position of global leadership. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to guess they have been focused on what a deal like the TPP would mean for their sitting and future ambitions in the Asia Pacific region for a long time now.

The United States can either be in a position where we can write the rules for the future trade agreements and develop closer bilateral ties with our negotiating partners, or we can sit on the sidelines.

Passing TPA is about expanding our influence in a critical region of the world with the TPP and solidifying our alliances with our partners in Europe with the TTIP. Failing to pass TPA, I fear, will confirm many of our allies' own fears that America is in retreat from the global stage.

But we can send a strong signal today, Mr. Speaker, that while our Nation's foreign policy has recently been adrift, the House of Representatives—and the United States—supports closer economic ties with our partners and wants to see an America that is engaged on the world stage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule and support for the TPA legislation later today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. It is such a danger, Mr. Speaker, that the majority is trying to move through the back door what it could not get through the front door on the floor of this House last week. And they are doing it in the most shameful way, Mr. Speaker: hiding behind our first responders. That is right; hiding behind firefighters and emergency personnel.

The International Association of Firefighters, representing more than 300,000 firefighters and emergency room personnel, oppose what is being done here today on this floor, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

There is one thing that I agree with the gentleman from Texas about. This is a donkey that died last week when we stood up for American workers, small businesses, and American jobs. And right now that donkey is like roadkill, and we are going to kill it right here on the floor of this House of Representatives.

We know that this body can pass legislation that in fact is not just about free trade, but is about free trade—and they are not doing it today—protecting our workers, protecting our climate, protecting our Buy America provisions for our procurement.

And so, Mr. Speaker, even as we are just getting word of the Pope's encyclical on climate change and overwhelmingly recognizing the human cost to us all, we have a letter from our U.S. Trade Representative, Michael Froman, saying that this deal doesn't do anything to deal with the authority of the administration to negotiate climate change. That, in fact, is shameful. And what we are doing here today is against American workers, against American businesses, and against American jobs.

It is time to kill this donkey once and for all by putting it to rest and coming back to the table to reset for the American workers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), one of the most exciting new Members of Congress from the Ways and Means Committee. I have visited and watched this young man as he not only ably represents a proud group of people, but is a strong American.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in this House, we have a duty to legislate based on truth, not fiction. We cannot afford to be uneducated, uninformed, or untruthful when it comes to PTA. Maybe the problem is we labeled it wrong. Maybe we should have called it ''Congressional Trade Authority Oversight.'' Maybe that is what we should have called it.

There is a great misunderstanding—and I hope it is a misunderstanding—about what this does for us. There is no way America can compete in the global economy without strong trade agreements. When Congress sets the parameters and very carefully constructs what the agreement has to contain, there is no mystery, there is no bogeyman, there is nobody hiding under the bed, there is nobody hiding in the closet. You don't have to have a secret decoder ring. You don't have to have some magical knock at the door to read all these different items. It is there for you to look at.

For crying out loud, will you stop pushing a false narrative if it is about growing our economy? The only way we can grow is protecting what we have and then going into the global economy and increasing our market penetration. It is that simple.

If you want America to grow, then you must allow America to grow. And you must allow America to lead, because when America leads, America wins. And when America wins, the rest of the world wins. It is just that simple.

Why in the world fast track? It is not fast track. If you want to call it slow track, that is fine, because you are going to have 60 days to read it. That is pretty slow, at least around here. You want to call it smart track? That is what it is. It is smart track. It is safe track, and it is sure track. The other thing, it puts America back on the track to economic prosperity.

Pass TPA today and put America back on the track to protect American jobs. Allow the economy to grow, and allow our workers not just to produce

and distribute products at home, but around the world. That is how we win, and that is how the people who depend on us win. When America is strong, America leads.

□ 1000

When we are not strong, we create a vacuum at the top of the world that is going to be filled with bad actors.

Please stop using a false narrative. If you are not informed, get informed; if you are not educated, get educated, but for God's sake, don't be untruthful.

I urge passage of the TPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Members, what I really dislike about this whole debate is that there is so much invective thrown around, claims of untruth.

Now, here is the truth. The reality is that, if we pass trade promotion authority, we will have nothing more than an up-or-down vote at the end of the process. They don't have to take our amendments. They don't have to listen to what we say. Very likely, what will happen is that whatever has been negotiated already will be what the deal is.

For some Members to try to claim that others don't get it or they are not being honest is, quite frankly, insulting and does not add one thing to the quality of the debate.

The American people deserve to know that if trade promotion authority passes, there is a ''yes'' or ''no'' vote that will happen at the end of the process, and nobody here will be able to impact it through the normal course of events. We can go to some meetings; we can write some letters; but can we actually legislate? No.

Now, the reason that this is a very bad outcome is because the United States Constitution delegates Congress, this body, with the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. It says: ''Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations.''

What we are doing here is taking that constitutional authority and we are handing it to the Executive and hoping for the best.

Now, the people who have been negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership all along are a body of about 600 multinational lawyers and businesspeople. The voice of the workers haven't been there. The voice of the environment has not been there. The voice of ordinary citizens who have every reason to want a better world and impact this process have been muted in favor of big multinational corporate types. We must vote ''no'' on TPA today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and an awesome free trader.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for giving me time.

Let's set the facts straight here. Liberal union leaders, radical environmentalists, some of our friends on the other side have been relentless in pushing misinformation to confuse and distract the American people. It undermines the confidence that the American people have in this body, the people's House.

Let's look at the facts. TPA, trade promotion authority, it is not a trade agreement. It is the process by which we get the best possible trade agreement, the best possible agreement on behalf of the American worker and the American farmer.

This is Congress asserting its constitutional authority by setting the priorities for our negotiators. We are robustly involved in the negotiation process, and this TPA version is even better than previous ones because it empowers all Members of Congress, not just the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee.

TPA has been public. It has been public for months for anybody and everybody who wants to read it. Just go to congress.gov. It is not secret.

They are trying to deliberately confuse TPA, trade promotion authority, with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is a trade negotiation underway and not completed yet. We want a strong TPP—Trans-Pacific Partnership—agreement for the American workers and for farmers. We won't get that without TPA.

TPA puts a strong check on the President, placing the Congress in the driver's seat with 150 negotiating objectives that must be addressed or else the final agreement won't be brought up for a vote. We will kill it. We have the power, not the President.

It contains strong protections against the President from putting in any new immigration authority in violation of American law. It prevents the President from subverting U.S. sovereignty and all these urban myths that are out there.

Frankly, the misinformation is disturbing, and it undermines the trust of this body. We have to put the facts on the table for the American people. This has been supported by a wide number of groups—business groups, conservatives, many other groups.

If you support transparency, if you support placing a check on the President, if you support robust oversight, and if you support getting the best deal for the American worker, knocking down barriers—whether they are tariff or nontariff barriers in these other countries—to give the American worker a break, open markets, then you support TPA.

TPA is a catalyst for economic growth. It opens the door for a robust trade agenda for the United States.

We created the global trading system after 1945. Are we going to walk away from it? We only have 20 agreements—with 20 countries, that is, free trade agreements. These are important agreements. Other countries have 40, 50, hundreds of them.

Why are we sitting on the sidelines? We have been sitting on the sidelines for decades. It is time for American leadership. We can't walk away from the trading system we created. Our partners around the world want us engaged.

This is the catalyst for American leadership. This is an important part of our national strategy and an important part of our foreign policy.

You want a strategy? You want economic growth? You want fairness for the American worker? Support TPA as a catalyst for growth and leadership.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

I am not going to go into the exact same debate we had 1 week ago because the facts are still the same. If we pass fast track authority, the facts are identical around the fact we will lose jobs here in this country and we will depress our wages here in this country. We will lose our sovereignty and control over our laws, and we will have problems with everything from food safety to intellectual property rights and so many other laws.

What is different about this week from last week is this is not the same trade promotion authority. This trade promotion authority will take away American jobs, but it lacks the trade authority that gives us the assistance and the dollars to help those people find other jobs.

This includes all of the amendments that affect us from taking away the provisions the Senate put in around currency manipulation, take away the amendments around human trafficking, and specifically say that we cannot address climate change in these trade negotiations.

Now, that alone is an issue that I want clarity from the White House on. I have been in and looked at the language, and I will not talk about classified language on the floor, but the amendment specifically—we need clarity about where we are on climate change in this agreement.

This is not the same TPA. It will cost jobs. It will lower our wages. It will not provide any protections for those workers who lose their jobs because of this. Now, because of last week's actions, the bill before us is a far, far worse bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues, let's let the American people have a say. The only way they will is if Congress retains our authority to amend and debate this bill. If we give that away, it is our own fault today.

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

Once again, I have to remind my colleagues we have got to follow some understanding about what we are trying to do here. This is TPA.

TAA was up last week, and my colleagues that are Democrats turned down the same things they are now talking about were provisions to protect the American worker. The Democrat Party voted against the American worker last week.

They are the ones that turned down exactly what the gentleman is talking about needs to be a part of this deal. The Democrat Party turned their back on the American worker. That was last week.

This week, now, they are trying to talk about things that are in TPP. Mr. Speaker, we are not here today for TPP. We are here today for trade promotion authority. That is it, TPA.

The gentleman, Mr. KELLY, was very right to say let's talk about the real facts of the case and the truth. This is about TPA. It is exactly the same bill that was here last week.

There were other considerations last week. The Democrat Party turned their back last week on the worker. We are not trying to do that today—trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Cincinnati, Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I think every Member of this body, on both sides of the aisle, have something in common. We all have small businesses in our district and probably a lot of them.

One of the privileges we have, as Members of Congress, is to talk to those people and find out what is important to them. What is important to them is important to the country because about 70 percent of the new jobs that are created in the American economy nowadays are created by small businesses.

In thinking about what I would say about TPA here this morning, I thought, rather than just tell people what I thought about it, I thought I would bring some examples of some of those folks that we have talked to.

As Chair of the Small Business Committee, I get to talk to small businesses all across the country. Here are some examples of what they are telling us.

Here is Michael Stanek of Hunt Imaging in Berea, Ohio. He said:

> Free trade agreements are extremely important as they lower foreign barriers to our exports and produce a more level playing field.
>
> Without TPA, the U.S. is relegated to the sidelines as other nations negotiate trade agreements without us, putting American workers and companies, especially small ones, at a competitive disadvantage.

Here is Dyke Messinger of Power Curbers in Salisbury, North Carolina:

> Passage of TPA, which lapsed back in 2007, is critical to restore U.S. leadership on trade.
>
> Manufacturers in the U.S. face steeper trade barriers abroad than virtually any other major country, including Mexico and China and European countries, largely because those countries have entered into more market access agreements than the United States. Trade and foreign markets are critical for small businesses like Power Curbers.

Here is Kevin Severns of Severns Farm in Sanger, California.

> Without TPA, critical negotiations with some of our key export markets may well stall. My understanding is that, on average, U.S. citrus exports to countries included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership can currently face tariffs as high as 40 percent.

That is tariffs at 40 percent.

> Given that 35 percent of California's citrus crop is exported around the world, access to these markets is vital to us.

Here is Brian Bieron of eBay, which helps many small businesses sell their products abroad. He said:

> Through our experience, we have found that technology is transforming trade by allowing Main Street businesses to directly take part in globalization, reaping the benefits of markets previously only open to the largest global companies. This is good economics because it means more growth and wealth, and it is good for society because it means a more inclusive form of globalization.

That is what people from around this country—small-business men, small-business women—are saying about TPA and TPP and trade. In effect, they are saying, if we want to grow the American economy and create jobs, which I think we all want to do, we must be proactive on trade, and that means passing TPA and then TPP.

Better trade agreements mean small businesses will be able to access new international customers and offer their products more easily and at a lower cost than ever before.

It means that more products will be built and sold. When that happens, jobs are created, wages go up, and more opportunity is available to all.

You put an American worker against anyone in the world, and I will take that bet every day of the week and twice on Sunday; but we can't get there without TPA.

Without TPA, other nations, especially China, will dictate the rules of the new economy, nations that do not respect the rule of law or the rights of individuals in many cases, especially in the case of China.

Ninety-six percent of the people that are on this globe that we all share live outside the borders of the United States. Many of the world's consumers are not here. We want to sell our products overseas, and TPA gets us on the right track.

□ 1015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding.

I wish to say that if the underlying Trans-Pacific Partnership were such a good deal, then why is the Rules Committee limiting our ability to read it and vet it fully and amend it?

By voting for the trade promotion authority, what we basically do is handcuff Members of Congress. So we should vote ''no.''

Why should we believe anything the executive branch sends up here? We have a right to read it fully and vet it fully.

Let's look at the history of these trade agreements. Over the last 25 years, every time we have signed a so-called free trade agreement that benefits the 1 percent—not the 99 percent—America has lost more jobs. Post-NAFTA, look what happened. We used to have trade balances with these countries. They have all gone into trade deficit, which means they send us more goods than we are able to get into their markets. Here is what happened after the WTO. Then we got into the China PNTR deal. Then the Colombia deal. Then with Korea.

There hasn't been a balanced trade account in this country for 30 years; 40 million lost jobs; $9.5 trillion of trade deficit, trading away one-fifth of our economic might to other places.

And what did the American people get? Lost jobs, outsourced jobs, stagnant wages. The average income in regions like mine—$7,000 less a year than 25 years ago. Not a good deal.

You can't create jobs in America and have free trade when you have closed markets abroad. Japan is closed. Korea is closed. China is closed. Europe limits 10 percent imports. We don't. We have an open market.

You can't create jobs and have free trade when you try to trade with countries where their people have no rights, no legal rights.

This Congress should vote ''no'' on this Trans-Pacific Partnership, the underlying bill, and the trade promotion authority because we have a right to read the agreement and openly debate it.

Right now we have to go down to a secret room. We have people who monitor us. And we can't even talk to the American people about what is in it. What is free about that?

The executive branch has totally overreached its power. Only four titles of the dozen in this TPP are actually about tariffs.

This bill is a treaty. It should be considered as a treaty, openly read by the Senate, and it should be able to be amended and fully vetted. This is so important. When you have gone through a quarter century of job loss and income loss by the American people, why can't we produce a bill that benefits the 100 percent—not just the 1 percent, the ones that were able to pay the plane tickets to go over to Asia and help to represent very important transnational interests? But there are not just the interests of those companies. We have to represent the interests of the American people.

Let's balance these trade accounts and develop a new trade model—not a NAFTA-based trade model, but a model that produces jobs in America, good

wages, and balanced trade accounts for the first time in a quarter century.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. We forgot to make sure everybody knew: we are only doing TPA today. We are not doing TPP. We are not doing these other agreements. I am sorry. I forgot to say that for the 57th time.

Where we cut deals, we win. With the 20 trade agreements America has, we had a $10 billion surplus last year alone.

I don't know where all these people are getting off and scaring and making fear statements about the American worker. I don't get it, when they talk about us not passing TAA when they are the ones—the Democrat Party—that turned it down. I don't understand why they are beating us up for putting in provisions about immigration. I guess they want to flood our workforce with foreign workers. I don't get where the Democrat Party and its great stalwarts are coming from today. This is about TPA, and that is what we are going to vote on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear, the Members on this side of the aisle—the Democratic Party Members on this side of the aisle—completely understand what we are debating today. We know we are debating the rule on TPA, the same TPA which has been modified. As the gentleman has said, we are not debating TPP.

The problem we have is, the trade promotion authority is intended to be the method by which this body, this Congress creates the parameters for negotiation of trade agreements, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership. And the reason that this has been difficult, this House and the Republican leadership, in particular, is trying to create a TPA that accommodates the already negotiated TPP.

So while it is a good rhetorical argument to say we are not debating TPP, the fact of the matter is, the reason that there has been such a lack of willingness to consider any modification, any amendments to the TPA bill is because any change would not align with the already negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The reason, for example, that a bipartisan amendment that I and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON) offered—with equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans, 22 of us—to deal with currency manipulation was not made in order is because it would not align with the already negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Most everybody agrees that it would be good policy, but this deal is already written. And now we are trying to back in a TPA bill that it will accommodate the TPP.

So it is rather difficult for me to accept the argument that this TPA question has nothing to do with the Trans-Pacific Partnership when everybody in this House of Representatives knows that it has everything to do with it.

The other thing that is important for us to keep in mind is that this is a worse piece of legislation than the bad one that came before the House last week. Because of the modifications to TPA that came through in the customs bill, as my colleagues have said, despite the fact that many on the other side have argued that our attempts to deal with climate change here in the U.S. alone will not be affected because it is not a global approach, when we have an opportunity to take a broader approach, representing 40 percent of the global economy and deal with climate change, we now have an absolute prohibition, a gag order where we can't talk about climate in the greatest opportunity we would have to deal with climate change; nor can we have even a weak provision regarding currency, which has been excised from the TPA. And, unbelievably, we will actually weaken our ability to deal with bad actors when it comes to human trafficking.

This is shameful, it ought to be rejected.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The gentlewoman from Ohio will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to know, if Members vote in favor of the trade promotion authority currently before us, will Members be allowed to amend the underlying bill, the TPP?

Could the chairman of the Rules Committee address that, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is engaging in debate and is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, in what form could I ask the question that I could get a straight answer as to whether Members will be able to amend the underlying 1,000-page trade agreement called the Trans-Pacific Partnership?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman may look to the managers for a specific item of debate.

Ms. KAPTUR. So, in other words, the chairman of the Rules Committee cannot answer my question? He is my friend. I think it would be important for Members to know that because it is my understanding that we are not allowed to amend the agreement if, in fact, TPA passes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

The gentlewoman from New York is recognized.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

TPA shouldn't stand for ''trade promotion authority''; it should stand for ''taking prosperity away,'' because that is exactly what it is going to do for millions of hard-working Americans.

The House failed to advance its proposal less than a week ago, and today the TPA we are voting on is even worse.

And hiding the vote behind our brave first responders? This is shameful.

Republican leaders are doing everything they can to jam through a special interest agenda that will depress wages, exacerbate inequality, and cost jobs. TPA will take away the constitutional responsibility that Congress has to strengthen and improve the Trans-Pacific Partnership. If we approve this measure, we are surrendering our ability to improve a trade agreement for working families.

We are not voting on TPP, as the chairman said, but we are voting on TPA, on the rules to govern these negotiations and the process to be filed. And if we vote for this TPA, we are saying that we are fine moving forward on a trade agreement that has no enforceable provisions against currency manipulation; meaning, there are no protections to stop countries from devaluing their currency, artificially reducing the price of their goods, and putting American manufacturers and American jobs at a competitive disadvantage. We are saying, we are fine with a trade agreement that fails to address the critical issue of climate change. We are saying that we are fine with entering into a trade agreement with countries like Brunei, where LGBT individuals can be stoned to death and women can be flogged in public. We are saying, we are fine with having a trade agreement that weakens protections against human trafficking; and we are fine with entering into a trade agreement with countries like Vietnam, which denies workers even the most basic collective bargaining rights, while throwing workers' advocates into prison.

So we are not voting on TPP. We are voting on TPA. But we are setting the rules for governing the negotiations, and we are removing ourselves from the process of improving and strengthening this trade agreement.

The House should reject this proposal and stand with hard-working Americans. We should oppose TPA. We should oppose the rule.

For 30 years, we have had trade policies in this country that have failed American workers, driving down wages, increasing income inequality, and, as a result of it, costing jobs. A vote for fast track is a vote to abandon our responsibility to ensure that trade works for our country and for American workers.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, to reject the underlying bill, and to vote ''no'' on TPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will control the time for the minority side.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a letter to Members of Congress from the general president of the International Association of Firefighters opposing House Resolution 321 when it attaches trade promotion authority to H.R. 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF FIRE FIGHTERS,
June 18, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of more than 300,000 professional fire fighters and emergency medical personnel, I strongly urge you to oppose H.Res.321 which attaches Trade Promotion Authority to HR 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employee's Retirement Act.

The underlying legislation provides an important measure of retirement security to the federal fighters who protect our nation's defense installations, VA hospitals and other vital facilities. It should not be politically exploited and used in a last ditch, desperate effort to pass TPA.

HR 2146, which simply enables federal fire fighters to access their own retirement savings once they reach retirement age, was passed by the House by a vote of 407–5 and adopted unanimously in the Senate with a technical amendment. This amended legislation deserves to be considered free of political gamesmanship and procedural tricks.

The IAFF urges you to oppose this rule, and consider HR 2146 without controversial amendments.

Sincerely,

HAROLD A. SCHAITBERGER,
General President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if we vote for trade promotion authority, fast track, without Trade Adjustment Assistance, if that is how we vote today, that is what we will get.

The Republican chair of the Rules Committee has made it clear. He has already used his precious time to start blaming Democratic leadership for the fact that Trade Adjustment Assistance will not become law.

The fact is that if Trade Adjustment Assistance ever comes before this House, it will, no doubt, be loaded up by the Republican leadership with a host of poison pills, making sure that Democrats cannot vote for it. I can't vote for Trade Adjustment Assistance if you terminate the Affordable Care Act as part of the bill, for example.

Now the proponents of trade promotion authority have had to misstate the actual economic facts, the figures on our trade surpluses and deficits, in order to make their case. They have come again and again and said, we have a trade surplus with our free trade agreement partners.

Completely false. I will put into the RECORD the chart listing each of our free trade agreement partners, and we are running a $177 billion deficit in goods. Including services, you are now down to a little over a $100 billion deficit.

□ 1030

Now, how is it that Member after Member has come here and said something demonstrably false? They have been fooled by slippery charlatans who feed them the following line: Since NAFTA, we have a surplus with those countries that have a free trade agreement.

''Since NAFTA'' implies since the early 1990s. No, they mean those agreements we entered into after NAFTA. So they look at our free trade agreements while ignoring NAFTA. That is like looking at the Cavs and ignoring LeBron. You can't do that.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the success and failure of our free trade agreements, number one is NAFTA. If you include all of our free trade agreements, including NAFTA, we have a $177 billion goods deficit. And then if you look at MFN for China, most favored nation status for China, well, then you are talking $400 billion of deficit. That was not a free trade agreement. That was an even worse agreement.

This TPP is a gift to China. First, it enshrines the idea that currency manipulation will be allowed, even encouraged. It sets Chinese rules for trade in Asia, preserving for them their number one tactic in running such a huge trade surplus with the United States. It hollows out American manufacturing, thus endangering our national security. And the rules of origin provision available for review in the basement will show you that goods that are 50 and 60 percent made in China, admitted to be made in China, which means actually 70 or 80 percent really made in China, come fast-tracked into the United States. China gets the benefit and doesn't have to make a single concession.

Vote ''no.''

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. First, we were all on the fast track, then the slow track with postponement into July, and now we are back on rush-hour scheduling, being told that fast track, which has been mangled in the meantime with new changes, has to be approved by high noon today.

Railroading this bill through now will deny any opportunity to ensure that our trade policy gets on the right track. The fast-trackers have rejected every constructive improvement for a better trade measure that we have advanced. And even these fast-trackers, if they are really candid with the American people, would concede there is not a Member of this Congress who knows what is in this agreement to the extent that the Vietnamese Politburo does. Because so much of it has been secreted, we do not have one word that has been made public or accessible to us about how it is that Vietnam will enforce provisions to ensure greater worker freedom and opportunity instead of being part of a race to the bottom.

What we do know about this fast-track agreement from a recent Canadian ruling, Bilcon v. Canada, is that corporate panels will be empowered to charge taxpayers millions of dollars for the privilege of maintaining public health and safety laws. The language to which my colleague from Texas has referred about preserving American laws is really meaningless because, yes, they are preserved, but when your city or your State acts to protect you, foreign corporations are accorded more rights than American businesses, and they can demand millions for keeping our laws in place.

What we do know is that, since last week, this railroad has picked up some mighty unsavory characters. The irony is that on the very day Pope Francis is formally releasing his encyclical on global warming, this railroad has picked up a troubling new provision that would deny any opportunity to address the greatest environmental challenge that our world faces.

Even Trans-Pacific Partnership supporters concede that it looks like a charter for corporate America rather than a high-level trade agreement. The Financial Times said, ''In too many aspects, it looks like a charter for corporate America.''

We learn, I think, more from USTR's past failures than from its current promises. USTR has never in its history successfully challenged worker or environmental abuses by any of our foreign trading partners. Usually the reason that USTR fails is that it doesn't really try. It doesn't seem to have a belief in law enforcement when it comes to worker and environmental abuse. In Guatemala, it took it eight years to even bring a dispute. In Honduras, it took nearly four years to issue another bureaucratic report. In Peru, we cannot get the audit that USTR was responsible for obtaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, ''Asleep at the Wheel'' is a great Texas swing band, but it is a horrible philosophy for trade law enforcement. Reject this rule; help us get a better trade policy; protect American families; and advance our economy. We can do better than this by rejecting this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, let me say to my colleagues that they should be appalled by

this process. This is again being brought up under a process where nobody—not just Democrats, but Republicans as well—can offer amendments.

In the United States Senate when TPA was considered, they were able to offer amendments, but when it came before the House last week, we were told we could offer no amendments. The excuse we were given is because, if we passed it, it would go right to the White House. But what we are doing today is actually not going to the White House. It is going back to the Senate, yet we are again being presented with a closed process.

Why can't Members of both sides of the aisle have an opportunity to make their views known on this important issue? Why are we being shut out when it comes to the issue of trade and TPA?

I heard a number of speakers say that this debate is not about TPP. Well, this is indeed about the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Whether or not TPP is implemented will depend almost entirely on whether the President has fast track in place.

The vote on fast track, or TPA, will determine the fate of the TPP trade deal. So a ''yes'' vote on TPA is a ''yes'' vote on TPP. It is that simple. History shows that is how it has worked time and time and time again.

Fast track is not just about TPP. If we vote for TPA for fast track, we are fast-tracking any trade deal that any President negotiates anytime in the next 6 years. We have no idea who the next President will be, but you are giving the next President—or next Presidents—the authority to have fast-track authority on whatever they want. Why are we just giving away all of our ability to play a role in these negotiations? The problem with these trade deals is that only the well-off and well-connected have a seat at the table.

I urge my colleagues to put American workers first. Vote ''no'' on the rule and vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the TPP is modeled after a failed trade agreement. It will further erode our national economy and change the rules in ways that hurt American workers. We are supposed to be here to protect the American workers and to create more opportunity, and we are yet going down the road of another trade deal that is going to rob America of important middle class jobs. It is appalling, and this process is appalling.

Vote ''no'' on the rule, and vote ''no'' on the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this debate today has been most interesting about the differences between the speakers who showed up today. One group of speakers is for America, for growth, for America leading, for America engaging the world, and for cutting deals with our friends against one other huge country that will overrun in every single economic circumstance the rest of the world because they do not respect intellectual property or rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, this is about gathering together the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to where we gather together the best rules and regulations that we can, parameters by which the President would go negotiate. This isn't about abdicating our role and responsibility. It is trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, please, we understand that some people haven't read the bill. We understand some people think this is about TPP or other agreements, but it is not. This is about a simple process: Are we going to exert our constitutional authority? Are we going to engage the President where the President can go engage the world on behalf of the American worker? Are we going to lead, or are we going to stick our head in the sand?

Mr. Speaker, America needs to lead, and the world wants us to lead. Mr. Speaker, the world wants American products, and American business wants to sell to others without high prices and without tariffs. What we want to do is to compete. That is why we are here today.

I urge adoption of this rule. I look forward to the debate that will follow, and I look forward to our young chairman, PAUL RYAN, leading that effort, proving not only to the Members here today and to you, Mr. Speaker, but to the American people that we want more jobs. We have not created all the jobs that we need in this country. We need more, and this is a part of that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

YEAS—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
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)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
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)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Byrne
Clyburn
Davis, Rodney
Gohmert
Gosar
Hurt (VA)
Jolly
Kelly (MS)

□ 1108

Mrs. ROBY and Mr. BRADY of Texas changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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 for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 373 on H. Res. 321. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

□ 1115

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 321, I call up the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2015.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with the amendment printed in House Report 114–167.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

At the end of the Senate amendment, add the following:

TITLE I—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

SEC. 102. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(a) OVERALL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States for agreements subject to the provisions of section 103 are—

(1) to obtain more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and enhance the global economy;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets, equitable trade benefits, and expanded export market opportunities, and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

(9) to promote universal ratification and full compliance with ILO Convention No. 182 Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor;

(10) to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity;

(11) to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce;

(12) to take into account other legitimate United States domestic objectives, including, but not limited to, the protection of legitimate health or safety, essential security, and consumer interests and the law and regulations related thereto; and

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

(b) PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—

(1) TRADE IN GOODS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade in goods are—

(A) to expand competitive market opportunities for exports of goods from the United States and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through the utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers and policies and practices of foreign governments directly related to trade that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade; and

(B) to obtain reciprocal tariff and nontariff barrier elimination agreements, including with respect to those tariff categories covered in section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(2) TRADE IN SERVICES.—(A) The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding trade in services is to expand competitive market opportunities for United States services and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating barriers to international trade in services, such as regulatory and other barriers that deny national treatment and market access or unreasonably restrict the establishment or operations of service suppliers.

(B) Recognizing that expansion of trade in services generates benefits for all sectors of the economy and facilitates trade, the objective described in subparagraph (A) should be pursued through all means, including through a plurilateral agreement with those countries willing and able to undertake high standard services commitments for both existing and new services.

(3) TRADE IN AGRICULTURE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to agriculture is to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of agricultural commodities in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in bulk, specialty crop, and value added commodities by—

(A) securing more open and equitable market access through robust rules on sanitary and phytosanitary measures that—

(i) encourage the adoption of international standards and require a science-based justification be provided for a sanitary or phytosanitary measure if the measure is more restrictive than the applicable international standard;

(ii) improve regulatory coherence, promote the use of systems-based approaches, and appropriately recognize the equivalence of health and safety protection systems of exporting countries;

(iii) require that measures are transparently developed and implemented, are based on risk assessments that take into account relevant international guidelines and scientific data, and are not more restrictive

on trade than necessary to meet the intended purpose; and

(iv) improve import check processes, including testing methodologies and procedures, and certification requirements,

while recognizing that countries may put in place measures to protect human, animal, or plant life or health in a manner consistent with their international obligations, including the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (referred to in section 101(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(3))));

(B) reducing or eliminating, by a date certain, tariffs or other charges that decrease market opportunities for United States exports—

(i) giving priority to those products that are subject to significantly higher tariffs or subsidy regimes of major producing countries; and

(ii) providing reasonable adjustment periods for United States import sensitive products, in close consultation with Congress on such products before initiating tariff reduction negotiations;

(C) reducing tariffs to levels that are the same as or lower than those in the United States;

(D) reducing or eliminating subsidies that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or unfairly distort agriculture markets to the detriment of the United States;

(E) allowing the preservation of programs that support family farms and rural communities but do not distort trade;

(F) developing disciplines for domestic support programs, so that production that is in excess of domestic food security needs is sold at world prices;

(G) eliminating government policies that create price depressing surpluses;

(H) eliminating state trading enterprises whenever possible;

(I) developing, strengthening, and clarifying rules to eliminate practices that unfairly decrease United States market access opportunities or distort agricultural markets to the detriment of the United States, and ensuring that such rules are subject to efficient, timely, and effective dispute settlement, including—

(i) unfair or trade distorting activities of state trading enterprises and other administrative mechanisms, with emphasis on requiring price transparency in the operation of state trading enterprises and such other mechanisms in order to end cross subsidization, price discrimination, and price undercutting;

(ii) unjustified trade restrictions or commercial requirements, such as labeling, that affect new technologies, including biotechnology;

(iii) unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including restrictions not based on scientific principles in contravention of obligations in the Uruguay Round Agreements or bilateral or regional trade agreements;

(iv) other unjustified technical barriers to trade; and

(v) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff rate quotas;

(J) eliminating practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or cyclical products, while improving import relief mechanisms to recognize the unique characteristics of perishable and cyclical agriculture;

(K) ensuring that import relief mechanisms for perishable and cyclical agriculture are as accessible and timely to growers in the United States as those mechanisms that are used by other countries;

(L) taking into account whether a party to the negotiations has failed to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or has circumvented obligations under those agreements;

(M) taking into account whether a product is subject to market distortions by reason of a failure of a major producing country to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or by the circumvention by that country of its obligations under those agreements;

(N) otherwise ensuring that countries that accede to the World Trade Organization have made meaningful market liberalization commitments in agriculture;

(O) taking into account the impact that agreements covering agriculture to which the United States is a party have on the United States agricultural industry;

(P) maintaining bona fide food assistance programs, market development programs, and export credit programs;

(Q) seeking to secure the broadest market access possible in multilateral, regional, and bilateral negotiations, recognizing the effect that simultaneous sets of negotiations may have on United States import sensitive commodities (including those subject to tariff rate quotas);

(R) seeking to develop an international consensus on the treatment of seasonal or perishable agricultural products in investigations relating to dumping and safeguards and in any other relevant area;

(S) seeking to establish the common base year for calculating the Aggregated Measurement of Support (as defined in the Agreement on Agriculture) as the end of each country's Uruguay Round implementation period, as reported in each country's Uruguay Round market access schedule;

(T) ensuring transparency in the administration of tariff rate quotas through multilateral, plurilateral, and bilateral negotiations; and

(U) eliminating and preventing the undermining of market access for United States products through improper use of a country's system for protecting or recognizing geographical indications, including failing to ensure transparency and procedural fairness and protecting generic terms.

(4) FOREIGN INVESTMENT.—Recognizing that United States law on the whole provides a high level of protection for investment, consistent with or greater than the level required by international law, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding foreign investment are to reduce or eliminate artificial or trade distorting barriers to foreign investment, while ensuring that foreign investors in the United States are not accorded greater substantive rights with respect to investment protections than United States investors in the United States, and to secure for investors important rights comparable to those that would be available under United States legal principles and practice, by—

(A) reducing or eliminating exceptions to the principle of national treatment;

(B) freeing the transfer of funds relating to investments;

(C) reducing or eliminating performance requirements, forced technology transfers, and other unreasonable barriers to the establishment and operation of investments;

(D) seeking to establish standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation, consistent with United States legal principles and practice;

(E) seeking to establish standards for fair and equitable treatment, consistent with United States legal principles and practice, including the principle of due process;

(F) providing meaningful procedures for resolving investment disputes;

(G) seeking to improve mechanisms used to resolve disputes between an investor and a government through—

(i) mechanisms to eliminate frivolous claims and to deter the filing of frivolous claims;

(ii) procedures to ensure the efficient selection of arbitrators and the expeditious disposition of claims;

(iii) procedures to enhance opportunities for public input into the formulation of government positions; and

(iv) providing for an appellate body or similar mechanism to provide coherence to the interpretations of investment provisions in trade agreements; and

(H) ensuring the fullest measure of transparency in the dispute settlement mechanism, to the extent consistent with the need to protect information that is classified or business confidential, by—

(i) ensuring that all requests for dispute settlement are promptly made public;

(ii) ensuring that—

(I) all proceedings, submissions, findings, and decisions are promptly made public; and

(II) all hearings are open to the public; and

(iii) establishing a mechanism for acceptance of amicus curiae submissions from businesses, unions, and nongovernmental organizations.

(5) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade-related intellectual property are—

(A) to further promote adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights, including through—

(i)(I) ensuring accelerated and full implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)), particularly with respect to meeting enforcement obligations under that agreement; and

(II) ensuring that the provisions of any trade agreement governing intellectual property rights that is entered into by the United States reflect a standard of protection similar to that found in United States law;

(ii) providing strong protection for new and emerging technologies and new methods of transmitting and distributing products embodying intellectual property, including in a manner that facilitates legitimate digital trade;

(iii) preventing or eliminating discrimination with respect to matters affecting the availability, acquisition, scope, maintenance, use, and enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(iv) ensuring that standards of protection and enforcement keep pace with technological developments, and in particular ensuring that rightholders have the legal and technological means to control the use of their works through the Internet and other global communication media, and to prevent the unauthorized use of their works;

(v) providing strong enforcement of intellectual property rights, including through accessible, expeditious, and effective civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement mechanisms; and

(vi) preventing or eliminating government involvement in the violation of intellectual property rights, including cyber theft and piracy;

(B) to secure fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory market access opportunities for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; and

(C) to respect the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar on November 14, 2001, and to ensure

that trade agreements foster innovation and promote access to medicines.

(6) DIGITAL TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES AND CROSS-BORDER DATA FLOWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to digital trade in goods and services, as well as cross-border data flows, are—

(A) to ensure that current obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments under the World Trade Organization and bilateral and regional trade agreements apply to digital trade in goods and services and to cross-border data flows;

(B) to ensure that—

(i) electronically delivered goods and services receive no less favorable treatment under trade rules and commitments than like products delivered in physical form; and

(ii) the classification of such goods and services ensures the most liberal trade treatment possible, fully encompassing both existing and new trade;

(C) to ensure that governments refrain from implementing trade-related measures that impede digital trade in goods and services, restrict cross-border data flows, or require local storage or processing of data;

(D) with respect to subparagraphs (A) through (C), where legitimate policy objectives require domestic regulations that affect digital trade in goods and services or cross-border data flows, to obtain commitments that any such regulations are the least restrictive on trade, nondiscriminatory, and transparent, and promote an open market environment; and

(E) to extend the moratorium of the World Trade Organization on duties on electronic transmissions.

(7) REGULATORY PRACTICES.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the use of government regulation or other practices to reduce market access for United States goods, services, and investments are—

(A) to achieve increased transparency and opportunity for the participation of affected parties in the development of regulations;

(B) to require that proposed regulations be based on sound science, cost benefit analysis, risk assessment, or other objective evidence;

(C) to establish consultative mechanisms and seek other commitments, as appropriate, to improve regulatory practices and promote increased regulatory coherence, including through—

(i) transparency in developing guidelines, rules, regulations, and laws for government procurement and other regulatory regimes;

(ii) the elimination of redundancies in testing and certification;

(iii) early consultations on significant regulations;

(iv) the use of impact assessments;

(v) the periodic review of existing regulatory measures; and

(vi) the application of good regulatory practices;

(D) to seek greater openness, transparency, and convergence of standards development processes, and enhance cooperation on standards issues globally;

(E) to promote regulatory compatibility through harmonization, equivalence, or mutual recognition of different regulations and standards and to encourage the use of international and interoperable standards, as appropriate;

(F) to achieve the elimination of government measures such as price controls and reference pricing which deny full market access for United States products;

(G) to ensure that government regulatory reimbursement regimes are transparent, provide procedural fairness, are nondiscriminatory, and provide full market access for United States products; and

(H) to ensure that foreign governments—

(i) demonstrate that the collection of undisclosed proprietary information is limited to that necessary to satisfy a legitimate and justifiable regulatory interest; and

(ii) protect such information against disclosure, except in exceptional circumstances to protect the public, or where such information is effectively protected against unfair competition.

(8) STATE-OWNED AND STATE-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding competition by state-owned and state-controlled enterprises is to seek commitments that—

(A) eliminate or prevent trade distortions and unfair competition favoring state-owned and state-controlled enterprises to the extent of their engagement in commercial activity, and

(B) ensure that such engagement is based solely on commercial considerations,

in particular through disciplines that eliminate or prevent discrimination and market-distorting subsidies and that promote transparency.

(9) LOCALIZATION BARRIERS TO TRADE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to localization barriers is to eliminate and prevent measures that require United States producers and service providers to locate facilities, intellectual property, or other assets in a country as a market access or investment condition, including indigenous innovation measures.

(10) LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to labor and the environment are—

(A) to ensure that a party to a trade agreement with the United States—

(i) adopts and maintains measures implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)) and its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)),

(ii) does not waive or otherwise derogate from, or offer to waive or otherwise derogate from—

(I) its statutes or regulations implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)), in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, where the waiver or derogation would be inconsistent with one or more such standards, or

(II) its environmental laws in a manner that weakens or reduces the protections afforded in those laws and in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, except as provided in its law and provided not inconsistent with its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)) or other provisions of the trade agreement specifically agreed upon, and

(iii) does not fail to effectively enforce its environmental or labor laws, through a sustained or recurring course of action or inaction,

in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party after entry into force of a trade agreement between those countries;

(B) to recognize that—

(i) with respect to environment, parties to a trade agreement retain the right to exercise prosecutorial discretion and to make decisions regarding the allocation of enforcement resources with respect to other environmental laws determined to have higher priorities, and a party is effectively enforcing its laws if a course of action or inaction reflects a reasonable, bona fide exercise of such discretion, or results from a reasonable, bona fide decision regarding the allocation of resources; and

(ii) with respect to labor, decisions regarding the distribution of enforcement resources are not a reason for not complying with a party's labor obligations; a party to a trade agreement retains the right to reasonable exercise of discretion and to make bona fide decisions regarding the allocation of resources between labor enforcement activities among core labor standards, provided the exercise of such discretion and such decisions are not inconsistent with its obligations;

(C) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to promote respect for core labor standards (as defined in section 111(7));

(D) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to protect the environment through the promotion of sustainable development;

(E) to reduce or eliminate government practices or policies that unduly threaten sustainable development;

(F) to seek market access, through the elimination of tariffs and nontariff barriers, for United States environmental technologies, goods, and services;

(G) to ensure that labor, environmental, health, or safety policies and practices of the parties to trade agreements with the United States do not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate against United States exports or serve as disguised barriers to trade;

(H) to ensure that enforceable labor and environment obligations are subject to the same dispute settlement and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement; and

(I) to ensure that a trade agreement is not construed to empower a party's authorities to undertake labor or environmental law enforcement activities in the territory of the United States.

(11) CURRENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to currency practices is that parties to a trade agreement with the United States avoid manipulating exchange rates in order to prevent effective balance of payments adjustment or to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other parties to the agreement, such as through cooperative mechanisms, enforceable rules, reporting, monitoring, transparency, or other means, as appropriate.

(12) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

(13) WTO AND MULTILATERAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.—Recognizing that the World Trade Organization is the foundation of the global trading system, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the World Trade Organization, the Uruguay Round Agreements, and other multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements are—

(A) to achieve full implementation and extend the coverage of the World Trade Organization and multilateral and plurilateral agreements to products, sectors, and conditions of trade not adequately covered;

(B) to expand country participation in and enhancement of the Information Technology

Agreement, the Government Procurement Agreement, and other plurilateral trade agreements of the World Trade Organization;

(C) to expand competitive market opportunities for United States exports and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, through the negotiation of new WTO multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements, such as an agreement on trade facilitation;

(D) to ensure that regional trade agreements to which the United States is not a party fully achieve the high standards of, and comply with, WTO disciplines, including Article XXIV of GATT 1994, Article V and V bis of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, and the Enabling Clause, including through meaningful WTO review of such regional trade agreements;

(E) to enhance compliance by WTO members with their obligations as WTO members through active participation in the bodies of the World Trade Organization by the United States and all other WTO members, including in the trade policy review mechanism and the committee system of the World Trade Organization, and by working to increase the effectiveness of such bodies; and

(F) to encourage greater cooperation between the World Trade Organization and other international organizations.

(14) TRADE INSTITUTION TRANSPARENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to transparency is to obtain wider and broader application of the principle of transparency in the World Trade Organization, entities established under bilateral and regional trade agreements, and other international trade fora through seeking—

(A) timely public access to information regarding trade issues and the activities of such institutions;

(B) openness by ensuring public access to appropriate meetings, proceedings, and submissions, including with regard to trade and investment dispute settlement; and

(C) public access to all notifications and supporting documentation submitted by WTO members.

(15) ANTI-CORRUPTION.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the use of money or other things of value to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any improper advantage in a manner affecting trade are—

(A) to obtain high standards and effective domestic enforcement mechanisms applicable to persons from all countries participating in the applicable trade agreement that prohibit such attempts to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any such improper advantage;

(B) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and

(C) to seek commitments to work jointly to encourage and support anti-corruption and anti-bribery initiatives in international trade fora, including through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, done at Paris December 17, 1997 (commonly known as the ''OECD Anti-Bribery Convention'').

(16) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to dispute settlement and enforcement of trade agreements are—

(A) to seek provisions in trade agreements providing for resolution of disputes between governments under those trade agreements in an effective, timely, transparent, equitable, and reasoned manner, requiring determinations based on facts and the principles of the agreements, with the goal of increasing compliance with the agreements;

(B) to seek to strengthen the capacity of the Trade Policy Review Mechanism of the World Trade Organization to review compliance with commitments;

(C) to seek adherence by panels convened under the Dispute Settlement Understanding and by the Appellate Body to—

(i) the mandate of those panels and the Appellate Body to apply the WTO Agreement as written, without adding to or diminishing rights and obligations under the Agreement; and

(ii) the standard of review applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreement involved in the dispute, including greater deference, where appropriate, to the fact finding and technical expertise of national investigating authorities;

(D) to seek provisions encouraging the early identification and settlement of disputes through consultation;

(E) to seek provisions to encourage the provision of trade-expanding compensation if a party to a dispute under the agreement does not come into compliance with its obligations under the agreement;

(F) to seek provisions to impose a penalty upon a party to a dispute under the agreement that—

(i) encourages compliance with the obligations of the agreement;

(ii) is appropriate to the parties, nature, subject matter, and scope of the violation; and

(iii) has the aim of not adversely affecting parties or interests not party to the dispute while maintaining the effectiveness of the enforcement mechanism; and

(G) to seek provisions that treat United States principal negotiating objectives equally with respect to—

(i) the ability to resort to dispute settlement under the applicable agreement;

(ii) the availability of equivalent dispute settlement procedures; and

(iii) the availability of equivalent remedies.

(17) TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are—

(A) to preserve the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws, including the antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws, and avoid agreements that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies, or that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(B) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market access barriers.

(18) BORDER TAXES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding border taxes is to obtain a revision of the rules of the World Trade Organization with respect to the treatment of border adjustments for internal taxes to redress the disadvantage to countries relying primarily on direct taxes for revenue rather than indirect taxes.

(19) TEXTILE NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in textiles and apparel articles are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of textiles and apparel in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in textiles and apparel.

(20) COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an agreement that is proposed to be entered into with the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership countries and to which section 103(b) will apply, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships are the following:

(i) To discourage actions by potential trading partners that directly or indirectly prejudice or otherwise discourage commercial activity solely between the United States and Israel.

(ii) To discourage politically motivated actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel and to seek the elimination of politically motivated nontariff barriers on Israeli goods, services, or other commerce imposed on the State of Israel.

(iii) To seek the elimination of state-sponsored unsanctioned foreign boycotts against Israel or compliance with the Arab League Boycott of Israel by prospective trading partners.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ''actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel'' means actions by states, non-member states of the United Nations, international organizations, or affiliated agencies of international organizations that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories.

(21) GOOD GOVERNANCE, TRANSPARENCY, THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LEGAL REGIMES, AND THE RULE OF LAW OF TRADING PARTNERS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to ensuring implementation of trade commitments and obligations by strengthening good governance, transparency, the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law of trading partners of the United States is through capacity building and other appropriate means, which are important parts of the broader effort to create more open democratic societies and to promote respect for internationally recognized human rights.

(c) CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIORITIES.—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall—

(1) direct the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by consulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concerning that country's laws relating to customs and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mechanisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environment and human health based on sound science;

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with parties to such agreements regarding the consistency of any such agreement that includes trade measures with existing environmental exceptions under Article XX of GATT 1994; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate an

annual report on capacity-building activities undertaken in connection with trade agreements negotiated or being negotiated pursuant to this title.

SEC. 103. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c); and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuance of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such additional duties,

as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify Congress of the President's intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of the enactment of this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreements or a successor agreement, on any import sensitive agricultural product; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—

(A) AGGREGATE REDUCTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of 1/10 of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(5) ROUNDING.—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) ½ of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (3) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 106 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), and subject to the consultation and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3524), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization.

(8) AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(b) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NONTARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Whenever the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or any other import restriction of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect,

and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President may enter into a trade agreement described in subparagraph (B) during the period described in subparagraph (C).

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under subparagraph (A) with foreign countries providing for—

(i) the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the prohibition of, or limitation on the imposition of, such barrier or other distortion.

(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c).

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) CONDITIONS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(3) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as ''trade authorities procedures'') apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an ''implementing bill''.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(c) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL PROCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 106(b)—

(A) the trade authorities procedures apply to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(B) the trade authorities procedures shall be extended to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) after June 30, 2018, and before July 1, 2021, if (and only if)—

(i) the President requests such extension under paragraph (2); and

(ii) neither House of Congress adopts an extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (5) before July 1, 2018.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.—If the President is of the opinion that the trade authorities procedures should be extended to implementing bills described in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall submit to Congress, not later than April 1, 2018, a written report that contains a request for such extension, together with—

(A) a description of all trade agreements that have been negotiated under subsection (b) and the anticipated schedule for submitting such agreements to Congress for approval;

(B) a description of the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title, and a statement that such progress justifies the continuation of negotiations; and

(C) a statement of the reasons why the extension is needed to complete the negotiations.

(3) OTHER REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The President shall promptly inform the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advisory Committee shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The President shall promptly inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018,

a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) STATUS OF REPORTS.—The reports submitted to Congress under paragraphs (2) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS.—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ''extension disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.'', with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) Extension disapproval resolutions—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and

(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to extension disapproval resolutions.

(D) It is not in order for—

(i) the House of Representatives to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules;

(ii) the Senate to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance; or

(iii) either House of Congress to consider an extension disapproval resolution after June 30, 2018.

(d) COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

SEC. 104. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) CONSULTATIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—

(1) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) ENHANCED COORDINATION WITH CONGRESS.—

(A) WRITTEN GUIDELINES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with Congress, including coordination with designated congressional advisers under subsection (b), regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall enhance coordination with Congress through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings upon request of any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress conducted under this title, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information with Members of Congress, and their staff with proper security clearances as appropriate, regarding those negotiations and pertinent documents related to those negotiations (including classified information), and with committee staff with proper security clearances as would be appropriate in the light of the responsibilities of that committee over the trade agreements programs affected by those negotiations.

(C) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—

(A) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In each Congress, any Member of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) SENATE.—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) CONSULTATIONS WITH DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).

(3) ACCREDITATION.—Each Member of Congress designated as a congressional adviser under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiating sessions relating to trade agreements.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUPS ON NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the ''congressional advisory groups'').

(2) MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the House of Representatives that would have, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(B) MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.—In each Congress, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the

Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(C) ACCREDITATION.—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable trade agreement, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement.

(E) CHAIR.—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(F) COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups may submit comments to the member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

(3) GUIDELINES.—

(A) PURPOSE AND REVISION.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be specified in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) access by members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance and enforcement of negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 105(d)(3).

(4) REQUEST FOR MEETING.—Upon the request of a majority of either of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(d) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(e) CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(A) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(B) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas the member represents, and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended—

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

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

''(3) There shall be in the Office one Chief Transparency Officer. The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with Congress on transparency policy, coordinate transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.''.

SEC. 105. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.—

(1) NOTICE.—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 103(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, written notice to Congress of the President's intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement;

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c);

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c), meet with the requesting congressional advisory group before initiating the negotiations or at any other time concerning the negotiations; and

(D) after consulting with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance, and at least 30 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and regularly update thereafter, a detailed and comprehensive summary of the specific objectives with respect to the negotiations, and a description of how the agreement, if successfully concluded, will further those objectives and benefit the United States.

(2) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.—

(A) ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter under section 102(b)(3)(B) with any country, the President shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country;

(ii) consider whether the tariff levels bound and applied throughout the world with respect to imports from the United States are higher than United States tariffs and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(iii) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.—(i) Before initiating negotiations with regard to agriculture and, with respect to agreements described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 107(a), as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(I) identify those agricultural products subject to tariff rate quotas on the date of enactment of this Act, and agricultural products subject to tariff reductions by the United States as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, for which the rate of duty was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate which was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994;

(II) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning—

(aa) whether any further tariff reductions on the products identified under subclause (I) should be appropriate, taking into account the impact of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned;

(bb) whether the products so identified face unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including those not based on scientific principles in contravention of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(cc) whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain export subsidies or other programs, policies, or practices that distort world trade in such products and the impact of such programs, policies, and practices on United States producers of the products;

(III) request that the International Trade Commission prepare an assessment of the probable economic effects of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned and on the United States economy as a whole; and

(IV) upon complying with subclauses (I), (II), and (III), notify the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of those products identified under subclause (I) for which the Trade Representative intends to seek tariff liberalization in the negotiations and the reasons for seeking such tariff liberalization.

(ii) If, after negotiations described in clause (i) are commenced—

(I) the United States Trade Representative identifies any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) for tariff reductions which were not the subject of a notification under clause (i)(IV), or

(II) any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) is the subject of a request for tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations,

the Trade Representative shall, as soon as practicable, notify the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the reasons for seeking such tariff reductions.

(3) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY.—Before initiating, or continuing, negotiations that directly relate to fish or shellfish trade with any country, the President shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(4) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING TEXTILES.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(5) ADHERENCE TO EXISTING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT AGREEMENT OBLIGATIONS.—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account the extent to which that country has implemented, or has accelerated the implementation of, its international trade and investment commitments to the United States, including pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ENTRY INTO AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 103(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

(2) SCOPE.—The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 106, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(3) REPORT REGARDING UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CERTAIN TRADE LAWS.—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

(i) the range of proposals advanced in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could require amendments to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(ii) how these proposals relate to the objectives described in section 102(b)(16).

(B) RESOLUTIONS.—(i) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), if a resolution is introduced with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) no procedural disapproval resolution under section 106(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations to which the report under subparagraph (A) relates has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ''resolution'' means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the _____ finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on _____ under section 105(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 with respect to _____, are inconsistent with the negotiating objectives described in section 102(b)(16) of that Act.'', with the first blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress, the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date of the report, and the third blank space being filled with the name of the country or countries involved.

(iii) Resolutions in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(iv) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(4) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 shall be provided to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 103(a)(2) or 106(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(c) INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO COMMISSION.—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the ''Commission'') with the details of the agreement as it exists at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the

agreement as described in paragraph (2). Between the time the President makes the request under this paragraph and the time the Commission submits the assessment, the President shall keep the Commission current with respect to the details of the agreement.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 105 calendar days after the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report assessing the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

(3) REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE.—In preparing the assessment under paragraph (2), the Commission shall review available economic assessments regarding the agreement, including literature regarding any substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and shall provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make each assessment under paragraph (2) available to the public.

(d) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES WITH AGREEMENT.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) conduct environmental reviews of future trade and investment agreements, consistent with Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169), dated November 16, 1999, and its relevant guidelines; and

(B) submit a report on those reviews and on the content and operation of consultative mechanisms established pursuant to section 102(c) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(2) EMPLOYMENT IMPACT REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The President shall—

(A) review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169) to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria; and

(B) submit a report on such reviews to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(3) REPORT ON LABOR RIGHTS.—The President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on a timeframe determined in accordance with section 104(c)(3)(B)(v)—

(A) a meaningful labor rights report of the country, or countries, with respect to which the President is negotiating; and

(B) a description of any provisions that would require changes to the labor laws and labor practices of the United States.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E), the President shall also submit to Congress a plan for implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs and agricultural inspectors.

(B) AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required by Federal agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture (including additional personnel required to implement sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to obtain market access for United States exports), the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) CUSTOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS.—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) IMPACT ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) COST ANALYSIS.—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—The President shall include a request for the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, after the date of the submission of the plan.

(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the plan required under this subsection available to the public.

(f) OTHER REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT ON PENALTIES.—Not later than one year after the imposition by the United States of a penalty or remedy permitted by a trade agreement to which this title applies, the President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the penalty or remedy applied under United States law in enforcing United States rights under the trade agreement, which shall address whether the penalty or remedy was effective in changing the behavior of the targeted party and whether the penalty or remedy had any adverse impact on parties or interests not party to the dispute.

(2) REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 5 years thereafter, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements with respect to which Congress has enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures since January 1, 1984.

(3) ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS AND REPORTS.—(A) The United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate after acceptance of a petition for review or taking an enforcement action in regard to an obligation under a trade agreement, including a labor or environmental obligation. During such consultations, the United States Trade Representative shall describe the matter, including the basis for such action and the application of any relevant legal obligations.

(B) As part of the report required pursuant to section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213), the President shall report annually to Congress on enforcement actions taken pursuant to a trade agreement to which the United States is a party, as well as on any public reports issued by Federal agencies on enforcement matters relating to a trade agreement.

(g) ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.—Any Member of the House of Representatives may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and any Member of the Senate may submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

SEC. 106. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the agreement, publishes the text of the agreement on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(C) within 60 days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(D) the President, at least 30 days before submitting to Congress the materials under subparagraph (E), submits to Congress—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement;

(E) after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft of an implementing bill described in section 103(b)(3);

(ii) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(iii) the supporting information described in paragraph (2)(A);

(F) the implementing bill is enacted into law; and

(G) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to a party to the agreement, submits written notice to Congress that the President has determined that the party has taken measures necessary to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date on which the agreement enters into force.

(2) SUPPORTING INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The supporting information required under paragraph (1)(E)(iii) consists of—

(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(I) asserting that the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(II) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 103(b)(3).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) does not receive benefits under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(4) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or other understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacts an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) FOR LACK OF NOTICE OR CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if during the 60-day period beginning on the date that one House of Congress agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution for lack of notice or consultations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements, the other House separately agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(B) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ''procedural disapproval resolution'' means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements with respect to which the President is considered to have failed or refused to notify or consult.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i) and paragraphs (3)(C) and (4)(C), the President has ''failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015'' on negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements if—

(I) the President has failed or refused to consult (as the case may be) in accordance with sections 104 and 105 and this section with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(II) guidelines under section 104 have not been developed or met with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(III) the President has not met with the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations pursuant to a request made under section 104(c)(4) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements; or

(IV) the agreement or agreements fail to make progress in achieving the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title.

(2) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolutions—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee; and

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution with respect to that trade agreement has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, and if no resolution described in clause (ii) of section 105(b)(3)(B) with respect to that trade agreement has been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) of such section.

(C) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(D) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN SENATE OF CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION TO REMOVE TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(A) REPORTING OF RESOLUTION.—If, when the Committee on Finance of the Senate meets on whether to report an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b), the committee fails to favorably report the bill, the committee shall report a resolution described in subparagraph (C).

(B) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A) if the Committee on Finance reports a resolution described in subparagraph (C) and such resolution is agreed to by the Senate.

(C) RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A resolution described in this subparagraph is a resolution of the Senate originating from the Committee on Finance the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PROCEDURES.—If the Senate does not agree to a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to a resolution described in subparagraph (C), the resolution shall be committed to the Committee on Finance.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF A CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION.—

(A) QUALIFICATIONS FOR REPORTING RESOLUTION.—If—

(i) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives reports an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b) with other than a favorable recommendation; and

(ii) a Member of the House of Representatives has introduced a consultation and compliance resolution on the legislative day following the filing of a report to accompany the implementing bill with other than a favorable recommendation,

then the Committee on Ways and Means shall consider a consultation and compliance resolution pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF A QUALIFYING RESOLUTION.—(i) Not later than the fourth legislative day after the date of introduction of the resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means shall meet to consider a resolution meeting the qualifications set forth in subparagraph (A).

(ii) After consideration of one such resolution by the Committee on Ways and Means, this subparagraph shall not apply to any other such resolution.

(iii) If the Committee on Ways and Means has not reported the resolution by the sixth legislative day after the date of its introduction, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(C) CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A consultation and compliance resolution—

(i) is a resolution of the House of Representatives, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to _____ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.'', with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

(D) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements which are the object of a consultation and compliance resolution if such resolution is adopted by the House.

(5) FOR FAILURE TO MEET OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the United States Trade Representative, shall transmit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the executive branch to address concerns of Congress regarding whether dispute settlement panels and the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization have added to obligations, or diminished rights, of the United States, as described in section 102(b)(15)(C). Trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill with respect to an agreement negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization unless the Secretary of Commerce has issued such report by the deadline specified in this paragraph.

(6) LIMITATIONS ON PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country to which the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking are applicable and the government of which does not fully comply with such standards and is not making significant efforts to bring the country into compliance (commonly referred to as a ''tier 3'' country), as determined in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons submitted under section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)).

(B) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ''minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking'' means the standards set forth in section 108 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106).

(c) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (b) of this section, section 103(c), and section 105(b)(3) are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with the full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

SEC. 107. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS FOR WHICH NEGOTIATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEGUN.

(a) CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding the prenegotiation notification and consultation requirement described in section 105(a), if an agreement to which section 103(b) applies—

(1) is entered into under the auspices of the World Trade Organization,

(2) is entered into with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries with respect to which notifications have been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

(3) is entered into with the European Union,

(4) is an agreement with respect to international trade in services entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(5) is an agreement with respect to environmental goods entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

and results from negotiations that were commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act, subsection (b) shall apply.

(b) TREATMENT OF AGREEMENTS.—In the case of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies, the applicability of the trade authorities procedures to implementing bills shall be determined without regard to the requirements of section 105(a) (relating only to notice prior to initiating negotiations), and any resolution under paragraph (1)(B), (3)(C), or (4)(C) of section 106(b) shall not be in order on the basis of a failure or refusal to comply with the provisions of section 105(a), if (and only if) the President, as soon as feasible after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) notifies Congress of the negotiations described in subsection (a), the specific United States objectives in the negotiations, and whether the President is seeking a new agreement or changes to an existing agreement; and

(2) before and after submission of the notice, consults regarding the negotiations with the committees referred to in section 105(a)(1)(B) and the House and Senate Advisory Groups on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

SEC. 108. SOVEREIGNTY.

(a) UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN EVENT OF CONFLICT.—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b), nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States shall have effect.

(b) AMENDMENTS OR MODIFICATIONS OF UNITED STATES LAW.—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall prevent the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States from amending or modifying any law of the United States, that State, or that locality (as the case may be).

(c) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.—Reports, including findings and recommendations, issued by dispute settlement panels convened pursuant to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall have no binding effect on the law of the United States, the Government of the United States, or the law or government of any State or locality of the United States.

SEC. 109. INTERESTS OF SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Trade Representative should facilitate participation by small businesses in the trade negotiation process; and

(2) the functions of the Office of the United States Trade Representative relating to small businesses should continue to be reflected in the title of the Assistant United States Trade Representative assigned the responsibility for small businesses.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS INTERESTS.—The Assistant United States Trade Representative for Small Business, Market Access, and Industrial Competitiveness shall be responsible for ensuring that the interests of small businesses are considered in all trade negotiations in accordance with the objective described in section 102(a)(8).

SEC. 110. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ADVICE FROM UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Section 131 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2151) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 2103(a) or (b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 2103(b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''section 2103(a)(3)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103(a)(4)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(2) HEARINGS.—Section 132 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2152) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(3) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—Section 133(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2153(a)) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(4) PREREQUISITES FOR OFFERS.—Section 134 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2154) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(5) INFORMATION AND ADVICE FROM PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS.—Section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(II) by striking ''not later than the date on which the President notifies the Congress under section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 106(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 2102 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 102 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(6) PROCEDURES RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING BILLS.—Section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(7) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 162(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2212(a)) is amended by striking ''section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002'' and inserting ''section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015''.

(b) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—For purposes of applying sections 125, 126, and 127 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2135, 2136, and 2137)—

(1) any trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as an agreement entered into under section 101 or 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2111 or 2112), as appropriate; and

(2) any proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as a proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112).

SEC. 111. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE.—The term ''Agreement on Agriculture'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(2)).

(2) AGREEMENT ON SAFEGUARDS.—The term ''Agreement on Safeguards'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(13) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(13)).

(3) AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.—The term ''Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures'' means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

(4) ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT.—The term ''Antidumping Agreement'' means the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 referred to in section 101(d)(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(7)).

(5) APPELLATE BODY.—The term ''Appellate Body'' means the Appellate Body established under Article 17.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(6) COMMON MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''common multilateral environmental agreement'' means any agreement specified in subparagraph (B) or included under subparagraph (C) to which both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations are full parties, including any current or future mutually agreed upon protocols, amendments, annexes, or adjustments to such an agreement.

(B) AGREEMENTS SPECIFIED.—The agreements specified in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, done at Washington March 3, 1973 (27 UST 1087; TIAS 8249).

(ii) The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, done at Montreal September 16, 1987.

(iii) The Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London February 17, 1978.

(iv) The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, done at Ramsar February 2, 1971 (TIAS 11084).

(v) The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, done at Canberra May 20, 1980 (33 UST 3476).

(vi) The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, done at Washington December 2, 1946 (62 Stat. 1716).

(vii) The Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, done at Washington May 31, 1949 (1 UST 230).

(C) ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS.—Both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations may agree to include any other multilateral environmental or conservation agreement to which they are full parties as a common multilateral environmental agreement under this paragraph.

(7) CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term ''core labor standards'' means—

(A) freedom of association;

(B) the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;

(C) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor;

(D) the effective abolition of child labor and a prohibition on the worst forms of child labor; and

(E) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

(8) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.—The term ''Dispute Settlement Understanding'' means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16)).

(9) ENABLING CLAUSE.—The term ''Enabling Clause'' means the Decision on Differential and More Favourable Treatment, Reciprocity and Fuller Participation of Developing Countries (L/4903), adopted November 28, 1979, under GATT 1947 (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501)).

(10) ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—The term ''environmental laws'', with respect to the laws of the United States, means environmental statutes and regulations enforceable by action of the Federal Government.

(11) GATT 1994.—The term ''GATT 1994'' has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

(12) GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN SERVICES.—The term ''General Agreement on Trade in Services'' means the General Agreement on Trade in Services (referred to in section 101(d)(14) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(14))).

(13) GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT AGREEMENT.—The term ''Government Procurement Agreement'' means the Agreement on Government Procurement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(14) ILO.—The term ''ILO'' means the International Labor Organization.

(15) IMPORT SENSITIVE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.—The term ''import sensitive agricultural product'' means an agricultural product—

(A) with respect to which, as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, the rate of duty was the subject of tariff reductions by the United States and, pursuant to such Agreements, was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate that was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994; or

(B) which was subject to a tariff rate quota on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(16) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGREEMENT.—The term ''Information Technology Agreement'' means the Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products of the World Trade Organization, agreed to at Singapore December 13, 1996.

(17) INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term ''internationally recognized core labor standards'' means the core labor standards only as stated in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-Up (1998).

(18) LABOR LAWS.—The term ''labor laws'' means the statutes and regulations, or provisions thereof, of a party to the negotiations that are directly related to core labor standards as well as other labor protections for children and minors and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health, and for the United States, includes Federal statutes and regulations addressing those standards, protections, or conditions, but does not include State or local labor laws.

(19) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of the United States; and

(C) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of a foreign country and is controlled by entities described in subparagraph (B) or United States citizens, or both.

(20) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS.—The term ''Uruguay Round Agreements'' has the meaning given that term in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7)).

(21) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION; WTO.—The terms ''World Trade Organization'' and ''WTO'' mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(22) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ''WTO Agreement'' means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(23) WTO MEMBER.—The term ''WTO member'' has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(10)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2146, Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Welcome back, everybody. I have to admit, I am a little disappointed that we are back here today. Last week, a bipartisan majority stepped up to pass trade promotion authority. That vote showed that Republicans and Democrats can still come together to do what is right for this country. It was a vote that I am very proud of.

Unfortunately, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle would not stand with their President and voted to sacrifice a program that they support—a program that they asked for—in order to block our path. It was disappointing, but we are not going to be discouraged. That is why we are back here today.

Enacting trade promotion authority is critical for our economy and our national security, and so we are going to get it done here today. Why do we need TPA? Well, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty easy, an easy question to answer—because we need more trade. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers don't live in America. They live in other countries. If we want to make more things here and sell them there, then we need to tear down those trade barriers that make American goods and services more expensive.

We know that trade is good for our economy. One in five jobs in America is already tied to trade, and they pay on average 18 percent more. We also need more trade to bolster our foreign policy and our national security. Stronger economic ties lead to stronger security ties. More market share means more influence. That is why so many national security voices, former military leaders, former Secretaries of Defense, former Secretaries of State have all called on Congress to pass TPA. They understand what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker.

What is at stake here is no less than America's credibility because the rules of the global economy are being written right now. The question is: Who is going to write those rules? Will it be the United States and our allies or will it be other nations that don't share our values or don't share our commitment to free enterprise and the rule of law?

Our friends in Asia and Europe are getting ready to place their bets. They want to sign up for American-style free enterprise, but they need to know that the United States is going to stand strong as a reliable ally, as a reliable trading partner before they do that. That is what TPA is all about.

So how does it work? We have heard all kinds of crazy misinformation spread by the opponents of trade. I mean, crazy stuff, really. Let me, one more time, explain what TPA is and what TPA is not. TPA is a process; it is not an agreement. It is a process that gives us the best shot at getting a good trade agreement. It is a process, dating back decades, that Congress has used to insert itself into trade negotiations in order to provide more accountability and more transparency to the administration, to the President.

This TPA has more transparency and more accountability than any version ever before. It lays out 150 objectives and guidelines that the administration must follow while negotiating a trade deal. These are our priorities. If the President wants an agreement, then he must meet to address these priorities. He must meet these guidelines in order to get it passed through Congress.

This TPA also requires that the administration consults with Congress during the negotiations: Give us access to all of the text, provide timely briefings on demand, allow Members to attend the negotiating rounds as accredited advisers if they want to. If we are here in session, we can send our people. That is what the Zinke amendment accomplishes.

Finally, perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker, TPA ensures that the American people can read any trade agreement, every trade agreement long before anyone is asked to vote on it—60 days. An agreement must be made public and posted online for 60 days before it can even be sent to Congress. This turns fast track into slow track.

Mr. Speaker, it is transparency, it is effective oversight, and it is accountability because if the President doesn't meet these requirements or doesn't follow the negotiating objectives, we can turn TPA off for that agreement. We can cancel the vote, we can amend the agreement, or we can stop it entirely. So it is ultimately, we, Congress, we always have the final say. No agreement takes effect, no laws are changed unless we vote to allow it.

This process, TPA, creates a pact between Congress and the administration that allows our trading partners to know that we speak with one voice. It allows them to make their best efforts, knowing that as long as the administration follows TPA, Congress won't try to rewrite an agreement later. In other words, it gives America credibility, Mr. Speaker. And, boy, do we need credibility right now.

Make no mistake, all of my colleagues, make no mistake: the world is watching us; they are watching this vote. The foreign policy failures of the last few years, not to mention the stunt pulled here last week, have capitals all around the world wondering if America still has it. Are we still the leader? Are we still the Republic that other countries aspire to be? They want to know that we are still willing to engage, still willing to lead, that we are still a nation that is out front. Or are we in retreat and decline?

We are here today to answer that question again. America does not retreat; America leads. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' for TPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is said that we should write the rules, not China. But make no mistake, the ''we'' is not Congress, leaving us with only a ''yes'' or ''no'' vote at the very end. To vote for TPA now is to surrender congressional leverage. To get it right in shaping TPP, the most significant trade negotiation in decades, Congress will have settled for a bill with so-called congressional negotiating objectives so vague they are essentially meaningless.

That won't matter to those who basically approach trade with a 19th century dogma, that trade between any two nations will naturally be beneficial, simply matching the comparative economic advantages of each. But that has not worked out when, in this era, one nation manipulates its currency as it trades with the other, when nations suppress worker rights to keep their wages low, or degrade their environment to help them compete, or when nations heavily subsidize their markets or they keep their markets closed while their competitor keeps them very open in vital areas, whether industrial or agricultural.

So let us write the rules, but Congress must be sure they are right. We must make sure that the beneficiaries are the many in our Nation, not just the few.

As often stated in this debate, trade does, indeed, create winners and losers. As one who has worked hard to help put together expanded trade agreements, I know that in a globalizing world economy, failure to write the rules effectively is one of the reasons there have been too many losers. Millions of jobs lost, with middle class wages stagnant for decades, while the relative few have done so well.

Congress should not give what would be essentially a blank check to USTR on key outstanding issues in the TPP negotiations. With this TPA, you are saying ''fine'' to no meaningful currency provision. You are saying ''fine'' to giving private investors in growing numbers the ability to choose an unregulated arbitration panel instead of a well-established judicial system in order to overturn local or national health or environmental regulations. With this TPA, you cannot be confident Vietnam and Mexico will adhere to meaningful labor standards. With this TPA, you can't be confident that Japan will open its market at long last to our cars or agricultural products. With this TPA, you can't be confident that there will be access to lifesaving medicines.

Despite a bombardment of rhetoric, instead of the approach that we laid out in the substitute that we have not even been allowed to consider in the committee or in this House, the reality is that this TPA will not put Congress in the driver's seat, but the backseat, for TPP and for 6 years in important negotiations with Europe in TTIP and who knows what else. Congress has a responsibility to get trade negotiations on the right track, not the fast track. Vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a senior member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, free trade is economic freedom. It is the freedom to buy and sell and compete around the world with as little government interference as possible. It is really one of the great economic rights of every American. Given the choice between more economic freedom or less, we should always choose more. We know if America doesn't lead in free and fair trade, we will grow weaker and our foreign competitors will grow stronger, and our factories and farmers and manufacturers will be priced out and shut down.

Texas is made for trade. America is made for trade. It is time, through expanded trade, to preserve these economic principles that have helped us thrive and grow over the century. That is why Congress flexing its constitutional muscles and setting clear rules for future American trade is not just a good thing for America; it is a great thing.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of our caucus and a member of our committee.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this trade promotion authority legislation, as we have heard, is all about writing the rules, writing the rules on trade. It is about who will lead or who will retreat on assisting on free and fair trade.

This TPA legislation sets forward the instructions on how we will write the rules in any trade agreement. Okay. So who is going to lead in writing the rules? On currency manipulation, where countries, not just the companies, but the countries themselves that want to trade with us are cheating by manipulating their currency to make the value of their goods look less expensive than American products in the same area, when those countries are cheating, what are we going to say should be the rules when it comes to currency manipulation?

□ 1130

Under this TPA, we can't say anything because we are prohibited from including anything in a trade agreement that will deal with currency manipulation.

You then have to ask a second question. You are telling me that countries that are going to sign these deals are going to be allowed to cheat when it comes to how they manipulate their currency so their products will look cheaper than ours? We are supposed to depend on those same countries that are cheating to now enforce the rules in these agreements against companies in those countries that are cheating? What kind of instruction is that?

What about when it comes to letting people in America know what is in these deals? What if we want to know where the products that are going to be bought and sold in our stores come from? Shouldn't we have the right, if we want, to know the country of origin of a particular product?

I have heard about tainted milk coming from places around the world. We have heard about toys that have dangerous chemicals in them that our kids play with. Don't we want to know where these products are coming from? That is all we are saying, just to know where they are coming from, not that we are going to degrade the place where they come from; we just want to know if it is made in the USA or made somewhere else.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BECERRA. Under this TPA, we can't ask those questions. We won't be able to find out where a product is made because someone else—a tribunal, not an American court—will decide whether we can label a product as made in the USA or not.

Right now, these international tribunals that have no American jurists or judges sitting on them get to decide for us if Americans should have the right to know where a product is coming from that they are buying from a store in their neighborhood.

How does that lead to making sure trade is free and fair if we can't even put a label on a product coming from some other country that has in the past sent us tainted products?

We can do much better. We have over two or three decades of experience in writing trade deals. We know what works; we know what doesn't. The thing we know most is that enforcement is the most difficult aspect of trade because most companies in faraway places don't follow American law and American rules and they cheat and they think they think can get away with it.

We can do much better. Let's get a better trade deal that is free and fair. This TPA doesn't give us that. It doesn't give us the right rules. Reject this TPA legislation.

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last week, in a bipartisan majority, this House granted this administration trade promotion authority so that it can begin to elevate standards and level the playing field for our workers, our farmers, and our businesses so we can effectively compete in one of the fastest growing regions of the global economy.

It is time for us to move forward. I feel confident that, with the assurances that we received from the Republican leadership, this body will have another opportunity to also pass Trade Adjustment Assistance so that the training programs and education for the workers who need it will be in place.

Out of consideration for some of our colleagues who are trying to get home to their communities today after last night's terrible shootings, I end by encouraging my colleagues to support this legislation. It is time for America to move on.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, if at first you don't succeed, try, try again. That seems to be the approach on trade.

Despite the fact that TPA passed the House last week by only eight votes, at no point did the lightbulb go off for the leadership that perhaps they could work with the majority of the Democratic Caucus to find agreement on how to move forward. I don't know why that didn't occur to you. Instead of cooperation, they have opted to use procedural tricks to pass the TPA.

The leadership has chosen to take a bipartisan bill passed by both Chambers of Congress that would aid our law enforcement officers and public safety workers and inject the unrelated, controversial trade debate into it. I can speak firsthand because I am one of the sponsors of the bill.

This bill, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act, I have worked on with my friend Congressman REICHERT, on behalf of the men and women who serve the public in physically demanding work each and every day.

It would ensure that they could access their full retirement benefits at the time they retire without incurring a tax penalty. It is a good bill. I am not only one of the sponsors, I vote for it.

Today, this bill to provide tax fairness for our law enforcement officers has been twisted and diminished to a convenient vehicle to ram through fast track for a deeply flawed trade bill.

This is not the same bill that we voted on Friday. Please read this bill. It is not. I urge a ''no'' vote.

In fact, Harold Schaitberger, president of the International Association of Fire Fighters, has written a letter urging Members to oppose attaching TPA to this bill.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would establish the biggest trade agreement we have seen in years, encompassing 40 percent of the world's economy. We need to take our time and do it right. In its current form, TPP is woefully inadequate and fails to ensure a fair deal for American workers.

Issues such as prohibiting currency manipulation and ensuring food safety have been neglected in TPP. As an example, only 1 percent of imported fish into this country—seafood—is inspected. I hope the next time you go into the restaurant, you ask the proprietor: Has this fish been inspected?

He will look at you like you have three heads. Isn't that interesting?

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. This country got shafted with our deal with Korea on country of origin automobiles. You don't really see any more cars traveling through Korea—or certainly China—that are made in the United States of America. We are taking a backseat.

Instead of protecting the interests of American U.S. workers—not protectionism, we are not advocating that—this trade bill gives protections and sweetheart deals to multinational corporations, pure and simple. The American people look at every poll—from the left, from the right, from north, south, east, west—and do not accept this deal, and we shouldn't either.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was thinking what a difference a week does not make. The vast majority of the people in my congressional district were opposed to fast track last week, and they are even more opposed to fast track this week.

We have seen fast track before. We have seen the jobs leave our community, our district, our State, and our Nation fast enough. They don't need our help. They don't need anybody else's help. We need to create jobs here in America, not have them flee.

I agree with my colleagues who have said vote ''no.'' I agree with the people of my congressional district, and I shall vote ''no.''

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support TPA to give the President the authority to negotiate this agreement. It is very simple. A lot of those countries are already able to send their goods into our country duty free. What we want to do is allow our exporting companies to be able to export to those countries duty free, also, so we can send our goods over there.

Look at what has happened in Texas. Texas exported more than $289 billion last year, up 146 percent from 2004. Let's look at the number of companies that export. They are not the big companies. Ninety-three percent of those 40,737 exporting companies were small- and medium-sized businesses.

Again, Members, I ask you to please support TPA. It is good for Texas; it is good for the United States, and it is a no-brainer to allow us to export to those countries.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great Nation are watching us today, and they are begging and pleading with us to please vote down this bill.

Who knows better than the American people who live in the towns and the cities where they have seen their manufacturing plants close and they have seen their jobs shipped overseas? Every trade deal has done it.

Let's look at the China deal. As a result of the China deal, 2 million manufacturing jobs have been shipped from America over to China.

Look at NAFTA. Yes, it created jobs; but where did they create jobs? They are in Mexico. Where did the manufacturing plants go? They went to Mexico.

That is why the American people are ringing everybody's office and urging them: Please let us not lose any more jobs.

Those of you who are concerned about income equality, the reason we have that as a burning issue in the heart and soul, particularly of middle class America, is because we are seeing the middle class vanish.

These are the jobs. These manufacturing jobs, ladies and gentlemen, are not where the big corporate presidents make millions of dollars. Yes, they are going to make plenty of millions of dollars; but these jobs go into the middle section of our economic stream and the lower income.

Look at Akron, Ohio; look at Atlanta, Georgia; look at Chicago; look at Detroit. They were once vibrant cities. The backbone of America is manufacturing, and we are shipping it out to the world.

You know what else we are shipping out there? We are shipping these jobs—not only that, the profits of these companies. Last year, $2 trillion of profits were held in these overseas accounts, away from our taxing structure.

Can't you see America is getting weaker because of these trade policies? I urge you to vote ''no'' and stand up for the American people for a change.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the ranking member for yielding and, once again, for his tremendous leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill and to once again say ''no'' to fast track. This legislation cynically uses a bill that would exempt retired Federal police officers and firefighters from paying a penalty on withdrawals from their retirement accounts if they retire after the age of 50. What does that have to do with fast track? Absolutely nothing—this is just plain wrong.

What is more, we know now that the Senate is considering attaching the Trade Adjustment Assistance, or TAA, to the recently passed African Growth and Accountability Act, better known as AGOA, as a means to get this flawed trade package passed.

That is why yesterday, my colleagues Congressional Black Caucus Chair Congressman BUTTERFIELD, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, Congressman KEITH ELLISON, and myself sent a letter to the Senate leadership expressing our opposition to what they are trying to do in using AGOA as a bargaining chip.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
United States Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER REID: We write to urge you to expeditiously pass H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, without attaching unrelated amendments. If passed, the bill would go to the President and reauthorize the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) until the end of FY 2025.

AGOA is too important to be used as a bargaining chip to pass unrelated trade legislation. As you know, AGOA is not controversial and passed out of the House of Representatives with almost 400 votes. AGOA is a trade preference program that is usually noncontroversial, and thus voice voted. It is the centerpiece of relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa. Though a small percentage of overall trade by the United States, AGOA has helped enhance trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

In its current form, AGOA expires September 30, 2015. It is imperative that the Senate move H.R. 1295 along to reauthorize the program soon. Delays will not only negatively affect global supply chains, but also adversely affect the livelihoods of individuals whose jobs come from AGOA.

The House has already passed H.R. 1295 to reauthorize AGOA. We urge the Senate to follow suit without delay and send the bill to President Obama's desk.

Sincerely,

GK BUTTERFIELD,
Member of Congress,
KAREN BASS,
Member of Congress,
BARBARA LEE,
Member of Congress,
KEITH ELLISON,
Member of Congress.

Ms. LEE. AGOA is a growth and trade act. That is a trade preference program that has helped enhance trade investment and job creation to democratic institutions throughout Africa.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LEE. In no way should that be used as a bargaining chip on this bill. It is outrageous. Members should not have to choose between programs that they support, like TAA and AGOA, and then supporting fast track.

These procedural gimmicks are outrageous, and they are fundamentally dishonest. If Members fall for this maneuver, we not only risk imperiling the TAA, a program that many of our constituents rely on, but also AGOA.

We have got to vote ''no'' on this bill, ''no'' to attaching TAA to AGOA. Let's get back to the drawing board and come up with a real fair, free, and transparent trade bill.

□ 1145

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if you vote for this bill, you get fast track without Trade Adjustment Assistance. There is no assurance Trade Adjustment Assistance will come to this floor or that it will come to this floor in a form that either Republicans or Democrats will support.

The supporters of this deal can't make their case without repeating demonstrably false statistics. The fact is we won a $177 billion trade deficit in goods with the countries with which we have free trade agreements. The $75 billion surplus in services brings the net to over a $100 billion deficit.

How have so many Members been misled by charlatan lobbyists into coming to this floor and giving false statistics? They are given this slippery phrase: Go down to the floor and talk about what has happened since NAFTA.

Now, ''since NAFTA'' usually sounds like, well, since the early 1990s. What they mean is excluding NAFTA. Excluding NAFTA when we review free trade agreements is like excluding LeBron James when you evaluate the Cavaliers.

This bill is catastrophic for our national security. It hollows out our manufacturing base, and it is the greatest gift to China that we could possibly make because it enshrines the sacrosanct nature of currency manipulation. It says, in the future, countries can manipulate their currency all they want and there will be no accounting for it.

In addition, the rules of origin provisions allow goods that are admitted to be 50 or 60 percent made in China—that are actually 70 or 80 percent made in China—to get fast-tracked into the United States. So China gets 80 percent of the benefit of this agreement without having to admit a single American export.

As for Vietnam, our workers are going to have to compete against 56-cent-an-hour labor.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHERMAN. We are told that we will get free access to the Vietnamese markets. Vietnam doesn't have freedom. Vietnam doesn't have markets. They are not going to buy our exports any more than their Communist Party decides to do so.

The chairman points out that with trade comes influence. That is right. There will be Nike lobbyists here, financed by this bill and its effects, lobbying against going after Vietnam for its oppression of religion and its oppression of unions. So they will have influence here in Washington. They will continue not to have freedom, and we will continue to lose jobs.

THE TRADE DEFICIT WITH FTA PARTNERS

MERCHANDISE TRADE BALANCE WITH FTA COUNTRIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	U.S. Domestic Exports 2014	U.S. Imports for Consumption 2014	2014 Balance
Australia	24,460,776	10,846,176	13,614,600
Bahrain	996,619	930,049	66,570
Canada	262,930,650	345,304,263	−82,373,613
Chile	15,311,892	9,501,206	5,810,686
Colombia	18,313,501	17,162,947	1,150,554
Costa Rica	6,289,716	9,493,622	−3,203,906
Dominican Rep	7,218,421	4,462,740	2,755,681
El Salvador	3,062,786	2,390,272	672,514
Guatemala	5,653,385	4,140,518	1,512,867
Honduras	5,686,432	4,511,855	1,174,577
Israel	7,894,126	23,054,059	−15,159,933
Jordan	1,971,195	1,354,296	616,899
Korea	42,010,900	68,602,393	−26,591,493
Mexico	192,706,833	292,481,624	−99,774,791
Morocco	2,044,141	1,010,429	1,033,712
Nicaragua	905,977	3,079,467	−2,173,490
Oman	1,911,822	974,788	937,034
Panama	9,737,362	386,123	9,351,239
Peru	8,891,414	6,029,607	2,861,807
Singapore	26,468,896	16,259,527	10,209,369
Total	644,466,844	821,975,961	−177,509,117

SERVICES TRADE BALANCE WITH FTA COUNTRIES

According to the Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis, we ran a surplus in services of $75 billion with FTA Countries as of 2013, the last year for which we have data on our services trade broken down for the FTA countries as a group. Assuming normal growth for 2014, our surplus in services is roughly $77 billion.

Therefore, our TOTAL TRADE BALANCE with FTA partner countries is just over $100 billion. We run a significant deficit with FTA Countries.

Explanation: There are different methods for measuring the trade balance of the United States. The table above uses the most accurate data for measuring the value of goods (merchandise) actually ''Made in the USA'' and exported from the United States to the various countries listed. The source for our goods data is the International Trade Commission (ITC) dataweb, available at http://dataweb.usitc.gov. ITC measures exports in two different ways (''Total Exports'' and ''Domestic Exports'').

We use ''Domestic Exports.'' According to the ITC, ''Domestic Exports measures goods that are grown, produced and manufactured in the United States, or goods of foreign origin that have been changed in the United States.'' FTA proponents like to use an alternative measurement, ''Total Exports,'' which ''measures the total movement of goods out of the United States to foreign countries,'' whether those goods were made or altered by U.S. workers in the United States or not—it includes goods that were simply transiting the United States without alteration. Counting these ''Re-Exports'' that are included in the ''Total Exports'' measurement will give a distorted bilateral trade balance for given countries because it drastically over-counts exports. For similar reasons and in order to give an accurate, apples to apples comparison, on the import side we use ''Imports for Consumption'' which includes only imports that are not re-exported. Using the alternative ITC measurement for imports, ''Total Imports,'' would overstate imports by counting those goods coming into the United States that are going to be re-exported. See http://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/tradestatsnote.pdf for more on these terms and what the measurements represent.

Services data. Ideally our nation's trade balance figures would provide the trade balance for both goods and services. However, services are more difficult for government agencies to track, and the agencies therefore do not break the trade data down consistently for every partner country, every year. Also, the agencies cannot compile services data as quickly as merchandise data. We use a 2013 services balance figure for FTA countries in the aggregate that the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis provided to the Chamber of Commerce for a report touting FTAs. We assume growth of about $5 billion in the positive services balance for 2014. See the Chamber report for these services data at https://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/open__door__trade__report.pdf.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. How much time remains for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 22½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We are the only two speakers left on our side. Because of deference to our Members from South Carolina who are trying to get home to this tragedy, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), and then I am just going to hold to close just for our South Carolina Members.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, read the bill. I have got it right here. The only thing different is the number at the top has changed. The content is the same.

TPA is not a trade deal. It is a process that holds this President accountable. It sets in motion Congress inserting itself.

By the way, NAFTA, I mean, I just continue to get blown away by the misinformation. No wonder the American people get confused.

I take this personally. As the gentleman from New Jersey knows, my dad lost his job way before NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in manufacturing with NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in services with NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in agriculture, food, and beverages with NAFTA. In fact, we have a trade surplus with NAFTA, if you take out oil and energy products. We have a trade surplus in manufacturing with NAFTA. I do get fired up about this.

Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of the world's population is outside the United States. A multinational corporation can move anywhere it wants to, a Fortune 500 company can move anywhere it wants to, and they do.

Lake Shore, in my district, a family-owned business, they cannot. This is about breaking down barriers for Lake Shore, for Screen Machine, because they can't move a plant overseas, and they are at a competitive disadvantage. A large corporation can move. They can't.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is about jobs. This is about the American worker. This is about the fact that we have the ability today to complete anywhere in the world if those trade barriers are broken down.

We have to break them down, Mr. Speaker. One out of every five jobs is trade-related. They are good jobs.

Vote ''yes'' on TPA. Vote ''yes'' for the American worker.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke in favor of H.R. 1891, the AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015. In the middle of tremendous controversy and tension over TPA, it was encouraging to have legislation that wasn't controversial, in fact, had overwhelming support with 397 votes. The bill was sent to the Senate, and we were hopeful that H.R. 1891 would have already made it to the President's desk.

Unfortunately, the bill is a victim of its own success. So many rumors are floating around that because AGOA is popular, supported by both Democrats, Republicans, Senators, and House Members, that now Senators are considering adding more controversial bills into AGOA.

We are hearing TAA might be added. The press is even reporting consideration is being given to using AGOA as a vehicle to extend the Ex-Im Bank. We hear the thinking is, if TAA failed in the House last week, if it is added in to AGOA, we will all vote for it.

AGOA can and should and stand on its own. The Senate should pass AGOA and send it to the President.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, once again, we are being asked to vote for an agreement that will cost jobs, undermine environmental protections, and erode workers' rights, all in the name of so-called free trade.

This agreement is being negotiated in the dark, behind closed doors. That secretive process may benefit large, multinational companies and their lobbyists, but it does not help small manufacturers in Brooklyn. It does nothing for New Yorkers struggling to raise a family while keeping their jobs from being exported.

When there is a bad process, we end up with a bad deal for American workers, and we have seen this in the past. New York lost 374,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA and the World Trade Organization agreements.

This vote, Mr. Speaker, comes down to a simple question: Are you going to side with Wall Street, large corporations, and their lobbyists, or will you stand with working families in your district? I will take the latter.

Vote ''no.''

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in Washington we never seem to lack for self-certified smart people. They are the folks who know what is best for you and your family.

While they, today, are insisting on railroading through this fast-track trade deal—and they say it is so sweet for working families—is it so unreasonable to ask: What do the workers think about this bill?

While the environmental provisions have been secreted away from the public, we do know that USTR does not believe in environmental law enforcement. Is it unreasonable to stop and ask: What do those who advocate for clean water and clean air and conservation of our resources think about this trade deal?

I believe they support fair trade. They recognize that it raises all boats, but unfair trade sinks too many of them. They are capsized by competing with those who pay an average minimum wage of 60 cents an hour and whose only worker organization is the Communist Party in Vietnam.

I believe our workers deserve respect. This bill asks American businesses to go out and compete with countries that mistreat their workers, that pollute their air and water and destroy their natural resources, and that deflate or adjust their currency, manipulating it in ways that are unfair.

Railroading this bill through today will deny any opportunity, which we have struggled so long for so many months to try to achieve to make this a better right-track bill. The fast-trackers have rejected every constructive improvement that we have offered to this measure. And all of us here in Congress have to concede we know less about what is in this trade bill than the Vietnamese Politburo, than the Malaysian Government that has countenanced sex trafficking.

We need an open, fair process to advance real trade opportunities for all families. Reject this fast track.

Mr. LEVIN. We had one additional speaker. I don't see her, so I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I started off by saying it is said we should write the rules, not China. That is true. We have been striving to try to help write the rules. We did so for years.

We introduced a substitute bill that outlined where we were coming from and where we thought these negotiations should go. That wasn't even given time for discussion.

So here is what we are left with. When you vote for TPA under these circumstances, essentially what we are saying to this administration, it is essentially a blank check. They may talk. They may let us see some of the documents, but often in ways we can't discuss them publicly.

This is likely to add up to a TPP that will be even more controversial than this TPA. For that reason, I strongly urge that, as was said earlier, we slow down this process in order to try to find a route to a TPP that would have broad bipartisan support. That has always been my aim, rather than this kind of vote with a few handfuls of Democratic votes making this far, far, far from a bipartisan vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

For those who are coming on the floor protesting this particular process from the minority, it is the stunt pulled last week that brought about this process.

We have talked a lot about what TPA is. It is a process, not a trade agreement.

I want every Member in this body to think about what this vote represents. It is one that will speak loudly about our political system: Can it still work?

It is a vote about what kind of Congress we want to be: Will we empower ourselves in trade agreements or just let the administration do whatever it wants?

It is a vote about what kind of country we want to have: Are we still committed to leading? Are we still the symbol of freedom in free enterprise?

Mr. Speaker, this is a vote for accountability and for transparency. This is a vote for a stronger economy and higher wages. This is a vote for our system of free enterprise. This is a vote for American leadership. This is a vote to declare that America still has it. This is a vote to reestablish America's credibility.

The world is watching. Vote ''yes.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2146, the Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015. For the past several

years I have had many conversations about trade with the people of Northwest Oregon. I've spoken with farmers, environmentalists, semiconductor manufacturers, wine makers, workers, sports and outdoor apparel employees, and others.

The district I represent has many trade-dependent jobs and industries. We export a broad array of products—from computer chips to potato chips. Last year in Oregon, nearly 6,000 Oregon companies exported more than $20 billion in products. Expanding the overseas markets for U.S. goods will help businesses expand in this country. Trade agreements done right make it easier to sell American-made goods and they level the playing field by reducing tariffs that currently make it difficult for Oregonians to compete in many of the world's markets.

This legislation is not the trade agreement itself, but rather a bill through which Congress establishes requirements for the negotiation of trade agreements and the procedure for Congress to use when voting on whether to approve the agreement when it is final.

The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act earned my vote because it requires the President to negotiate a trade agreement that includes strong and enforceable labor and environmental standards, fosters innovation, would help expand exports, provides transparency for the American people, and guarantees a meaningful role for Congress in trade negotiations.

I strongly support the rights of workers and their ability to collectively bargain and work in a safe environment. I also oppose child labor and forced labor. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act raises the bar in these areas and includes provisions that require trading partners to comply with internationally-accepted labor standards and face trade sanctions if they do not. For the first time it includes human rights—one of the cornerstones of our democratic values—as a negotiating objective. Oregon's First Congressional District is known for its natural treasures—from the Pacific Ocean to the Columbia River to the Clatsop State Forest—and it is imperative that they be preserved for future generations. Deciding between conserving our natural resources and growing our economy is a false choice; we can and must do both. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act ensures that our clean air, land, and water will not be up for negotiation.

The bill also protects intellectual property to safeguard innovation and fight piracy overseas, but with provisions to ensure that those protections will not impede access to much-needed medicines for people in developing countries.

The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act requires trade agreements to contain high standards and protections, and it also requires that the agreements include strong enforcement provisions to make clear that the standards and protections will be upheld and enforced.

It is important to my constituents that any trade agreement be accessible and transparent to the public. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act includes unprecedented access to trade agreements; the entire final agreement must be made available to the public for a minimum of 60 days before the President signs it. In addition, after the full text of the trade agreement becomes public, there will still be months before Congress votes on whether to approve it.

To earn my vote, any trade agreement must be good for Americans. The jobs we gain by expanding exports tend to pay high wages, but there is a risk that some workers may be displaced by trade and by globalization. Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) is an important program to help workers transition into new fields by investing in skills and worker retaining. Without a reauthorization, TAA will expire at the end of September 2015. I voted in favor of TAA last week, but unfortunately it did not pass. But let me be very clear, I voted for the TPA again today because the Speaker, the Senate Majority Leader, and the President have committed that Trade Adjustment Assistance and customs enforcement legislation will also move forward without delay.

I was deeply concerned that an early version of TAA legislation included cuts to Medicare. Seniors serve our country, contribute to our economy, raise families, and strengthen communities across the nation. I urged House leadership to eliminate this provision. The bill I voted for did not cut Medicare and I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure seniors are not singled out to pay for this program.

This trade package, however, is far from perfect, and as we move forward I will continue to work to pass TAA and improve the trade agreement. I am very disappointed that partisan language to tie the administration's hands on climate change was inserted at the last minute into the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act, which passed the House of Representatives last week without my support. I am also very concerned that two very smart enforcement provisions offered by my colleague from Oregon, Representative EARL BLUMENAUER, were deleted. His "Green 301" and enforcement fund provisions were very important to the overall effectiveness of the customs bill, and I will encourage the conferees to insist upon their inclusion in the bill we ultimately send to the President's desk for signature.

We live in a changing and global economy. Markets, industries, and technologies evolve and American businesses and workers need to be able to react and adapt to thrive. A 21st century trade agreement broadens our country's reach and, done right, leads to more opportunity, more growth, and more job creation. It also supports the principle of trade according to fair rules, equally applied, as opposed to all parties doing whatever they want on a playing field that is far from level.

I am committed to policies that support a strong, long-term economy for hardworking Oregonians and Americans. A trade agreement done right can help achieve this goal, and passing H.R. 2146 is an important step in this process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of H.R. 160.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—218

Abraham
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—208

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney

Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Cook
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleming
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Harris
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Byrne
Clyburn
Davis, Rodney
Gosar
Jolly
Kelly (MS)
Payne
Young (AK)

□ 1225

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 374 I would have voted "no" on passage. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 374 I intended to vote "no."

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the passage of the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 140, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

YEAS—280

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
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—140

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Byrne
Clyburn
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Fincher
Gosar
Jolly
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Messer
Poe (TX)
Rogers (KY)

□ 1233

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 for:

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375 I was unavoidably detained and missed the recorded vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375 I was detained with constituents including a World War II veteran and family visiting in the U.S. Capitol for the first time and missed rollcall No. 375. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall No. 375. Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 375, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 18, 2015, I was absent

from the House for family medical reasons. Due to my absence, I did not record any votes for the day.

Had I been pesent, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 373, rollcall 374, and rollcall 375.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act, sponsored by Representative ED WHITFIELD. This bill is essential for families all across the Nation. If we do not act, the electricity bills could skyrocket as a result of EPA's clean power plan rule.

The House will also continue the annual appropriations process with consideration of fiscal year 2016 Interior appropriation bill sponsored by Representative KEN CALVERT.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I note that the Export-Import Bank, which, of course, expires on June 30, is not among the scheduled pieces of legislation.

As the gentleman knows, Speaker BOEHNER has been quoted as saying that, if we don't pass the Export-Import Bank, that there are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear. He then again said, as the Chamber closest to the people, ''The House works best when it is allowed to work its will.''

The majority leader knows that I am absolutely convinced that the Export-Import Bank is supported by a majority of Members of this House, but this House has not been allowed to work its will on the Export-Import Bank.

Predecessors of yours and a very dear friend of mine, Senator BLUNT, said not too long ago that he believed that, if a bill were brought to the floor of the House, it would have the votes. More importantly, because he is now, of course, in the other body but is among the leadership in the other body, he said that the bill had the votes in the Senate. I believe he is right on both of those observations.

I understand the majority leader is not for the bill. It is my understanding that the Speaker is. I would hope that those of us who support it and, frankly, those who oppose it would have the opportunity, as the Speaker indicated, for the House to work its will.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there are any plans prior to June 30, when the Export-Import Bank authorization to give loans expires, are there any plans to bring that legislation before this House in a timely fashion so that the authorization would not expire?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman did say he knows my stance on this issue; and, no, there is no action scheduled before the House.

Mr. HOYER. I apologize. Could the gentleman repeat himself?

Mr. MCCARTHY. There is no action scheduled for this House, no.

Mr. HOYER. Does the majority leader intend to, therefore, have the authority of the Export-Import Bank expire, notwithstanding the Speaker's observation and that it will cost thousands of jobs?

I yield to my friend.

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

There is no action scheduled at this appropriate time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating his answer. I heard that answer, but my question to the gentleman was: Is it his intention that the Export-Import Bank expire and, therefore, not bring legislation to the floor?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding for the third time with the same question.

There is no pending action before this House for next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating for a third time his answer to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply observe, sadly, that the representation the House can work its will on an issue of great importance to the United States and to jobs in the United States will not be brought to this floor, notwithstanding the fact that 180 Democrats have signed a discharge petition and 60 Republicans filed a bill to extend the Export-Import Bank.

That is 240 votes, Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker well can add himself. Two hundred and forty votes is a majority of this House. They reflect in my view, Mr. Speaker, the will of this House.

It is extraordinarily regrettable that, when the Speaker of the House says that, if we don't do something, thousands of American jobs are going to be lost—it is particularly regrettable, just after we had a vote on a bill that many people believe is going to lose us jobs and, therefore, they opposed.

How sad it is that we don't bring to the floor a bill which will, like 85 other countries—85 other countries—help us export goods? Those 85 countries, Mr. Speaker, are not going to stop helping their countries export goods, so the loss will be to our exporters and those they employ.

I very much regret that that won't be brought to the floor. As the majority has told me, it is not scheduled; I know it is not scheduled. I lament the fact that it is not scheduled.

Representative CHRIS COLLINS of New York said: I can't figure out for the life of me why my party, the Republican Party, that stands for jobs, and in every conference meeting, it is jobs and the economy.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is on the floor; he talks about jobs and the economy.

Here I am, says CHRIS COLLINS, in the majority of my own Conference, fighting to defend the Export-Import Bank, which is the best example of creating jobs in America.

I regret that that is not being brought to the floor. I won't ask the question again because he has already told me it is not scheduled, and apparently, there is no intent to schedule. I regret that.

Now, Mr. Leader, if I can ask you, we passed now six appropriations bills. Yesterday, the Labor, HHS bill was marked up in subcommittee and the Financial Services in full committee.

Can the gentleman tell me whether it is the intention, whether they are scheduled right now or not, to bring all 12 appropriations bills to the floor before—well, whenever—all 12 bills to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1245

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, this is the earliest we have ever started the appropriation process. The gentleman is correct that we are halfway through the 12 bills, having passed 6 already, and we are bringing up Interior next week. It is our intention to do the work that we are responsible for in finishing the appropriation process.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

Let me ask him further as he knows what is happening in the Senate and whether they can take those bills up: Does the gentleman contemplate, as the majority leader, or does he know whether the Speaker contemplates any effort to come to a bipartisan agreement as was done when Mr. RYAN and Senator MURRAY met and came to grips with a resolution and a compromise on what otherwise would be the sequester 302(a) allocations on discretionary spending, which the chair of the committee, as you know, Chairman ROGERS, has called ill-conceived and unrealistic?

Does the majority leader know whether there is any plan to try to get us from the gridlock, which we are apparently in one more time on the appropriations process, to a place as

Ryan-Murray got us where we moved ahead in a bipartisan way and, in fact, funded the government?

Although, it was not until December, and we had a stopgap measure in there. Is there anything scheduled to discuss that or to pursue that compromise?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, there is no gridlock here. We have passed half of the appropriation bills already. We have started the process earlier than ever before. As the gentleman knows, with just the bill before—very bipartisan—more than 46 Democrats joined us in repealing the medical device tax.

I would probably tell the gentleman that his question really goes to the minority leader on the Senate side, HARRY REID. In reading some of his statements, he wants to create a shutdown, which I think would be wrong for the American people.

I think the best way forward is for the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate to take up DOD appropriations and move that to the President's desk.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend.

There is no Democrat in this House, in the Senate, or in the White House who wants to shut down this government. As a matter of fact, we have not done that. It was done in '95 and in early '96. It was done last year when many in your party said ''shut it down'' if the President doesn't change his immigration policy. Any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats want to shut down the government is simply incorrect.

Now, what the minority leader has said in the Senate, I believe, is that, until such time as sequester is changed that it is not useful to waste time on bills that will not become law as we did, of course, many years during the Ryan budgets, which were never implemented, and they were never implemented in the House of Representatives fully—not once. Why? It is because, as Mr. ROGERS said, they were ill-conceived and unrealistic.

I just want to make it clear to the majority leader that I am prepared to work with him and with others to get us to a compromise on levels of funding that are realistic and well conceived by Mr. ROGERS, by Mr. COCHRAN, and by others.

Until we do that, we are going to be in a place where we are going to be, I predict, in late September, on the threshold of giving some fear that the government is going to shut down again, the greatest government on the face of the Earth. I am not sure what people around the world thought when we shut our government down for 16 days. It was not a confidence builder. That is for sure.

We have another item that we are losing confidence on, the highway bill. You didn't mention, Mr. Leader, anything about the highway bill being scheduled. I understand it does not expire until July 31, so we have about 6 weeks, maybe a little longer than that.

Does the gentleman know whether there is any compromise being achieved so that we can give confidence to States, counties, municipalities, contractors, the business community that they will have a funding stream to invest in building, repairing, and maintaining our infrastructure in this country?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will answer your question, but, first, I just want to make sure I clarify as to your earlier question.

I am just reading here from Politico, as you have been able to read other statements. It says here that the Senate Democrats are prepared to shut down the government. Leader REID outlined Senate Democrats' obstructionist plan for the summer.

They have a title and a time for it, obstructionists for the summer, warning that, because of the Democrats' plan to block appropriations bills, we are heading for another shutdown.

Unfortunately, as I read in other articles of this same time period, I believe the incoming leader on the other side, too—Senator SCHUMER—said he was actually working with the administration on this. I do not think this is helpful.

For the history of why we are where we are, sequester was an idea from this administration. The President is the one who put that into the bill. We are writing appropriation bills to the law. That is what our rules are and what we are doing. We are getting our work done, and we are hopeful that this Democratic plan of obstructionists throughout the summer will not come true.

Now, you asked about the highway bill. This is a very good question and is one that I do want to work with you on because we were working together on this, Republicans and Democrats, from our committee.

Unfortunately, as the gentleman may know, a month or so ago, your side of the aisle said they had to stop working with us. Part of the reason we were given was that it fell into the obstructionist plan for the summer, that it wasn't just about appropriations, but that you wanted to somehow shut down transportation, which we do not want to do.

We want to get to a 5-year plan, and we were working with you on offsets to be able to pay for this throughout the rest of the year. Unfortunately, when the Democrats decided to stop this program, we had to just go to July.

We know we have some time left, and we are very committed to getting this done. We think it is important for America to keep them working, and we hope you will come back to the table and work with us because we will be more than willing to work with you.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I think that is my reputation, that of wanting to work to constructively achieve joint objectives—in this case, the highway bill.

Mr. RYAN is on the floor, but I won't ask him to yield for a question as to whether or not the Ways and Means Committee has come up with a way to finance the highway bill.

I know he said that there is not going to be a gasoline tax, which, historically, Republican Presidents have been for. I am not suggesting this be it, but maybe tax reform, as my friend has said publicly for that.

I will repeat, Mr. Leader, there is no Democrat who wants to shut down the government. I hear what you said. I know the quote. What they have said is they are not going to shut it down indirectly as you want to do. Now, you have done it directly.

I do not mean you, personally, but the only two times that I have served in the Congress of the United States over the last 34 years when the government was shut down as a policy was in 1995 under Newt Gingrich and in the last Congress. Those were the only times, and I have been here 34 years.

Has it happened inadvertently for a couple of days? Yes, it has, because the legislation was not agreed to or we couldn't get it to the President in time or things of that nature.

Let me say something because, on your side of the aisle, you love to say this. You love to place sequestration at the feet of President Obama's. Now, my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has not been here as long as I have, but sequestration originally started certainly in Gramm-Rudman—or it may have even started before then—with Phil Gramm, a Republican from Texas, and Mr. Rudman, a Republican from New Hampshire. That is when it started. Then we see all the time the across-the-board cuts—the 1 percent, the 2 percent, the 3 percent. Now, we have defeated them, but that is a part of sequestration.

More importantly, on 7/15/11, your side, in charge of the Congress, offered a bill that you called Cut, Cap, and Balance. Now, this was 5 days or 6 days before your allegation that Mr. Lew went to the majority leader then, Mr. REID, and said maybe sequestration will help get this bill through.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we were confronting the failure to reauthorize the payment of America's bills, the debt limit. That was what we were facing. What Mr. Lew was suggesting was that the Republicans liked sequestration, so maybe if we put that in the bill, even though we don't like it, they will vote for not defaulting on the national debt.

In fact, that is what happened; but if you look at your Cut, Cap, and Balance bill—your bill I voted against—the fallback that you suggested was sequestration. That was about a week before Mr. Lew said to Mr. REID that maybe that will get our Republican friends to support paying the national debt.

That passed, by the way, on the July 19, 2011. It was 6 days later that Mr.

Lew, in trying to get something done to make sure that America did not default, suggested to Mr. REID maybe putting that in the bill will get the Republicans' votes so that we will pay our debts.

The problem is, if you know the facts, you get a little frustrated with hearing this representation, the President was for sequester. Let's just, for the sake of argument, say that nobody here was for sequester. Then let's get rid of sequester. If you are for sequester, I get it. You don't want to change it.

There are a lot of your Members who certainly don't want to change it. I tell people all over this country when I talk to them that sequester is a complicated word. It starts with an S. It stands for ''stupid.'' It is a policy unrelated to opportunities, to challenges, and to needs. It was a number pulled out of the air.

I would hope, Mr. Leader, that we don't talk about ''you did it'' and ''you did it.'' Let's talk about how we solve the problems confronting our country. Ex-Im is one of them. Appropriations bills that we can agree on is another and highway bill funding to give confidence to our economy and to our entities that have to keep people moving and commerce moving.

Let's give them confidence. Let's sit down. Let's get these done. Let's bring it to the floor. As Speaker BOEHNER said, let this House work its will.

The gentleman referred to the 46 Democrats who voted with him and his party on the most recent bill, which was a tax reduction and which is, as are all of the tax reductions that you have brought to the floor, unpaid for.

Very frankly, as the father of three daughters, as the grandfather of three grandchildren, and as the great-grandfather of three great-grandchildren, I don't like the fact that the expectation is they will pay the bill. They don't vote, of course, so they can't vote for or against us.

My daughters can, notwithstanding the 46 people who voted for it on our side of the aisle because they are for the policy. I will tell you I have talked to a lot of them, and they are not for not paying for it, but they were put in the position of either being for something, therefore, or being against something because it is not paid for and is hurting future generations.

The only reason I mention that is the gentleman brought it up, and I will tell him that there is very broad, almost unanimous sentiment on our side that we ought to pay for things, and when that policy was in place, we balanced the budget for 4 years in a row.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Hopefully, I can take from the gentleman's comments that he is willing to work with us on highways and on coming back to the table. I appreciate that.

We may disagree on whether the administration put it in the bill in sequester, but I think history will prove me right. I look forward to it just as we worked throughout this week and passed two bills today on a bipartisan level.

You may have disagreed with one, but 28 on your side of the aisle agreed with it, so did your President. We look forward to getting this work done for the American people. We work within the current law. That is what we look to do, and I look forward to continuing to work with you.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that in that spirit, there are 240 people in this House who think the Ex-Im Bank ought to be extended and reauthorized. I hope we will follow that process. I would reiterate, yes, I am willing to work with the gentleman on highways or on anything else which will benefit the American people and our country.

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

□ 1300

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2015, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 319, I call up the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114–157 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1190

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 ''Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), sections 3403 and 10320 of such Act (including the amendments made by such sections) are repealed, and any provision of law amended by such sections is hereby restored as if such sections had not been enacted into law.

SEC. 3. RESCINDING FUNDING AMOUNTS FOR PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

Section 4002(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2016'';

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking ''2022'' and inserting ''2026''; and

(B) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (7); and

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

''(3) for fiscal year 2017, $390,000,000;

''(4) for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, $487,000,000;

''(5) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, $585,000,000;

''(6) for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, $780,000,000; and''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. 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 H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we are bringing to the floor today is Dr. ROE's bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This is a bill that came out of the Committee on Ways and Means with a bipartisan vote. This is an agency that Members on both sides of the aisle believe does not have the right to exist, should not exist, and does not follow our democratic process.

Let me explain why we are doing this. There is no greater example of the conflict of visions than this. ObamaCare created something called IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board. It is a board of 15 people who are not elected or appointed.

They have the power to cut Medicare's payments for treatment. They have a quota which they have to hit in order to find the same number to actually cut. Every year, a formula kicks in, and the 15 unelected bureaucrats

find where they are going to cut Medicare payments to providers to hit that quota.

They can do all of this without Congress' approval. The idea, of course, is that unelected bureaucrats know best, unelected bureaucrats know better than patients, their doctors, or their representatives in Congress; they will know which treatment works the best because they are detached, they are distant, they are above the fray, they are not involved in the emotions or the personal relationships that such personal decisions like your health care ultimately involve.

That is the big problem. They are totally unaccountable. They are divorced from reality. Health care is not a statistic. It is not a formula. It is not uniform. It is not cookie cutter. It is personal. It is individual. It is distinct.

Every patient is different. This is why patients, along with their doctors, need to be put in charge of their health care. What IPAB would essentially do is ration health care. It would take control away from patients.

Now, the other side says, Hey, no, not so fast; Congress can override them—but that is only with a supermajority vote.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this movie before. It never ends well. Seniors will suffer the consequences. Medicare is more than a program; Medicare is a promise. Seniors have worked hard; they have paid their taxes; they have planned on Medicare throughout all their working lives, and now that they are retired, it is something that they deserve, a secure retirement. It needs to be there, just like it has been for our parents.

Think about what a Member of Congress will do. This Board of unelected bureaucrats will say, We are cutting Medicare X, Y, and Z ways to these providers for Medicare, which will deny services to seniors; and they will do it according to this formula that is in law.

If Congress doesn't like it, then the law says Congress has to go cut Medicare somewhere else and overturn this ruling with a three-fifths supermajority vote in the House and the Senate—as if that would ever happen.

All this thing has done, it is designed to basically go around Congress, go around the laws, and have unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats ration care for our seniors.

This is wrong; it is undemocratic; it does not fit with our Constitution, and we think it ought to be repealed. That is why we are bringing this bill to the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 12, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I write in regard to H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on June 2, 2015. As you are aware, the bill also was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 1190 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 1190 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1190 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. 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 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 H.R. 1190. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

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

The real purpose of this bill at this time, indeed, is to take a further effort to repeal ACA. That is really what this is about at this particular moment. The Republican leadership is, yet again, taking aim at ACA. H.R. 1190 would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB. This would really be the 59th vote to repeal or undermine ACA.

Since it passed, we have seen the slowest growth in healthcare prices over any period of that length in nearly 50 years. Growth in per enrollee healthcare spending across both the public and private sectors has been controlled.

The three slowest years of growth in real per capita national health expenditures on record were 2011, 2012, and 2013. The ACA, in essence, has changed the healthcare cost landscape, keeping cost increases down and keeping or helping, at least, to keep families out of debt.

While we know the Medicare delivery system reforms have been working to deliver value and lower costs, the IPAB was created as a backstop—a backstop—only to come into effect if other efforts weren't successful. This should be clear. IPAB only comes into being if delivery system reforms aren't doing their job to manage Medicare.

According to the CBO, Medicare growth rates are projected to remain beneath IPAB targets throughout the entire budget window, thereby not triggering the Board's provisions until 2024. I think, when you subtract 2015 from 2024, you get 9 years; so here we are, on this date, at this time, 9 years, according to CBO, before the provisions would come into effect, asking this Congress to repeal the IPAB provision.

If the ACA's delivery system efforts continue to be successful, IPAB may never even need to be constituted. It is specifically prohibited from cutting benefits or raising costs on seniors.

What IPAB can do, however, is to make recommendations to go after overpayments, go after fraud and abuse, and try to improve, if needed, the way there is reform of the delivery system. IPAB will not take away Medicare benefits; it will not shift costs to seniors.

If we in Congress are doing our job as stewards of Medicare, we can manage cost growth while protecting beneficiaries on the front end. In the event IPAB makes recommendations, Congress always has the ability to disapprove or modify them. If we do our job, we won't need IPAB. If we fail to do our job, IPAB will prod us to action 9 years from now or perhaps even later.

Let me talk a few words about the offset. It is a significant reduction of funding for the prevention and public health fund. While the Republicans so far have come forth with their proposals that are never paid for, this time, they have decided to have a pay-for, but it would cut by half or more than that the current funding for the prevention and public health fund.

That fund was established in the ACA to provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health and will provide $900 million this year alone for interventions that will reduce smoking, tackle heart disease, and help improve prenatal outcomes.

I have a listing of what it has meant for Michigan, just as one example: $3.5 million for State health department efforts to prevent obesity and diabetes; $3.8 million to address chronic disease risk factors among African Americans, American Indians, Latinos, and other minorities; $3.3 million for community transformation grants in central Michigan to address heart disease prevention and diabetes; and almost $3 million for tobacco use prevention.

Here we are, at long last, the Republicans come forth with a pay-for, and they are paying for it by taking away something that really, really matters.

We have in front of us a Statement of Administration Policy, and I ask that it be placed in the RECORD. It just repeats some of the points that I have

made, so I will leave it just to be entered into the Record; and, therefore, I will now say that we should not vote for this legislation.

It would repeal a part of ACA designed to help keep healthcare costs under control, and so importantly, it would cut critical public health and prevention funding.

I reserve the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1190—PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

(Rep. Roe, R–TN, June 15, 2015)

The Affordable Care Act has improved the American health care system, on which Americans can rely throughout life. After more than five years under this law, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage. Up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access to coverage. And, health care prices have risen at the slowest rate in nearly 50 years. As we work to make the system even better, we are open to ideas that improve the accessibility, affordability, and quality of health care, and help middle-class Americans.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) will be comprised of fifteen expert members, including doctors and patient advocates, and will recommend to the Congress policies that reduce the rate of Medicare growth and help Medicare provide better care at lower costs. IPAB has been highlighted by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) economists, and health policy experts as contributing to Medicare's long-term sustainability. The Board is prohibited from recommending changes to Medicare that ration health care, restrict benefits, modify eligibility, increase cost sharing, or raise premiums or revenues. Under current law, the Congress retains the authority to modify, reject, or enhance IPAB recommendations to strengthen Medicare, and IPAB recommendations would take effect only if the Congress does not act to slow Medicare cost growth.

H.R. 1190 would repeal and dismantle the IPAB even before it has a chance to work. The bill would eliminate an important safeguard that, under current law, will help reduce the rate of Medicare cost growth responsibly while protecting Medicare beneficiaries and the traditional program. While this safeguard is not projected to be needed now or for a number of years given recent exceptionally slow growth in health care costs, it could serve a valuable role should rapid growth in health costs return.

CBO estimates that repealing the IPAB would increase Medicare costs and the deficit by $7 billion over 10 years. The Administration would strongly oppose any effort to offset this increased Federal budget cost by reducing the Prevention and Public Health Fund. The Affordable Care Act created this Fund to help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. There has been bipartisan and bicameral support for allocation of the Fund, and the Congress directed uses of the Fund through FY 2014 and FY 2015 appropriations legislation. The Fund supports critical investments such as tobacco use reduction and programs to reduce health-care associated infections. By concentrating on the causes of chronic disease, the Fund helps more Americans stay healthy.

The Administration is committed to strengthening Medicare for those who depend on it and protection of the public's health. We believe that this legislation fails to accomplish these goals. If the President were presented with H.R. 1190, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the author of the legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud sponsor of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act. This bipartisan legislation, which I introduced with my colleague, LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB.

Created by the Affordable Care Act, this panel of 15 unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats exists to cut Medicare spending to meet arbitrary budgets and have been given enormous powers to do so.

Listen to this carefully. Peter Orszag, President Obama's former budget director, has noted IPAB represents the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve. Let me repeat that: the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, we just spent, in a bipartisan way, 3 years working through SGR reform. Seventeen times, we kicked the can down the road so our seniors wouldn't be denied access to care. This bill is basically SGR on steroids. It trumps all the work we just did on SGR reform.

Any proposal made by IPAB will be considered using expedited procedures, and without a three-fifths vote in the Senate, Congress can only modify the type of cuts proposed, not the amount, so we have to do the amount. If Congress doesn't act on IPAB's recommendation, the cuts will automatically go into effect. To make matters worse, the Board is exempt from administrative or judicial review.

On the projections between 2020 and 2024, the CBO can't tell me from year to year, within the tens of billions of dollars, what the budget deficit is going to be each year, so I don't put a lot of stock in that.

If the President does not nominate individuals to serve on the IPAB or if the IPAB fails to recommend cuts when required to do so, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the power to make the changes unilaterally.

□ 1315

One person will make those changes for the entire country. Think about that for a second. One person would have the ability to reshape a program that has 55 million enrollees. Whatever you may think about the President's healthcare law, this just isn't right.

After practicing medicine for more than 30 years, I can tell you that no two patients are the same and that different approaches are required for different needs. IPAB is blind to that fact and will ration seniors' access to care through a one-size-fits-all payment policy.

Medicare desperately needs reform to ensure it continues to be there for current beneficiaries and the next generation, but this is not the way. We can do better.

It is time to go back to the drawing board. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and put medical decisions back where they belong. Mr. Speaker, that is between patients and doctors.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This legislation is a ghost hunt. It doesn't exist. There is no IPAB. There is nobody that has been appointed. Nothing is going to happen until 2024.

So the question you have to ask yourself is: Why are we out here? Well, we are out here because some people think that trying to control costs in health care is a bad idea.

If you go back and read the Medicare legislation when it was put in, the AMA extracted from this Congress the right to charge their usual and customary fees. They have been driving the costs, and we have been trying to control it with all kinds of mechanisms all the way through it. Only with the incidence of the ACA have we seen the curve come down.

We have actually extended the life of Medicare to 2030. Right now, we are spending 17 percent of our gross domestic product on health care. When I came to this Congress, it was about 12 or 13 percent. It has only gone up. We have not been able to do it ourselves. So the creators of this bill said: Let's put something in on the outside that can give us some suggestions.

Now, when we had Simpson-Bowles—and I know the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee thought the Simpson-Bowles idea was a good idea—what happened after it was brought out in public? Nothing. We ignored it.

The reason for IPAB is to put pressure on the Congress to act to control costs. I guess Republicans don't care about costs because they don't understand that there are 10,000 people signing up for Social Security every single day. That is 3.5 million people.

The numbers are going up. The costs are going to go up. People are going to run around here saying we have got to cut benefits; we have got to shift the costs to the old people; we have got to do all this. The IPAB was a way to force the Congress to face the consequences of their own inaction.

Dr. ROE is correct; we spent 16 years kicking the can down the road on this issue of SGR. That was, again, an attempt to control costs. It never worked. It was ill-conceived in the beginning.

This is an issue where there is some real muscle in it, and people are afraid of that. They are afraid of it 9 years

out because they know how the Congress does. This is just another way to try to undercut and make Medicare and the ACA not work.

Mr. LEVIN pointed out the other thing that is important, and that is the place they look for the money is to go to community health, health departments. Nobody needs health departments. Why do you need people looking at restaurants to see if they are safe to go into, or to look at the water supply or look at what is happening in sewage? You don't need that stuff.

This $7 billion they are going to grab here is straight out of the health departments of our country. Every one of your counties is going to be facing the impact of this.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. The only thing that I think one can say is that it is a bad idea to get rid of some muscle to force us to look at costs, but it is worse to pay for it by taking money away from health departments. They are the ones that always get cut.

Who wants inspectors? The other side says: We don't like regulations. It is regulations that are ruining America. We have got to get those regulations out.

You don't want regulations enforced in restaurants? Then take $7 billion away from it and see what kind of restaurant problems you start to have.

Milwaukee had the cryptosporidium organism in the water supply. That is a health problem that is dealt with by the actual health department in the county. We are taking $7 billion to pay for this badly constructed idea.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have spent going on four decades taking care of patients in rural east Tennessee, and I saw access becoming more and more and more of a problem. It is a serious issue now, as Medicare costs have gone up and up and up.

I have a mother who is almost 93. She has a difficult time affording her health care and other needs that she has. One of the things I am very concerned with, as Dr. MCDERMOTT said, we have 10,000 seniors a day getting on that program. We need to leave those decisions to doctors and patients, not to bureaucrats.

Let me give a little more information. There is a similar panel in England called NICE, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, I believe is what the acronym is. The other day, the Royal College of Surgeons talked about how they noticed that over 75, almost nobody got operated on for breast cancer, almost nobody over 75 got a gall bladder operation, almost nobody over 75 got a knee fixed, and almost nobody over 75 got a hip fixed. That is wrong, and that is exactly the pathway we are going down if we don't stop this nonsense.

There is a very good article in the New England Journal of Medicine published in 2011. I recommend you all read it. It is a look back from 25 years. That is the only information they had. This particular author was not for IPAB or against it; he just analyzed it.

Twenty-one of those 25 years, IPAB would have kicked in, meaning those cuts would have happened. And I can tell you this right now: our seniors better look at this with a laser beam on because their care is going to be cut if this goes into effect. We need to get rid of it now, before that happens.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California), a very active member of our committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

I am the Democratic lead, along with Congressman PHIL ROE, and I am proud of the bipartisan work we have done to repeal the unelected bureaucracy known as the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB. I proudly voted for the ACA, and I think time has shown that the law works. The ACA has reduced the number of uninsured Americans, lowered healthcare costs, prevented disease, and increased access to cures.

Despite the success of the law, no bill is perfect. I believe that there are certain areas for improvement in the ACA, and I am committed to working in a bipartisan manner to solve these issues and provide our constituents with the world-class health care that they deserve.

The ACA is a good law and a few small tweaks can make it stronger, and that is why I decided to reach across the aisle to work with Congressman ROE on this legislation. Repealing IPAB is not the exclusive purview of the Republican Party, and it is a bipartisan effort.

Unfortunately, much like the last time Congress considered IPAB repeal in 2012, an unpalatable pay-for undermined the bipartisan support for a deal. I know Congressman ROE has worked tirelessly to avoid repeating the pay-for battle that we had back in 2012 in order to retain Democratic support.

Despite these efforts, Republican leadership has chosen to draw from the prevention and public health fund to pay for H.R. 1190. This is something that I simply cannot support, and it is with great disappointment that I must cast my vote against H.R. 1190. I truly believe that repealing IPAB is the right thing to do, but I cannot support gutting a great provision in the ACA to get rid of a bad one.

The prevention and public health fund is an unprecedented investment in public health to prevent costly and life-threatening diseases. The fund has invested nearly $5.25 billion in States, cities, and communities to keep our constituents healthy and safe before they need costly, long-term care to manage their illnesses.

The fund also exists to prevent stroke, cancer, tobacco use, and obesity, while also funding vital childhood immunization programs, and invests in detecting, tracking, and responding to infectious diseases. County public health departments rely on this fund to serve their constituents, and I know my home State of California has received over $195 million thus far.

Despite all this, the Republican leadership has decided to take approximately $8.85 billion from the fund which actually helps lower the cost of health care through prevention, eliminating the need, ironically, for IPAB in the first place.

In closing, I again want to thank Congressman ROE and the 235 bipartisan cosponsors for their hard work. I am disappointed that I must vote against my own bill, because I know the underlying policy is good policy, but I cannot vote for something that drains an essential fund from the ACA.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time allotment remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, let me take a couple of minutes to explain why Americans fear the Independent Payment Advisory Board, as it meddles with their health care.

As I stand here today, I will tell you that I am a physician, and I can tell you what is already taking place within private insurance with these peer reviews when you recommend something.

I recommended an MRI to a patient. That afternoon, I get on the phone. The woman says: I have had a problem for 10 years. I have had cortisone injections, physical therapy, blah, blah, blah.

I said: You need an MRI.

I am being denied the MRI by the insurance company because I have only seen her once. And I said to the gentleman, the doctor on the phone: How many times have you seen her?

None.

I said: What State do you have a license to practice in?

Not Ohio, which is where we were.

And so I said: Tell me your specialty.

My specialty is foot and ankle. This woman was in for a foot problem.

He said: I am an emergency room doctor.

I said: Well, then you would refer her to a specialist, which is where she is today.

He said: Well, I am not going to let you get that MRI.

I said: I hope this call is monitored for quality assurance, because I want someone to hear what you said to me today.

And then I asked the patient if she would go to her HR director and call the insurance company and say: We are going to drop the insurance because you are not letting the patients get the care their doctor recommends.

And then we got it. Within 3 weeks, I had her better because I knew what was wrong once I had the MRI.

Imagine trying to have that type of a discussion with the Independent Payment Advisory Board. If they pick up their phone, will they have a conversation with you about the patient?

This is a problem. This is what Americans are fearing today. And this is why the Independent Payment Advisory Board should go away.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. It is a great bill. We should pass it. IPAB is a bad agency. It should not have been created in the first place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB, one of the most ominous provisions in the sweeping overhaul of health care known as the Affordable Care Act.

The stated purpose of IPAB is to reduce Medicare's per capita growth rate. The Board is to be made up of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats—by the way, you can't have a majority of docs on the Board—who will be paid $165,300 a year to serve 6-year terms on the Board.

This panel of 15 unelected and unaccountable government bureaucrats is tasked with reducing Medicare costs through arbitrary cuts to providers, limiting access to care for seniors. If Medicare growth goes over an arbitrary target, the Board is required to submit a proposal to Congress that would reduce Medicare's growth rate.

These recommendations will automatically go into effect, unless Congress passes legislation that would achieve the same amount of savings. In order to do so, Congress must meet an almost impossible deadline and clear an almost insurmountable legislative hurdle.

The Board has the power to make binding decisions about Medicare policy, with no requirement for public comment prior to issuing its recommendations, and individuals and providers will have no recourse against the Board because its decisions cannot be appealed or reviewed. In other words, the Board will make major healthcare legislation essentially outside the usual legislative process.

The Board is also limited in how it can achieve the required savings. Therefore, IPAB's recommendations will be restricted to cutting provider reimbursements. In many cases, Medicare already reimburses below the costs of providing services; and we are already seeing doctors refusing to take new Medicare patients—or Medicare patients at all—because they cannot afford to absorb the losses.

Any additional provider cuts will lead to fewer Medicare providers, and that means that beneficiary access will suffer. Seniors will be forced to wait in longer and longer lines to be seen by an ever-shrinking pool of providers or have to travel longer and longer distances to find a provider willing to see them.

Clearly, Medicare growth is on an out-of-control trajectory that endangers the solvency and continued existence of the program. IPAB, however, is not the solution.

Mr. Speaker, the House voted 223–181 in 2012 to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Today, H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, enjoys the support of 235 of our House colleagues who have signed on as cosponsors.

The time has come for the House to once again repeal this flawed policy, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1190.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1190. This bill would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, and pay for it by drastically reducing our investment in prevention and public health.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support IPAB. I oppose independent commissions playing a legislative role other than on the recommendatory basis. It is not the job of an independent commission to make decisions on healthcare policy for Medicare beneficiaries. Congress simply must stop ceding legislative power to outside bodies.

However, IPAB remains an insignificant provision from the Affordable Care Act, as it has not even been convened. Because of how well other provisions of the ACA are working, Medicare cost growth rates are projected to remain beneath IPAB targets through the entire budget window, thereby not triggering the IPAB provisions until 2024 at the earliest.

That said, I urge this House to oppose H.R. 1190, which would pay for IPAB repeal by effectively gutting the Affordable Care Act's prevention and public health fund, an incredibly significant provision from the ACA.

The prevention and public health fund is a mechanism to provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health, to improve health outcomes, and to enhance healthcare quality. The fund has worked to reduce tobacco use, promote community prevention and use of preventive services, and combat healthcare associated infections.

This year the fund will invest nearly $1 billion in programs that will benefit every State, and these dollars go to proven, effective ways to keep Americans healthier and more productive.

In my home State of New Jersey, we have received more than $47.5 million for prevention and public health fund programs. This bill would walk back these and other important strides we have made in public health and prevention.

This bill is yet another Republican attempt to attack and undermine the Affordable Care Act. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) manage the remainder of the Committee on Energy and Commerce time on the Democratic side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valued member of our Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

The President's healthcare law included the creation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB. Despite its name, IPAB is the opposite of independent, Mr. Speaker. IPAB is a group of 15 unelected members, unaccountable to the American people. IPAB's job is to control Medicare spending. That sounds nice, but they only have one way to do that, by cutting reimbursement rates for doctors and hospitals.

Seniors rely on Medicare, as well as the doctors who will see them. If this unelected, unaccountable Board cuts reimbursement rates, doctors will stop seeing Medicare patients. That is bad for the 180,000 seniors in my district.

Support this bill, and let's abolish IPAB. I look forward to a bipartisan vote in support of H.R. 1190.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation, H.R. 1190, for reasons that I will detail in a moment.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman indicated there were 235 people for this bill in this House. I just observed a few minutes ago there are 240 people for Export-Import Bank. We have brought this bill to the floor. I would hope the gentleman would urge his side, when 60 of his folks are for it, all of ours are for it, to bring the Export-Import Bank to the floor because it is about jobs.

Having said that—and I want to acknowledge that I am a good friend and

have great respect for the sponsor of this bill, Dr. ROE. He and I have worked together on anaphylactic shock and the dangers caused by the eating of peanuts. He is a good doctor. He is a good person.

We happen to disagree on this bill, however. This, essentially, will be the 60th vote, over the next 2 days, 4 days, on the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

We obviously have a difference of opinion on the Affordable Care Act. I believe it is working. I believe that millions of people are covered by insurance. Because of the Affordable Care Act, millions of children are covered under their parents' policy, and millions of seniors are paying less for prescription drugs. Millions of people with a preexisting condition have the confidence that they can get insurance.

The bill we are debating today and voting on next week would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, as it is referred to.

Now, I was disappointed at the reference of ''bureaucrats.'' It is used as an epithet, unfortunately, not as a descriptive term.

The fact of the matter is these folks are appointed and they make recommendations. They make recommendations to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress of the United States can reject them; and/or the President of the United States, if the Congress passes legislation to set that aside, can consider it as well.

IPAB develops proposals to contain the rate of growth of Medicare spending. The Board hasn't been formed. There are no members appointed yet; yet Republicans are asking taxpayers to spend $7-plus billion over the next 10 years to eliminate it. It is not that it has acted badly. It is not that they are irresponsible. There are no people appointed to this Board yet.

The Affordable Care Act has slowed the growth of healthcare costs to its lowest rate in 50 years. That helps every American, whether they are covered by the Affordable Care Act or private employer insurance or self-insured.

As a result, CBO predicts that action by the Board would not even be triggered until 2024, but the cuts to the prevention fund would act now. Republicans are paying for this bill by cutting funding for disease prevention and public health now. Even then, CBO reports that this bill still bends the healthcare cost curve in the wrong direction over the long run.

Today, as has been observed, we passed another bill. That one was without offsets. That will create an additional $24 billion deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the House has a choice. It can continue the same old partisan attacks against affordable health care and add billions to the deficit, undermine prevention and public health, bringing deficit-financed tax cuts passed by this Republican-led Congress up to $610.7 billion since January.

Somebody is going to pay that bill because we are not. My generation is not being asked to pay for it, $610.7 billion.

It could reject, of course, the politics as usual and, instead, work together in a bipartisan way to focus on creating jobs, lowering the deficit, and investing in a competitive economy.

You heard the sponsor of this bill saying, I cannot support it, the gentlewoman from California, because the proponents of this bill would rather attack the Affordable Care Act than they would to pass this bill.

Now, they want to pass this bill, but their priority is undermining the Affordable Care Act, which is why they didn't work with Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ and others who agree with them on the policy. I have to disagree with them on the policy; but they have even put people who agree with them in a place where they cannot support the undermining of the Affordable Care Act and preventive health in America.

Let's choose to work together to do what American people are asking us to do, not undermine the critical healthcare reforms that are containing costs, increasing access, and improving quality.

That is why I opposed the medical device tax bill, and that is why I am urging my colleagues to defeat this one as well.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished minority whip, I do support Ex-Im Bank and urge my leaders to act on it. We are together on support of that.

Let me just mention a few things to correct the record. Number one, we had Secretary Burwell before the committee earlier this year and Dr. LARRY BUCSHON, on our Health Subcommittee, asked her specifically, when the IPAB cuts would begin to take effect. She said in 2019. In fact, the President's own budget request would begin the cuts of IPAB in 2019.

Now, you don't have to have the members of the IPAB appointed in order to have the cuts. The law, IPAB, designates the Secretary of HHS with the authority to make those cuts. To overcome those cuts, you really have to have two-thirds votes in the House and the Senate, with commensurate cuts from somewhere else in Medicare to replace those cuts that you are overcoming.

□ 1345

So this is a Board that has tremendous power that will deal with provider payments and cuts.

We just dealt with the SGR, the sustainable growth rate, in a bipartisan manner. We acted to repeal the sustainable growth rate that required cuts to provider payments for seniors, and it was supported overwhelmingly.

But if you liked the SGR, you will love IPAB. This is the SGR on steroids. It will be very difficult to overcome these 15 unelected bureaucrats, experts, whatever you want to call them—it can't be a majority of docs, by the way—or the Secretary, whoever makes the recommendations.

We use the prevention fund as a pay-for, taking funds from the prevention fund until 2025 to reach the $7.1 billion. But this prevention fund gets $2 billion every year, beginning this year and every year ad infinitum. So $2 billion in 2015, 2016, '17, '18, '19, '20, '21, '30, '31, '40, '41. Every year, the Secretary gets $2 billion to use at her sole discretion. She doesn't have to use it for public health purposes. She has sole discretion on how this money is used.

Would you like to know some of the things she has used the money for so far?

Well, $450 million was used for the Navigator program and implementing the Affordable Care Act; $400,000 has been used for pickle-ball; $235,000 for massage therapy, kick boxing, and Zumba classes, whatever that is; $7.5 million on promoting free pet neutering; $3 million for the New York Department of Health to lobby for the passage of a soda tax; money for gardening projects, fast food, small businesses, bike clubs.

Rather than spend money on questionable projects, lobbying campaigns for higher taxes, and for Affordable Care Act media campaigns, H.R. 1190 would rather use these funds to protect Medicare seniors and their health care because the money for the operation of IPAB, for these salaries, for their travel, for all their expenses comes directly out of the trust fund moneys for seniors, used for seniors and those with disabilities. That is wrong.

We are constraining. We are not repealing the prevention fund to pay for this, but we need to constrain the use of that fund. And good public health policy ought to come before the Congress, not be at the sole discretion of this one Secretary or czar or however you might want to term it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in favor of this legislation, H.R. 1190, and I urge the Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I oppose H.R. 1190.

If the Republican appetite for the repeal of the Independent Payment Advisory Board was based solely on its merits, I might be a little bit more charitable about their bringing this bill to the floor because, as you have seen from the speakers on our side, there is a legitimate debate on the merits. I have some concerns myself about the IPAB. But, unfortunately, I think that where this is coming from is this impulse, this kind of ceaseless impulse to undermine and dismantle the Affordable Care Act, and the evidence of that is in the pay-for.

Why would you want to go undermine the public health portion, really, a significant commitment that was made through the ACA to begin to turn our healthcare system towards prevention, towards public health? Frankly,

we need as many resources as we can muster to put behind that. And the pay-for for this repeal would take $8.85 billion that has been set aside for the prevention and public health fund away from that fund and undermine all of the various activities that are being funded by it.

I don't know why it is that our colleagues on the other side cannot restrain themselves when it comes to this shiny object of repealing the ACA when we now have plenty of evidence at our fingertips as to the positive impact that the Affordable Care Act is having: 3 million young people who now can stay on the health insurance coverage of their parents, who were not covered before; millions more that are benefiting from the health exchanges across the country; seniors who now have less anxiety about falling into the so-called doughnut hole under the part D prescription drug benefit program because, under the ACA, we are beginning to close that doughnut hole; insurance companies now being barred from discriminating against people based on a preexisting condition; preventive care screening for our seniors under the Medicare program; tests and other screenings that they used to have to come out of pocket for, now that is completely covered as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

You ask the average person out there about any of those things I just mentioned, and they say: Why would we want to give these up?

These are important to our health, important to the strength of our families and our community. Yet our colleagues just don't seem to be able to help themselves when it comes to wanting to attack the Affordable Care Act.

Furthermore, if you view this IPAB as an important mechanism in terms of controlling costs, as has already been said, the trigger mechanism would not kick in for a number of years here anyway. In other words, the costs are being controlled currently. So that basis for sort of the urgency of it now in terms of bringing these other pay-fors into the mix doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

Let's acknowledge that one of the reasons that that trigger isn't going to come any time soon is because, again, the Affordable Care Act is working when it comes to controlling costs. So that is the other side of the discussion. The Affordable Care Act is working in terms of providing more coverage and improving treatment and management of chronic care on the one hand, and the evidence is that it is also reducing cost on the other hand. So it makes sense to try to preserve that, and I think the public health fund and prevention fund is a critical piece.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation for the reasons enumerated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

I just want to read into the RECORD, so that we have this information, a couple of observations from some of the groups out there that are most engaged in prevention and public health across the country and the perspective that they bring in terms of this offset, of undermining and depleting the prevention and public health fund.

The American Lung Association said, using money from the prevention fund as a pay-for would have a devastating effect on our Nation's public health.

The American Heart Association: Cardiovascular disease is a leading cause of death in the United States and is our most costly disease. The fund supports evidence-based initiatives like WISEWOMAN, a preventive health services program that provides lifestyle programs and health counseling that help low-income, uninsured, and underinsured women ages 40 to 54 prevent, delay, or control heart disease and stroke.

The American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network observes that the national breast and cervical cancer early detection program is funded in 31 States through the fund.

And there are others that have observed—the March of Dimes, the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids—that it doesn't make any sense to go raid the prevention and public health fund to support this repeal of the IPAB.

For those reasons and the others that have been presented here today, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1190.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

While the programs enumerated by the gentleman from Maryland are laudable, there is nothing in the prevention and public health fund that guarantees that these will be funded or that they are priorities. It is at the sole discretion of the Secretary as to what she would allocate the funds for. And rightly, these kinds of funds should come before Congress, and Congress should approve these kinds of public health funds.

I might mention that CBO estimates that H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, as amended, would have no budgetary effect on fiscal years 2015–16. It would reduce direct spending by $1.8 billion over the 2016–2020 period, and reduce the direct spending by $45 million over the 2016–25 period.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, and repealing IPAB.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act. It was critical that the Affordable Care Act (ACA) included the cutting edge delivery and payment reforms that it did. But, I have never believed that the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) will be effectively able to fulfill its stated mission of cost containment. I have concerns with how IPAB will operate and that it gives up important Congressional authority over payment.

For these reasons, I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, but once again, the House Republican majority has decided to kill the bipartisanship of this bill with a controversial pay-for. My Republican colleagues continue to prove that they would rather have an anti-ACA talking point rather than a real solution.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, my home state of New Jersey has received more than $20 million for evidence-based programs to prevent heart attacks, strokes, cancer, obesity, and smoking from the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund. This bill, as it is being considered today, would completely gut this fund by cutting $8.8 billion—nearly $2 billion more than is needed to pay for repealing IPAB.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to work with Democrats to find an agreeable way to pay for this bill, and I urge opposition to this bill in its current form.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

While I support repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB), I oppose offsetting the cost of repeal with funds from the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the nation's single largest investment in prevention programs. Established under the Affordable Care Act, the Fund represents an unprecedented investment in preventing disease, promoting wellness, and protecting our communities against public health emergencies.

Since its creation, the Fund has invested in a broad range of evidence-based initiatives. These include community prevention programs, research, surveillance and tracking efforts, increased access to immunizations, and tobacco prevention programs.

Much of this work is done through partnerships with state and local governments, which leverage Prevention Fund dollars to best meet the local need. These monies have been used for important work, such as controlling the obesity epidemic, detecting and responding to outbreaks, and reducing health disparities.

Congress has a distinct responsibility to formulate and fund programs and initiatives that promote public health and wellness. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is one means by which Congress fulfils this obligation.

While I opposed the creation of the IPAB and support its repeal, gutting the Fund would be a significant step backwards on the path towards improving our nation's health. Rescinding $8.85 billion to offset the costs of H.R. 1190 will have a devastating effect on our nation's health. It is not an acceptable trade off.

We spend billions of dollars on treating disease once people become sick. This investment in prevention is a key component of efforts to improve health and bend the health care cost curve. Using this money to pay for other priorities will only damage the long-term health of our nation.

I urge my colleagues to protect the federal government's only dedicated investment in prevention and vote against H.R. 1190.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, which repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB), that was established under the ACA in response to high rates of growth in Medicare expenditures and charged with developing proposals to ''reduce the per capita rate of growth in Medicare spending.''

I oppose this bill strongly because by repealing IPAB before it has a chance to work, the bill would eliminate an important safeguard that will help reduce the rate of Medicare cost growth responsibly while protecting Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1190 is nothing but another attempt, in a long line of House Republican efforts to undermine both the Medicare guarantee and the Affordable Care Act.

Repealing IPAB cost over $7 billion during the course of a ten year period according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

Republicans have chosen to pay for the cost of this repeal with cuts to the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund.

This fund has invested nearly $5.25 billion into programs that support a number of public health initiatives, including obesity prevention and childhood immunization.

It has been used to increase awareness of and access to preventive health services and reduce tobacco use—concentrating on the causes of chronic disease to help more Americans stay healthy.

Eliminating these funds in the name of damaging the sustainability of Medicare is a two-pronged attack on our nation's public health.

After more than five years under the Affordable Care Act, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage; up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access to coverage.

Mr. Speaker, given the real challenges facing our nation, it is irresponsible for the Republican majority to continue bringing to the floor bills that have no chance of becoming law and would harm millions of Americans if they were to be enacted.

House Republicans have tried 58 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled more than 16 million previously uninsured Americans to know the peace of mind that comes from having access to affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Their record to date is 0–58; it will soon be 0–59 because the President has announced that he will veto this bill if it makes it to his desk.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look at the facts before prematurely repealing sections of the ACA that have significant negative impacts on Americans currently insured.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board recommends to Congress policies that reduce the rate of Medicare growth and help Medicare provide better care at lower costs.

IPAB has been highlighted by the non-partisan CBO, economists, and health policy experts as contributing to Medicare's long-term sustainability.

The Board is already prohibited from recommending changes to Medicare that ration health care, restrict benefits, modify eligibility, increase cost sharing, or raise premiums or revenues.

Under current law, the Congress retains the authority to modify, reject, or enhance IPAB recommendations to strengthen Medicare, and IPAB recommendations would take effect only if the Congress does not act to slow Medicare cost growth.

Despite the Supreme Court's upholding of the law's constitutionality, the reelection of President Obama, and Speaker JOHN BOEHNER's declaration that: "Obamacare is the law of the land," Republicans refuse to stop wasting time and taxpayer money in their effort to take away the patient protections and benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we stop wasting our time in taking away healthcare protections and benefits and work to ensure that we support the current law.

A law that is providing access to an industry once denied to so many Americans and now supports millions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 1190.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REPEAL THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, Maine is home to the most skilled woodworkers on Earth, but ObamaCare's medical device tax is killing our jobs.

Hardwood Products and Puritan companies in Guilford have been family-run businesses for nearly 100 years. 450 hard-working Mainers produce 3.5 million popsicle sticks per day. The company also manufactures more tongue depressors and medical swabs than any other business in the Western Hemisphere. Its only competitor is located in China.

Puritan Company pays nearly $250,000 per year in medical device tax. As a result, they can't afford to buy new equipment to manufacture new medical products or hire more workers.

It is not right for this ObamaCare tax to export our manufacturing jobs to China. It is not right for this punitive tax to smother innovation that helps Americans enjoy longer and healthier lives.

Today, let's all band together, Republicans and Democrats here in the House, to deep-six this horrible tax.

□ 1400

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF JUNETEENTH

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Juneteenth, the oldest celebration honoring the end of slavery in Texas and in the U.S.

In Texas, the observance of June 19 as Emancipation Day for Blacks has spread across the United States and beyond as a symbol of freedom and opportunity that reflects how far we have come as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, as Texas commemorates Juneteenth, I want to take just a little time here to acknowledge a few of the public celebrations that will take place in the congressional district that I represent.

In Grand Prairie, in the very proud Dalworth community at Tyre Park, they are going to celebrate the holiday with a fish fry and live music on Juneteenth. Also, in the city of Fort Worth, there will be a Juneteenth parade and celebration, and there will be a gathering at the Fort Worth Water Gardens in downtown Fort Worth.

I also want to acknowledge my good friend, Opal Lee, who has worked very hard to bring so much recognition of Juneteenth around the city of Fort Worth, the State, and the Nation as well.

As we mark 150 years celebrating Juneteenth, let us commemorate a new era of achievements in the Black community giving us all a chance to reflect on our roots and an opportunity to educate the next generation about such a historic day.

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, which repeals ObamaCare's arbitrary Independent Payment Advisory Board, known as IPAB.

One of the most concerning and equally troubling aspects of ObamaCare is its unprecedented shift of power to Washington bureaucrats. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is no exception to that. Entrusting 15 unelected bureaucrats with across-the-board power to reduce Medicare spending and decide which treatments are determined necessary only serves to jeopardize access to quality care for our seniors.

We know by now that one-size-fits-all solutions coming from D.C. will not fix our healthcare system. Instead, we should focus on advancing well thought-out, long-term solutions to make Medicare more sustainable so we can protect access to care now and for future generations.

This bill brings us one step closer to getting Washington out of the way and putting Americans back in charge of their healthcare decisions.

DACA ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week we marked 3 years since President Obama created the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA. He did this in response to Congress' failure to pass the DREAM Act and help children of undocumented immigrants stay here and help build a better future for America.

For children who probably know no language other than English and know no country other than America, for many of these immigrants brought here as children through no fault of their own, America is the only home they have ever known. They love this country, and they deserve a chance to stay and contribute to our Nation's future.

President Obama announced an expanded DACA last year, along with the program that deals with parents of such children to help the immigrant parents of American citizens and legal residents. Unfortunately, a partisan lawsuit has held up their implementation, and Republicans have now voted three times to end this opportunity for children of immigrants. They would split families apart.

If my Republican friends wish to change our immigration policies, they have a perfect vehicle, Mr. Speaker, for doing so: a comprehensive immigration reform bill supported, in my opinion, by a majority of the House of Representatives. Let's bring such a bill to the floor so that we can fix our broken immigration system and create a pathway to citizenship for these DREAMers and others who have been living and working here for almost all their lives.

OUR DOCUMENTS OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, quite often, as others have already done today, when I have come before this body, it has been to recognize someone who has done something significant in my district or to speak about a bill, whether I was for it or against it, or a piece of policy or an issue. But today I don't have pre-prepared remarks. I just wanted to remind those of us who are here of why we are here. Why do we attend sessions here in this body day in and day out? What is the purpose for our being here?

Before I begin remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to personally extend my thoughts and prayers on behalf of myself and my family, as well as those of the 11th Congressional District in Georgia, to those victims of the horrific attack that happened last evening in Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Homeland Security as well as the special task force on foreign fighters, and as part of that, we spend a lot of time studying terrorism and the terrorist attacks against this Nation. One thing that I have seen that is consistent about these terrorist attacks is that they are attacking us not because of who we are. Most of them don't even know our names. They may not know our families or what we believe, and it may well be the case in Charleston, as I know it was in Garland, Texas, in the attacks there, they didn't even know their victims. But what I have seen with these attacks of terrorism is they are attacks about what we stand for, and that is freedom.

In Garland, Texas, it was an attack on the First Amendment, our freedom of speech. Last night, it was an attack on the most fundamental right that our Founding Fathers gave to us, and that is our freedom of religion, a right that, as they said, was given to us by God and cannot be taken away.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity since being in Congress a short amount of time—and it is more than an opportunity, it is really a privilege—to take constituents as they come to the Capitol here on tours. As I walk down the Halls of this building and I point out the statue of Thomas Jefferson that we have right outside the Chamber, or even as I stand here, the image of Moses is looking at me as he is looking over the Chamber, as I see the statues of our Founding Fathers, they have left us reminders of why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, as we are getting close to the great anniversary festival of the birth of this Nation, I think it is imperative and important that we as a body are reminded of why we are here. I just want to speak briefly about two phrases that you can find in Washington, D.C., that remind us not only of why we are here, but what it takes to preserve the freedom that we have been given.

Mr. Speaker, as I walked down the aisle to come to this podium, I just glanced up above the rostrum where you are standing, and I see four words, ''In God We Trust.'' That is one of the phrases that my eyes often go to as I am sitting in this Chamber as we are debating bills. I reflect back on why do we have that phrase here?

Well, it also goes back to another phrase that I have seen recently as I was taking a tour of The Mall outside this building, where we have the museums of the heritage of this Nation. There is also a building there, the National Archives. Inside that building are the documents of freedom, the most hallowed of all of our documents: the Constitution; the Bill of Rights; and then the one that we hold the most sacred, the one that is most requested by visitors to this Nation's Capital to see, and that is the Declaration of Independence.

In that Declaration, our Founding Fathers expressed what they believed that this Nation would be one day. It was their vision, it was their faith, and it was their philosophy about this new Nation. They were revolutionary ideas that they brought forth because it was the first time in the history of mankind that a government existed with emphasis on the freedom of individual, empowering the individual. Every other government on the face of the Earth before this had focused its attention upon a group, a collective, whether it was by their race or their religion or aristocracy or their family line. But our Founding Fathers sensed something different: if we empower the individual, if we recognize the rights that God has given them and we give them the freedom to excel and exceed, then our Nation, as a whole, would excel.

They believed that these rights were important to be protected: the right to speak freely, the right to have ideas, the right to pursue happiness, the right to pursue commerce, and the right to worship without fear of oppression from the government. These were revolutionary ideas.

They also knew that they had a challenge. Because of these revolutionary ideas, they knew that they would not be well accepted by other governments because it threatened the power base of those governments. In fact, they knew they would have to take on the most powerful military force in the history of the entire world if they were ever going to see these ideas come to fruition.

Now, think about that. This ragtag rabble of Washington's soldiers would have to take on the most powerful military force in the history of the world. It was an impossible task, and they understood that. But, Mr. Speaker, that phrase that is in marble above the rostrum reflects one of those two key phrases, because in the last line of the Declaration of Independence, our Founding Fathers wrote these words: ''And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.''

You see, ''In God We Trust'' was the first element that they identified that we must have if we were going to preserve this freedom that they were fighting for.

Now, outside the National Archives, where that Declaration is still on display, are the words, ''Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.''

''Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.''

You see, that is the second phrase that I think we must be reminded of today. The second part of that last line of the Declaration of Independence says, ''we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.'' You see, freedom is not free, and it is held and it is protected at a price.

Just recently, I was given the opportunity to travel to the beaches of Normandy. As I stood upon the sands of

Omaha Beach, I started reflecting upon the price that was paid that day for our freedom and our liberty. I brought back a little bit of the sand from the beach, as my dad was in World War II and served in that theater. And as I sat at home right around Memorial Day, I was looking at that jar of sand, and I started thinking: What if these sands could speak? What would they say? What would they tell us in this august body here? What would they tell the people of our Nation if that sand could speak?

You see, that sand absorbed the blood of American patriots who had the courage to step off of those Higgins boats into the line of fire, and I wondered why would they do that, knowing that more than likely they would never return back home. You see, that sand absorbed the blood of these patriots.

The sand also may be able to tell us of the last words that were spoken by some of those patriots as they drew their last breath after giving their lives, their very lives, for our freedom. Would they tell the name of the father or mother as they cried out their last cry of hope?

□ 1415

Would they tell the name of a sweetheart which they will never embrace or a brother or a sister or a child that they will never see?

As I started thinking about it, I started realizing that sand held the DNA of these soldiers—not just DNA of the soldiers, but the DNA of our entire Nation.

I believe today, Mr. Speaker, that, if that sand could tell us anything today in this body, it is to remember what they died for.

I believe, if that sand could speak today, that sand would tell us these words: this is why we died, because we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to ensure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

As we are nearing that celebration—we celebrate 239 years of the birth of this Nation—I call upon the Members of this body to once again reflect on why we are here, and that is to preserve freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to speak.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ISIS CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of weeks, America has asked what is our strategy to defeat ISIS and what is the President's plan to prevent the spread of barbarism in Syria and Iraq?

For all of our advancement in self-governance, the rule of law, and a betterment of people's lives, the world stands in shock at beheadings, immolations, crucifixions, sexual enslavement, and human suffering as a way of governance could exist on earth today.

As the world has watched in horror, it has also looked to America. Where America leads, nations stand shoulder to shoulder; where America is absent, tyranny takes its chances and rears its ugly head—but who would have thought barbarity would emerge?

Since last year, the President has been unable to articulate his strategy to aid our ally in Iraq to combat ISIS. As a combat veteran of Iraq that has had to watch my American and Iraqi friends die, that has had to handle the flesh and blood of battle, that has had to do terrible things to destroy enemies, that has had to watch the good people of Iraq suffer in absence of effective government, this is deeply personal.

It is personal because I have lived among the Sunni Arab. I have celebrated his victories, his wedding, his birthdays, and his accomplishments. I have mourned as close Iraqi friends have died to acts of terror and mourned when Iraq's educated, intelligent, and free people have been expunged.

The President's refusal to negotiate a status of forces agreement and decision to abandon Iraq in 2012 is largely responsible and aided ISIS' path to destruction in that country.

We soldiers and servicemembers who have sacrificed so much in Iraq weep. We defeated Saddam's army, toppled the Ba'athist government, captured and brought a world tyrant to justice, fought an insurgency, and stood shoulder to shoulder with disenfranchised Sunnis and Kurds to restore control to Iraq's Government. We turned the country around with a military pause.

The President used that pause for abandonment and political expediency; where we sacrificed, he quit. I speak for so many of the Iraq veterans when I say: Mr. President, you have hurt us deeply. You have torn a hole within us. We are at a loss to see the state of Iraq today.

Now, as we ask what can be done, we see a strategy offered by this administration. I heard it yesterday in the House Armed Services Committee when Secretary of Defense Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Dempsey attempted to articulate it. I left more confused than when I entered.

The President is offering a plan without vision or conviction. Indeed, Secretary Carter could not even name it, calling it the so-called nine-line strategy. So-called? Do we not even have enough conviction to call the strategy some name? Is it our strategy or not? Are we so unsure of it that we do not even know what to call it? Then we were informed of the ''lily pad strategy.'' I suppose that is the one that makes us look like a bunch of toads.

The nine lines, if we decide to actually call it that, this strategy, when taken together, is mostly passive and defensive. In my 21 years of military infantry service, I have never seen enemies defeated by defense.

While passive measures are important, they are only complementary. The President is looking for nations in the Middle East to lead. Middle Eastern countries are looking to the United States for leadership. We cannot approach this problem like pushing a strand of wet spaghetti. Grab it by the front, and it will go where you want it to go.

If Iraq and Syria were a crime-ridden neighborhood, this nine-line strategy would be like relying on neighborhood watches to physically fight criminals and restore leadership of the town. The mayor and police would then tell them, Well, if you clean up your neighborhood, then we will come and provide the protection that you require—if only life worked that way.

The military can provide pauses, but we cannot provide an Iraqi collapse when the President pulls out all the protection necessary to sustain a nascent government. If the United States is not committed with a diplomatic, economic, and informational solution, all the heroics exerted by our men and women in uniform to provide a window will be squandered once again if we abandon our gains.

Secretary Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Dempsey spoke of trying to find people willing to fight in Iraq. There are plenty of them. The problem is they are Sunni Arabs and Kurds. They do not wish to live under ISIS; yet we will not organize them into a Sunni-Arab and Sunni-Kurd federation that would actually stand a chance of success and would be a deadly blow to the objectives of ISIS.

They want to govern themselves because Baghdad cannot include them. They do not wish to live under ISIS' barbarity, and we should embrace them.

In the interim, what can be done that is not passive? How about some of this? Cripple Raqqa. This town, it is clear, is the center of ISIS power. The President's Cabinet says: We are worried about collateral damage and civilian casualties.

News flash, the most humane thing we can do to end the suffering of hundreds of thousands of people is cripple what ISIS draws its strength from; destroy their infrastructure, hammer the electricity capacity of that city, destroy the bridges on their roads of ingress and egress, take away the oil refining installations that they possess and use to fund themselves with millions of dollars of illegal cash.

We have the ability to rebuild those later, but ISIS would be diminished deeply by their loss. The most humane thing we can do to protect civilians is defeat the barbarians, causing their

suffering. That is true humanity. If the United States leads, others will stand shoulder to shoulder. Mr. President, we need you to lead.

We hear talk about countermessaging. Well, here is something every American can help with. News stations, stop putting ISIS recruiting videos as B-roll on your newscasts. Replace it with crosshairs and explosions of their defeat, or show the world their acts of barbarity, instead, for the B-roll. Stop using their images and their propaganda for furthering American newscasts. Americans, write your local news stations and tell them to stop it.

Iran, here is the cold reality and its impact on ISIS and Middle East unrest. Lifting sanctions on Iran will introduce tens of billions of dollars into these war-torn nations and will destabilize the entire region. Mr. President, do not lift the sanctions on Iran. They must show good action before we show good will.

Finally, we must go back to the drawing board on this so-called strategy of halfheartedness. Using American warriors should mean backing them with the full weight and might of this Republic.

Mr. President, do you not realize that our enemies hear you loud and clear when you say you will not sign the Defense Authorization? Secretary Carter, do you not realize that we are still negotiating it between both Houses of Congress? Why do you say you support a veto when we are still in the process of its negotiation? By such actions, one thing is certainly clear: nothing is too good for the troops, and nothing is what they will get.

Instead, lead, achieve, get an ISIS strategy worthy of this mighty Republic, sign the Defense Authorization, and let's get back to our constitutional requirement to provide for our Nation's defense.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had an interesting vote today on the trade agreement, and I know my friends at Club for Growth have scored that.

They wanted people to vote ''yes'' because they believed, as some have said, it is about free trade; but it is a bit ironic for those who follow politics because, on the one hand, Republicans were being told this will allow us to force the President to keep us apprised, to give us notice of what is going on so that we can reign anything in that is not helpful to the country.

I didn't have that impression of the bill, not when reading the TPA, not going to the classified setting. I mean, I did that; I read the TPP, most of it.

Having been a lawyer and a judge, prosecutor, done defense, a chief justice, I have litigated a lot of loopholes. There are a lot of loopholes in that TPP. There were loopholes in the TPA.

□ 1430

One of my Democratic friends was telling me, Mr. Speaker, that he was being told that the whole reason the President came up here is that, by passing this trade agreement, it is going to allow the President to get his agenda done in the next 18 months without Congress being able to stop him.

Some of my Democratic friends prefer that Congress have more say than that, and some were not happy with the proposal at all. They also were smart enough to know there are a lot of American jobs that will be lost because of that bill. I am not an isolationist. I believe in free trade, but I don't believe in free rein for a President. I am afraid that is what it will do, and that is why I had to vote ''no'' once again.

But it passed, and now, we will see if what some of my Democratic friends were told is accurate in that the bill will allow the President to achieve his agenda without Republicans being able to stop him. It appears that way to me, in reading the bills, that he has got enough loopholes he can take advantage of.

Plus, even without loopholes, there is a requirement of notification. He was required to notify us before he released anybody from Guantanamo. He didn't do it. He went ahead and released five of the worst murderers in return for a guy who is, we are told, about to be charged with desertion.

The President doesn't seem to be bogged down by having to follow the law, but I am impressed with my friends who think—but, yes—if we pass one more law that makes him give us notice, after 6½ years of his not keeping us apprised as the law requires, this time, we think he really, really will.

I am impressed with that kind of optimism, even though the old expression here in Washington is, no matter how cynical you get, it is never enough to catch up. Sometimes, I think there is merit to that.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there is an issue even far more important than trade that is about to hit this country. It could create a constitutional crisis of proportions that some of the Justices on the Supreme Court can't imagine. Mr. Speaker, I blew up the law. This is the law. It is not an ethical requirement.

I mean, having been a prosecutor, a defense—heck, I was even court-appointed to appeal a capital murder conviction. I don't know how many here on the floor have appealed a capital murder conviction. I begged the judge not to appoint me, but he did anyway, and when I got into the thousands of pages of records, I found out he had not gotten a fair trial.

I fought for him in the highest court in Texas and got the death penalty reversed. Some clients felt like I was a pretty good lawyer. I was told before I went on the bench that I got the only jury verdict against what was then the largest oil company in the world. I don't know if it was or is. That is what I was told.

I know something about practicing law, and I know something about being a judge. I know that, with any case in which the public would suspect that I could not be impartial, I would have to recuse myself. Sometimes, judges will just recuse themselves so they don't have to make a tough call—I never did that—but there are times when you have such a strong opinion about a matter that you have no business sitting on that case.

Now, ethical requirements would insist that a judge conduct his performance as a judge in such a way that it comports with the requirements of the canons of ethics. However, this isn't an ethical violation that would get you a letter from some bar president or from somebody saying: We think you violated the canons of ethics.

This isn't it. This is United States law. This is the law of the land. This is part A. Part B goes into some different possibilities when a judge might have to recuse him or herself, but it is volume 28 of the United States Code, section 455, and section A doesn't have any subparts to it like B does. B is, like I say, other examples where the judge might have to recuse himself, but A is unequivocal.

''Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall''—that is a ''shall''—''disqualify himself''—generic, male or female—''in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.''

This is not some model code of ethics. This is the United States law. No one in the country, including on the United States Supreme Court, is supposed to be above the law. As we have talked about, we have two Justices who have performed same-sex marriages.

In fact, the article by Greg Richter, May 18 of 2015, is quoting from Maureen Dowd in her article in which Maureen Dowd writes regarding Justice Ginsburg: ''With a sly look and special emphasis on the word 'Constitution,' Justice Ginsburg said that she was pronouncing the two men married by the powers vested in her by the Constitution of the United States.''

Now, there is no question that Justice Ginsburg is biased, prejudiced. She has her own opinion about this matter. She has had her opinion about this. That was clear in the first same-sex marriage she performed. For her not to disqualify herself is a violation of the law of the United States; yet we are told that Justice Ginsburg is not going to recuse herself, that she wants to be part of a majority opinion.

What happens when someone who is disqualified for sitting on a case sits on a case anyway in order to use her partial, biased position to bring about a majority opinion? It would certainly seem that that would be an illegal act, not criminal—this isn't criminal law—but it is an illegal act for someone to violate this law.

Then, of course, we also had Justice Kagan as mentioned in the fall of last year, in September of last year, in The Hill, when Peter Sullivan reported: "'Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan officiated a same-sex wedding on Sunday,' a court spokeswoman told the Associated Press.

"The ceremony in Maryland for a former law clerk is the first same-sex wedding that Kagan has performed. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and retired Justice Sandra Day O'Connor have performed same-sex weddings in the past.

"Gay marriage," the article reads, "has been a divisive topic at the Supreme Court as it has been elsewhere in the country."

The article reads: "The Court could decide as early as this month whether to take up the issue again in the coming session, this time to consider a more sweeping ruling declaring a right to same-sex marriage across the country.

"Ginsburg said last week that, unless an appeals court allows a gay marriage ban to stand, 'there is no need for us to rush' on a Supreme Court ruling."

But they took the case up, and now, we are told they are going to rule by June 30 of this month.

Clearly, Justice Kagan is disqualified. She has had a profound opinion. It reads "in which the impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

There are different standards of evidence in the law. Some States use different burdens of proof. You can have more likely than not if it is a group, like on a jury, one more than half. If there is a preponderance of the evidence that it is more likely than not, then you find that way.

Probable cause is an issue that has an evidentiary requirement. It has got to be, probably, something is likely or has occurred, a preponderance of the evidence. I mentioned that "beyond a reasonable doubt" is what most criminal courts have before you can find someone guilty. Evidence must be beyond a reasonable doubt. There are some courts that use a standard called "clear and convincing evidence."

This United States law doesn't use any of those standards. It is a very weak threshold before a judge or a Justice must disqualify himself. He must disqualify himself. I hated the fact that Justice Scalia, some years back, had to disqualify himself, but he had already had an opinion expressed about, I believe it was, the Pledge of Allegiance.

He could not be sure that it wouldn't end up as a 4–4 decision, which meant the ninth circuit decision would stand, which struck down "under God" in the pledge, as I recall, but he disqualified himself. Justice Scalia followed 28 USC 455.

He disqualified himself because his judgment—his impartiality—might reasonably be questioned. It appeared that he was partial, that he had an opinion in the case, so he disqualified himself. That is acting in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I keep coming back to this. It is a matter of a constitutional crisis when the Highest Court in the land not merely strikes down and says that their opinion is more important than Moses', depicted up there in the center point of this room, more important than Moses', depicted in the marble wall over the Supreme Court, holding the Ten Commandments.

The Supreme Court says theirs is more important than the opinions established and stated by Jesus Christ when he said—and he was quoting Moses—that a man shall leave his mother and father, a woman leave her home, and the two will come together and be one flesh, and what God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

That is the law of God according to Moses. It is the law of God according to Jesus. It is tough enough if you have a United States Supreme Court which, back in the 1890s, said this is clearly a Christian nation. Despite what any opinions may be, the evidence established. This country was established as a Christian nation.

The great thing is that, if a nation is established on Judeo-Christian beliefs, it allows anybody to live here and to function here and to do so without impediment to one's beliefs because one can be an atheist, an agnostic, a Buddhist, a Muslim.

You can be any of those things, as long as you are not trying to take over the country like some would like to do.

□ 1445

But otherwise, by basing a country on Judeo-Christian beliefs, we have provided more freedom for individuals than any nation in the history of the world. And yet we may have an ultimate crisis here when a Court says our opinion is more important than God, if there is one, more important than Moses, more important than Jesus. Our opinion is not only more important than those people, but it is the law of the land, and it is so important that our opinion count that we are going to violate the law ourselves in order to force our opinion—clearly what it is—our opinion on the United States of America.

I don't want anybody to be prejudiced against anybody else. I was sick to my stomach this morning hearing about the shooting in Charleston, South Carolina. This evil perpetrator killed my brothers and sisters. We are brothers and sisters in Christ. Skin color does not matter one bit. He killed my brothers and sisters.

I hope America joins me in mourning. I know the people on both sides of this aisle do. At our prayer breakfast this morning, we prayed and will continue to pray for the families of those who were lost. Those Christians, we as Christians believe, as Jesus told the thief beside him: This day you will be in paradise with Me. We believe they are better off than any of us here in the United States or on Earth.

Because of their beliefs, we believe they are in paradise with Jesus himself, with the Lord, but it is the terrible wake they leave behind that is so tragic. State senator, from all accounts a good man, not only a Christian brother, but a really good man, pastor. Three men, six women. So our hearts go out to them. We don't want anybody to be prejudiced against anybody.

But when it comes to the founding block, the foundation of any solid society, it doesn't matter what relationships exist. It doesn't matter who loves or is friends with whom. As a Christian, I think I can love most everybody. There are a few it is kind of tough, but most everybody. I have got some Democrats over here. I love them. They are just wonderful people. They are wrong on issues, but I love them. They are great folks. There is no animus.

But when it comes to the foundation of this Nation, the home, a mother and a father, regardless of what other relationships may exist between siblings, between anybody else, what matters is you don't destroy the central building block.

I was intrigued when the Iowa Supreme Court back in 2009 didn't use these words, but basically said there is no evidence in nature to indicate a preference of a marriage being between a man and a woman. It was clear the people of Iowa spoke—I love those folks. They were awesome. They came out, and for the first time since the up-or-down retention vote started, I understand, in 1960 or 1962 or so, they threw out the judges that were up for reelection because the vast majority in Iowa knew that is ridiculous.

Nature makes very clear that you start a family, whether you keep both a mother and father, things happen. There are so many of our greatest Americans have arisen from orphanages or from single-parent homes, but still it doesn't get away from the optimum being nature says you are best off if you have a mother and father. They can produce children. Yes, you can adopt children, sure, but that is where nature comes in and says, yeah, but the optimum is a mother and a father in a home.

I know there are some who are involved in same-sex marriage. They are not able to love as I do. They hate anybody that disagrees with them. There are some that can love me, though we disagree. I hope that the continued hatred that has been growing among some in the same-sex community can be tamped down, but this is an issue that is foundational to any society that is going to maintain strength,

going to maintain viability for a long time into the future rather than show we just crossed another milestone on our way to the dustbin of history. This is something that is important to our society, to our foundation. Let's love everybody. Let's use law enforcement to stop those like the evil perpetrator in Charleston, like the leftwinger I think it was in North Carolina that killed the Muslims. There is no call for that. The man needs to go to prison. In Texas, we would say it is a multiple murder. I would say you need to get the death penalty for killing more than one Muslim. There is no place for that.

But again, when it comes to the optimum home, a loving mother and father can procreate, adopt, but regardless of who agrees or disagrees, this is going to be a civilization changer, and it is not going to be for the better. We are going to continue our divisiveness and destructiveness when the highest Court in the land has Justices that say: My opinion is so much more important than the Bible, Moses, Jesus. My opinion is so much more valuable that I am going to violate the law; I am going to break the law so I can sit on this opinion, so the country can have my forced opinion on it.

I know there are Christian leaders, some are ready to capitulate, but there are some that won't. But we are now to the point, STEVE KING and I and some others, addressed back when the hate crime bill was being discussed, that we are going to lead to the point where you ultimately persecute, eventually prosecute people because of their beliefs about sexuality. People then were wrong because they couldn't see the future, but this is where we have come.

Now, if you hold the same beliefs that David Axelrod says the President didn't, but he said it in order to get elected, that a marriage is a man and a woman, you hold that belief that most Americans have held and still hold, that the Founders all held regardless of their sexuality, they believed a family, marriage at least, was a man and a woman, that that was foundational.

So I am not sure what is going to happen in this country. I don't have that kind of crystal ball. But I know if we have two or three Justices who are clearly disqualified, who have clearly indicated—not only raised questions as to whether they could be reasonably questioned as to their impartiality, they made clear they are very, very partial. I don't know what happens, but it isn't going to be good at all.

Justice Sotomayor has made statements that indicate she has an opinion before this case was decided. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope scholars will look carefully at this and they will understand, if Supreme Court Justices violate the law in order to change the law dramatically, as they want to do, is that a valid law? I don't believe it is. If they break the law in order to make the law, it is a void law. They need to recuse themselves and let an impartial group on the Court make the decision. It should be left to the States anyway.

It is probably sufficient grounds for impeachment for a Supreme Court Justice to violate the law so that they can force their will upon the American people to push through their legislative agenda even though they are not legislators. Probably impeachment would be in order. If they break the law in order to change dramatically the law, they shouldn't be on the Supreme Court.

It is my hope and prayer they will do the legal thing, recuse themselves before the Court makes its final decision with regard to marriage. If they don't, they will go down in legitimate American history books as being exceedingly destructive, and history will note that they violated the law in order to change the law so that it would be the way they wanted, not with a constitutional amendment, not through a legislative process, not by a constitutional convention that article V provides for. They just had the feeling that they wanted to tinker with over 200 years of law and foundational societal structure and force America to abide by their legislative agenda. Again, I just can't get over that.

If they don't disqualify themselves, they will violate the law to try to change the law with the agenda they have made clear that they have. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope Americans will join me in not only hoping, but praying that their hearts will be touched, that they will decide not to act illegally, that they will be moved toward acting lawfully, disqualify themselves, and let us get a proper opinion from the Supreme Court.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. JOLLY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 19, 2015, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1863. A letter from the Secretary, Office of the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Proceedings before the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Rules Relating to Suspension or Disbarment from Appearance and Practice (RIN: 3038-AE21) received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1864. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0106; FV15-925-2 FR] received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1865. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing ten officers on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1866. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Bruce E. Grooms, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1867. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Removal of Obsolete Provisions received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1868. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1869. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1870. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1871. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1872. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Designation of National Security Positions in the Competitive Service, and Related Matters (RIN: 3206-AM73) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2390. A bill to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–168, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1646. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how small and medium sized unmanned aerial systems could be used in an attack, how to prevent or mitigate the effects of such an attack, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 114–169 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALVERT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2822. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1646 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2390 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2818. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 2819. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to make certain provisions relating to health insurance inapplicable in a State that does not have an exchange established by the State under section 1311 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2820. A bill to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform partnership audit rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 2823. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ensure that juveniles adjudicated in Federal delinquency proceedings are not subject to solitary confinement while committed to juvenile facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2824. A bill to provide whistleblower protections to certain workers in the offshore oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 2825. A bill to eliminate the offsetting accounts that are currently available for use by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BERA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2826. A bill to establish the Commission on Government Transformation to make recommendations to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, of Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2827. A bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2828. A bill to amend titles 28 and 10, United States Code, to allow for certiorari review of certain cases denied relief or review by the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2829. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, House Administration, Rules, Appropriations, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2830. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2831. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions classified to chapters 44, 45, 46, and 47 of title 50, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2832. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 52, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 2833. A bill to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2834. A bill to enact certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, ''Environment''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 2835. A bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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 Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 2836. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand the number of employers required to provide a reasonable time and place for employees to express milk at the workplace; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2837. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Pierre L'Enfant from the District of Columbia and to provide for the permanent display of the statue in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 2838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2839. A bill to reform and modernize domestic refugee resettlement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2840. A bill to prohibit any appropriation of funds for the Science and Technology account of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that eligible product developers have competitive access to approved drugs and licensed biological products, so as to enable eligible product developers to develop and test new products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify individual income tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. KILDEE):

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution supporting National Men's Health Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 326. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to reduce the influence of money in politics; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H. Res. 327. A resolution recognizing the three-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which permits young people who were brought to the United States by their parents as children to remain temporarily in the United States and make meaningful contributions to our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 328. A resolution commemorating the inaugural ''International Yoga Day'' on June 21; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 329. A resolution encouraging the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H. Res. 330. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Members of Congress should support and promote the respectful and dignified disposal of worn and tattered American flags; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H. Res. 331. A resolution expressing support for States to adopt ''Racheal's Law''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Res. 332. A resolution recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

57. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4, urging Congress to enact legislation allowing individual states to establish daylight saving time as the standard time in their respective states throughout the calendar year; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

58. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 4, urging Congress to pass legislation that would better align 42 C.F.R. part 2 with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

59. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Resolution 15-003, supporting pregnancy resource centers in their unique contributions to the individual lives of women and men and of babies--both born and unborn; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

60. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 1422, urging the Congress and the President to pass and enact new economic sanctions against Iran should that nation be found to be in violation of the Joint Plan of Action or fail to reach an acceptable agreement by the dates set forth in the November 2014 extension of the Joint Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

61. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, Urging Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 19, urging the Secretary of Energy and Congress to support siting of United States Department of Energy's Frontier Observatory for Research in Geothermal Energy at the Newberry Geothermal Project; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

63. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 15-019, declaring March 23, 2015, to be ''Colorado Aerospace Day''; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

64. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 11, urging the Congress to support the mission of the Veterans Health Administration Office of Rural Health and efforts to improve access to health care for veterans in rural areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

65. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 9, urging the Congress to recognize the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure for United States veterans who served in the waters defined by the combat zone in Vietnam, and in the airspace over the combat zone; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

66. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 141, urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to designate Grambling State University as a United States Department of Agriculture 1890 land-grant institution; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and the Workforce.

67. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 109, commending the United States Congress on the passage of bipartisan legislation to permanently set the payment amounts that Medicare pays for physician services, known as the doc fix; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2819.

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.''

This bill also makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 2821.

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, 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. CALVERT:

H.R. 2822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United

States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .'' In addition, clause I of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power. . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 2823.

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. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4—To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2826.

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. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 2827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 2829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions classified to chapters 44, 45, 46, and 47 of title 50, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 52, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1 and 18, and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation, which maintains the United States Code by codifying Federal statutes, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation enacts certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, ''Environment.'' Codifying Federal statutes is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the legislative branch of the United States.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2839.

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. SALMON:

H.R. 2840.

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. STIVERS:

H.R. 2841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TROTT, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. REED, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 154: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 167: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 282: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 288: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 292: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 320: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 347: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 358: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 465: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 540: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 556: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. HILL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 578: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 600: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 610: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 649: Ms. SLAUGHTER
H.R. 699: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 700: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 721: Mr. TONKO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 727: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 771: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 775: Mr. WELCH and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 836: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 855: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 865: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 868: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 887: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 911: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 913: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1019: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1151: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1197: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1202: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1220: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BERA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. Graham, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. Watson Coleman, and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1233: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 1270: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1282: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1300: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1309: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1312: Mr. KIND and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1321: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1360: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1378: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1388: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1414: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1427: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1434: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 1460: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1475: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1516: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1559: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1581: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. WALZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1595: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 1598: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1610: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1613: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1644: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 1678: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1683: Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FARR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1684: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1686: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1688: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1718: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1739: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1748: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1779: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1784: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1786: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 1804: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1853: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1877: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1893: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 1919: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2016: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2046: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2050: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2059: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2063: Ms. LEE and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2072: Mr. POCAN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2125: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2147: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2217: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2244: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2247: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2259: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2295: Mr. PERRY and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 2296: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2302: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2341: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2360: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2379: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2400: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 2404: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2410: Mr. CLAY and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2417: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2429: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2461: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2466: Mr. YOHO and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2510: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 2520: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2524: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2555: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2571: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2576: Mr. SCHRADER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2620: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2643: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2647: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2680: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2691: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2710: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2716: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2721: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2734: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2737: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2738: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2740: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2745: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 2748: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2750: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2761: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2770: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2788: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2805: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2817: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LONG.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Con. Res. 56: Ms. ESTY, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H. Res. 54: Mr. HANNA.
H. Res. 112: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 117: Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 130: Mr. TROTT.
H. Res. 214: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 230: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HILL, and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 259: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H. Res. 282: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 286: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Res. 294: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 318: Mr. LANCE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. JOYCE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

14. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Oakland County Board of Commissioners, Michigan, relative to miscellaneous resolution No. 15110, urging the Michigan Legislature to adopt legislation creating a sales and use tax exemption for the purchase of tested and approved firearms safety and storage devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015 No. 98

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are perfect in wisdom and goodness. Thank You for the great and mysterious opportunities of our lives. Empower our Senators to seize these opportunities, thereby, fulfilling Your purposes for their lives in this generation. May Your Spirit guide them in their thoughts, words, and deeds, providing them with the wisdom they need to navigate through life's turbulent seas. Keep their thoughts pure, their words truthful, and their actions trustworthy, giving them consciences void of offense toward You or humanity. Lord, inspire them to be mindful of their eternal destiny and their accountability to You. Use them today as instruments for Your glory.

And, Lord, comfort the families and loved ones of the victims of the Charleston, SC, church shooting.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I don't know another way to describe what I heard this morning in my morning briefing and then the news accounts of this sickening revelation of what took place in South Carolina last night.

Think about this. The sanctity of a house of worship was violated as a gunman opened fire in the historically Black Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, SC.

We know now at least nine people are dead, and others, of course, are hurt. I don't know how to describe it. This individual was like a wolf in sheep's clothing. He sat among the congregation for a substantial amount of time before he pulled out a weapon and started firing at people. The thought of people who were in a house of worship being gunned down as they gathered to pray is heart-wrenching, devastating, and is the ultimate act of cowardice and hatred.

As our good Chaplain said, our hearts go out to the families and friends of the people who were gunned down in that church. It is hard to even comprehend anything so awful. So, on behalf of the Senate family, we send our support and our sympathy.

We hope Charleston law enforcement are able to capture this murderer, and the perpetrator be swiftly apprehended and brought to justice.

Mr. President, I had some remarks I was going to give, but they could be deemed partisan in nature and I can give them some other time. I don't feel it would be appropriate for me now to talk about these things that are definitely inappropriate today with this pall hanging over our country.

Based upon that, I would ask that the Presiding Officer announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the time equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, typically I would come to the floor and talk about the business at hand before the Senate, but I think that in light of the horrific news we all woke up to this morning, I wish to touch briefly on the tragic events that unfolded overnight in Charleston, SC.

Although we don't know all the facts, by all appearances, the gunman targeted worshippers while they were in church in a way that certainly shocks all of our conscience and sensibilities. I think it is the sort of act that we all find hard to understand, and it is truly unspeakable.

Law enforcement is doing what it does best, which is conducting its investigation, including looking for the suspect.

I think it is appropriate that we all offer our thoughts and perhaps say a private prayer for all of those who were affected by this senseless and horrific tragedy.

Obviously, the Senate has some important business to do, and I will come back later and talk more specifically

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

about the Defense authorization bill and the next business we have in line, which is to make sure that our troops get paid and that we provide them the resources they so justly deserve and are entitled to.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before beginning my remarks, I want to express my profound sorrow, sympathy, and condolences to the people of South Carolina and the people of Charleston for the tragedy that occurred last night. To my colleagues, Senators SCOTT and GRAHAM, and to all the people of South Carolina, these things are very hard to understand, very hard to fathom, and I think I speak for all of our colleagues when I say our hearts go out to the people of South Carolina this morning concerning this unspeakable tragedy.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion this week, and there will be, I am sure, over the next few days, about Pope Francis's comments in his encyclical issued this morning on the issue of climate change and on the issue of the preservation of the environment. Some of the reaction has been that the Pope should stay away from science and stick to morality and theology. I am here this morning to say I believe that is exactly what he is doing. He is sticking to morality and theology, and that is why he has made the statement that he has.

I have always viewed this issue in fundamentally an ethical and moral context. There has been a lot of talk, discussion, and debate in committees and on this floor about the science, which I think is irrefutable—the science of climate change, the science of the increasing load of CO_2 in the atmosphere, the most we have ever had in some 3 million years, and the impact it will have. I have talked about the practical impact it will have on the lobster population in Maine and on the shellfish, on our forests, on moose in New Hampshire, on water-edged cities and communities all over this country. All of those practical and scientific things we have talked about at great length on this floor. The only thing I would say is that I am convinced the science is irrefutable that, A, something is happening; B, it is detrimental to the future of the world; and, C, we—people—are largely responsible for it.

Fundamentally, this is a moral and ethical issue. It has always occurred to me in two moral and ethical contexts. One is that I don't understand what right several generations of people on this Earth have to use up a finite resource that was created over millions of years. It took 3 or 4 million years to create the oil and gas that is underneath our Earth. How do we have the right to use it all up in 200 or 300 years? That assumes we are the only people who will ever occupy this planet. Indeed, I don't believe that is the case. Obviously, it is not the case. There are generations that will come after us—6, 7, 8, 10 generations of people who will come after us. Why do we have the right to use resources that the Earth created for all of time?

One of the fundamental premises of the Old Testament is, of course, the Ten Commandments. One of the basic Ten Commandments is ''Thou shalt not steal.'' I believe we are stealing resources from future generations by simply using them up in our lifetimes. That is moral and ethical issue No. 1.

The second ethical issue is the fundamental ethical and moral principle of stewardship. The first line of the Bible says: ''In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.'' God created—God created—the heaven and the Earth. We have a responsibility to steward, to take care of the creation that God gave us.

There are some very interesting Biblical references early in the Bible, in Leviticus, the third Book of the Bible, about this concept of stewardship. One is in Leviticus 25. The Lord said to Moses: ''The land must never be sold on a permanent basis, for the land belongs to me.'' This is God speaking: The land belongs to me. ''You are only foreigners and tenant farmers working for me.''

That is the concept of a long-term stewardship—that we don't own the land. Yes, we have deeds and we think we own it, and we can pass it on to our children, but we don't own the planet, and we have a responsibility to pass that resource on to our children in good shape and not destroy it.

Another interesting provision in Leviticus—and I hope it is OK to make notations in the Lord's Book because that is what I did. In Leviticus 25, Moses is told a very interesting thing about how to take care of the land. God talked about a Sabbath for the land, just as He talked about a Sabbath for people—a day of rest. ''For six years you may plant your fields and prune your vineyards and harvest your crops, but during the seventh year the land must have a Sabbath year of complete rest.''

Very interesting—the land must have a Sabbath. It is the Lord's Sabbath. Do not plant your fields or prune your vineyards during that year.

And then later on in Verse 32, God tells Moses what will happen if you don't observe that rule. In other words, if you just keep planting and abusing the land, He said—this is again quoting God here in Leviticus 25: ''Your land will become desolate.'' There is an interesting observation. God said:

> Your land will become desolate, and your cities will lie in ruins. Then at last the land will enjoy its neglected Sabbath years as it lies desolate while you are in exile in the land of your enemies. Then the land will finally rest and enjoy the Sabbaths it missed.

The concept is we have an obligation to the land, to the Earth that has been given to us.

Then, we skip all the way from the beginning of the Old Testament to the end of the New Testament to the Book of Revelations, and there is a kind of admonition, I think, for all of us in terms of our stewardship of the Earth.

In Revelations 11:18, the Chapter says: ''But your wrath came, and the time for the dead to be judged, and for rewarding your servants . . . and for destroying the destroyers of the earth.''

That is something we ought to take very seriously; that the time will come for the destroying of the destroyers of the Earth. This is all about morality, theology, and ethics. This is about simply taking care of the asset the Good Lord gave us—whatever Name you give to the Good Lord. It is the Earth we have been given. It is the only Earth we have. It is the only home we have, and we simply can't destroy it. Yet in Genesis it says man is given dominion over the waters, the Earth, and the animals. But that doesn't mean we are entitled to destroy it. It means we have to steward it, we have to conserve it. That is really what this discussion is all about. This is about ethics. This is about morality. It is about theology, as I have demonstrated.

Now, I want to go from the Good Book to another way to state this. In Maine we have what is called the Maine rototiller rule. It is all you need to know about environmental stewardship: If you borrow your neighbor's rototiller to clean up your garden in the spring, the principle is you always return it in as good shape as you got it, with a full tank of gas. That is environmental stewardship. We don't own this planet. We have it on loan. Therefore, we have a responsibility to pass it on to our children and grandchildren and countless generations ahead of us in as good of shape as we got it and maybe with a full tank of gas. And that means we just can't willy-nilly act like there are no consequences for our actions, that we can befoul the air and the land and the water for our convenience, for our aggrandizement, for our material comfort. We have to think about other people. That is of course the fundamental principle of every religion in the world: ''Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.'' I would submit that ''others'' includes not only those of us here or those of us in America or those of us around the world but those of us who haven't been born yet.

We have an obligation to ''do unto others as we would have them do unto us.''

So I welcome the Pope's words this week as a valuable voice in an important discussion. I realize we will have differences about how to solve this problem. We will have differences about the exact dimensions of it. We will have differences about what the resolution should be and the technology we should use and how we should get there and transitions and all those kinds of things. That is perfectly legitimate. But, fundamentally, we have to think of this as a moral and ethical issue—as a moral and ethical issue—the obligations we owe to other people in this country, to other people in the world who have no voice in the use of the resources that are being taken away from them, and particularly to the people whom we don't yet know who are going to follow us on this wonderful home we have been given to steward, to preserve, to use but to pass on in as good or better shape than we found it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish to begin by extending my deepest condolences and prayers to the families and loved ones of those lost in the heinous church shooting in Charleston, SC. Our hearts break for the people of Charleston and especially for the congregation of this house of God—a place of refuge, a place of peace, a place of love. The perpetrator of this hate crime must be found and swiftly brought to justice.

Tragedies like this remind us that we are all interconnected, in our hometowns, in our country, across the planet. Whether it is our common home of worship or the common home of our planet, we are called every day to care for one another, especially those who are most in need.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today, Pope Francis released a historic encyclical—a message to the world to preserve the planet from climate change and environmental degradation. In giving us his message to protect what he calls ''our common home,'' Pope Francis has also given us a common goal—we must act now to stop climate change.

Pope Francis's encyclical calls all people of conscience to examine our own lives, our relationships to people and the planet, and our duty to take action. The Pope's message is clear: Mankind created the problem of climate change and now mankind must solve it.

Pope Francis delivered this message to the world, but the world needs America to lead.

As the wealthiest Nation in the world and one of its largest pollution emitters, it is our economic and moral responsibility to act now. There is time to avoid the worst effects of climate change, but we must act now.

Global temperatures are warming, glaciers are melting, sea levels are rising, extreme downpours and weather events are increasing, the ocean is becoming more acidic. Last year was the warmest year ever recorded, and it is the poorest and the most vulnerable in developing nations who have suffered the most from the developed world's pollution. By reducing U.S. carbon pollution, the United States can be a leader, not a laggard, in answering Pope Francis's call.

Climate change deniers may be the doubting Thomases of the 21st century, but there is no doubting the science anymore when national academies of sciences across the globe, including the Vatican's, all agree that burning fossil fuels is changing the Earth's climate.

So to all of the critics of Pope Francis's message, let's stop denying the science and let's start deploying the solutions. Let's deploy more wind and solar energy and renew tax breaks for these projects. Let's make our cars and trucks even more fuel efficient. Let's fully implement and defend President Obama's Clean Power Plan that will reduce carbon pollution from America's powerplants.

The United States can be the leader in the clean energy revolution to reduce the pollution imperiling this planet, and then we can partner with other nations to share this technology and protect the most vulnerable. The United States has the technological imperative to lead on clean energy. We have the economic imperative to engage in massive job creation that will make it possible to save all of creation. We have the moral responsibility to protect our planet for future generations.

The Pope has given us the guidance—the moral guidance—in his encyclical, and we know, ultimately, science and technology will be the answer to our prayers. But the leadership must begin here. This cannot happen without leadership from the U.S. Senate, from the United States of America. If we want to see more solar and wind deployed in our country, then we must put the tax credits on the books that incentivize the private sector and individuals across the country to deploy it.

Last year, there were 5,000 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is twice as much as has been deployed in the whole history of the United States up until 5 years ago. This year, there is going to be 7,500 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is triple the whole history of the United States up until 5 years ago. Next year, there is going to be 10,000 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is four times as much as had ever been deployed in the whole history of our country cumulatively. So this is a revolution that is absolutely helping to transform the way in which we generate electricity in the United States.

The same thing is true for wind. Wind is expanding at the same exact pace, in terms of generating sources of electricity from a place that has always been there, using God's energy in order to provide electricity for American homes and businesses.

What is happening in both areas? Well, the Republican Senate has allowed the wind tax breaks to already expire. Already they have expired. The solar tax breaks expire at the end of next year. We have no agreement, no signal that this Senate is sending to the investors and solar consumers across the country that solar will be given any incentives past the end of next year.

Similarly, we have seen a dramatic increase in the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive. In fact, much of the problem we have in finding a source of revenues for a robust transportation bill comes from the fact that people are now consuming less gasoline in their much more fuel-efficient cars since President Obama took the authority—by the way, which this Senate gave to him in 2007—to dramatically increase the fuel economy standards for those vehicles. We have to go all the way up to the 54.5 miles per gallon which the President has proposed. That will dramatically reduce greenhouse gases.

And we must ensure that the President's clean power rules, which he is going to promulgate within the next month, stay on the books. There are already those in the Senate who are saying they are going to try to vitiate, to overturn, to make impossible the implementation of those powerplant rules which will keep the greenhouse gases coming out of coal-burning plants—especially across our country—to a minimum, to reduce by 30 percent the amount of greenhouse gases, carbon, that comes out of powerplants generating electricity in our country by the year 2030. We can do this. We are a technological power. The Pope, the world, they look to us.

They say to us: President Kennedy challenged the Nation to put a man on the Moon in 8 years in order to say to the Soviet Union that we would not allow them to dominate outer space, and in 8 years our country invented new metals, invented new propulsion systems, returned that crew from the Moon safely. And we, with our American flag, said we are going to use outer space for peaceful purposes. Well, the flag that flew on the Moon is now in the Capitol. That is the return on investment in science and technology in the United States to help the rest of the world ensure that outer space would be used for peaceful purposes.

The rest of the world expects us to be able to invent new technologies, new batteries, solar, wind, geothermal, energy efficiency, vehicles, metals that

will dramatically reduce the amount of pollution we are sending up into the world but simultaneously spread these technologies across the planet.

In the 1990s, we invented new digital technologies. It was first just a very plain phone, but no one had one in their pocket until 1995 and 1996 because the phone was the size of a brick and it cost 50 cents a minute. No one had one. It was too expensive. But then this Congress moved over 200 megahertz of spectrum. It incentivized the private sector to begin to move. Within 3 years, everyone had one of these phones in their pocket. Within another 8 years, it moved to a smartphone because we had begun the revolution. Where was the smartphone invented? Right here in the United States.

Let's take Africa, for example. Twenty years ago did anyone believe that 700 million people in Africa would have a wireless device in their pocket? No. Why do they? Because the United States invented—the United States put the policies on the books that generated this revolution. They skipped telephone poles. They went right to wireless, right to cell phone towers. We did that. We gave the leadership.

That is leading to a lot of economic development in Africa and in continents around this world. We have to do the same thing in energy technology. They can envision a day where they bypass having to put wires down the street for electricity as well and solar panels could be on their roofs, providing electricity to power their cell phones, their refrigerators, their stoves, their air-conditioning.

We can do this. We have the capacity to do it, but we have to set our mind to doing it because there is an economic incentive for us. Oh, yes, there is a national security incentive for us. Oh, yes, we can tell the Middle East we don't need their oil anymore than we need their sand. We are going to provide our own power, and we are going to give other countries in the world the capacity to produce their own power. But we can do it as well because it is a moral imperative, because God's Earth, his creation is, in fact, now in jeopardy.

We have to be the leaders. We have to answer this moral cause. We cannot say we can't do it. We can't say we can't invent our way out of this potential catastrophe for the entire planet. The Pope is calling upon us to be the world's leader, morally and economically. We can do it.

Today is an important day, I think a watershed moment. I am a Catholic. The Pope is a Jesuit who is trained as a chemist. For those who say the Pope has no business talking about climate, he is a chemist. There are many people who say: Well, I don't have a view on climate because I am not a scientist.

The Pope is a scientist. He has looked at the evidence. He has asked the Vatican academy of arts and sciences to study this issue. They have come back with their conclusions. Man is creating the problem and mankind now must solve the problem, but it is those who have created the pollution that the greatest responsibility falls.

You cannot preach temperance from a barstool. You cannot tell people to reduce what they are doing—smoking or drinking or engaging in dangerous activities—if you, too, are engaging in them. The leadership must come from this Chamber. The leadership must come from the United States of America. Pope Francis's message must resonate throughout this Chamber in the months and years ahead. If we do it, we will have been doing—as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address—truly God's work here on Earth.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I hope we are in the final hours of a 2½-week consideration of the Defense authorization bill. Not all amendments were debated and not as many were reported yet. We still have hopes that there could be a managers' package, which is composed of agreed-upon amendments by both sides, equally divided by both sides of the aisle, both Republican and Democratic. There are some important amendments, so I hope we are able to get approval of at least some of them prior to the votes that I believe will be scheduled for this afternoon in order to conclude debate and consideration of the Defense authorization act.

As we enter the final throes—and there are Members on the other side of the aisle and maybe even on this side of the aisle who are deeply concerned about the OCO funding for this authorization—I repeat again to my colleagues, I don't like the use of OCO. I would like to follow the advice of every one of our military leaders who say that continued sequestration puts the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military in greater danger. I am not sure we have a greater obligation than to do everything possible to prevent the lives of our men and women serving in uniform from being put in greater danger. To get hung up on the method of funding, which many will use as a rationale for opposing this bill, seems to me an upside down set of priorities—badly upside down.

If we don't fund, if we don't authorize, if we don't make possible for us to equip and train and retain the finest military force in the world, why is it a higher priority to object to the method of funding? As I said, in a perfect world, I would argue vigorously—and have continued to—about the harmful effects of sequestration.

I am not talking about a political opinion. I am talking about the view of the uniformed leaders of our Nation who have the respect and admiration of all of us. They are telling us that if we continue sequestration, which would be the effect of not including the additional funding of the overseas contingency operations, then obviously in this world that becomes more and more dangerous as we speak—and I continue to quote probably the most respected man in America, in many respects, Henry Kissinger, who testified before our committee that he has never seen more crises around the world since World War II, as is the case today.

I would entreat my colleagues who may be contemplating voting against this legislation on the grounds that the funding is a disqualifying factor—it is a troubling factor and it is troubling to me—but shouldn't we care more about the men and women who are serving in the military than the problem you might have with a certain process that was followed in order to get there? I would think not.

If you look at the world in 2011, when the unthinkable happened; that is, that sequestration automatically kicked in because both sides were unable to agree on a process that would reduce the deficit and put us on a path to a balanced budget. Everyone said sequestration will not happen because they will come to an agreement. Obviously, sequestration did happen. But if you look at the world in the year of 2011, when sequestration kicked in, and the world today, I think—I think—there is a compelling argument that national security and national defense is far more important than it was then. Because of a series of events that began in 2011—including an incredibly misguided decision by the President of the United States to withdraw all forces from Iraq, which then, inevitably, as some of us predicted, led to the situation as it exists today—the world is now and the Middle East is now literally on fire.

What are the results of the misguided policies and the commitment on the

part of the President to get us out of wars? The President ignored one reality; that is, that we may get Americans out of wars, but that doesn't mean the wars are over. What we have seen is the spread of ISIS. We have seen Iran on the move in nations throughout the region, including the latest information we have that Iran is supplying weapons to the Taliban in Afghanistan, not to mention Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon, where they are basically in control. Our Sunni Arab—Middle Eastern Arab nations are now going their own way because they have no confidence in the United States.

What has been the result? All you have to do is pick up this morning's copy of the Washington Post. ''Refugee crisis hits tipping point. U.N. ranks 2014 as worst year on record, cites dire need for aid.''

London—The number of people uprooted from their homes by war and persecution in 2014 was larger than in any year since detailed record-keeping began, according to a comprehensive report released early Thursday by the U.N. refugee agency that will add to the evidence of a global exodus unlike any in modern times.

Just a year after the number of refugees, asylum-seekers and people forced to flee within their own countries surpassed 50 million for the first time since World War II, it surged to nearly 60 million in 2014—''a nation of the displaced'' that is roughly equal to the population of the United Kingdom.

The rapidly escalating figures reflect a world of renewed conflict, with wars in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Europe driving families and individuals from their homes in desperate flights for safety. But the systems for managing those flows are breaking down, with countries and aid agencies unable to handle the strain as an average of nearly 45,000 people a day join the ranks of the displaced.

I urge my colleagues to understand two things: One, a lot of these things didn't have to happen. The absence of American leadership and involvement is largely responsible for a great deal of this. Second of all, it is of vital importance, in my view, given the situation throughout the world, that we pass the Defense authorization bill, reconcile our differences with the legislation with the House and the administration, and take into account that this is probably the greatest piece of reform legislation in recent history, perhaps in the last 30 years, since the then-well-known Goldwater-Nichols Act was passed.

In Reuters today, it says: ''World's displaced hits record high of 60 million, half of them children.''

Of the 60 million people who are displaced, half of them are children. They are the ones who always suffer the most.

The article says:

. . . at the end of last year, the highest ever recorded number, the U.N. refugee agency said on Thursday.

More than half the displaced from crises including Syria, Afghanistan and Somalia were children, UNHCR said in its Annual Global Trends Report.

In 2014, an average of 42,500 people became refugees, asylum seekers, or internally displaced every day, representing a four-fold increase in just four years.

In 4 years, there was a fourfold increase in the number of refugees. Again, that is not an accident.

''We are witnessing a paradigm change, an unchecked slide into an era in which the scale of global forced displacement as well as the response required is now clearly dwarfing anything seen before,'' said U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees Antonio Guterres in a statement.

UNHCR said Syria, where conflict has raged since 2011, was the world's biggest source of internally displaced people and refugees.

There were 7.6 million displaced people in Syria by the end of last year and almost 4 million Syrian refugees, mainly living in the neighboring countries of Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey.

For the information of my colleagues, there are now more Syrian children in school in Lebanon than there are Lebanese children in school in Lebanon.

UNHCR said there were 38.2 million displaced by conflict within national borders, almost five million more than a year before, with wars in Ukraine, South Sudan, Nigeria, Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo swelling the figures.

It also noted that more than 1.6 million people sought political asylum in a foreign country last year, a jump of more than 50 percent compared to the previous year—largely due to the 270,000 Ukrainians who submitted asylum claims in Russia.

While many conflicts have erupted or reignited in the past five years, few have been conclusively resolved. Just 126,800 refugees were able to return home in 2014, the lowest number in 31 years, UNHCR said.

I say to my colleagues, I have been to refugee camps, and I have seen the suffering and pain and the hopelessness there. I was taken around by a teacher at a refugee camp where there were about 175,000 people, as I recall, in Jordan, and there were a large number of children around in this camp.

The teacher said to me: Senator MCCAIN, do you see all of these children here?

I said: Yes, I do.

She said: They believe you Americans have abandoned them, and when they grow up, they are going to take revenge on you.

My friends, we are sowing the wind, and we will reap the whirlwind. It is time that the United States assumed again a leadership role in the world.

Now many of the critics who call me ''Defense Hawk'' MCCAIN—I am not sure why the opponents are not called ''Defense Doves,'' fill in the blank—seem to believe I am advocating that a large number of American troops be dispatched to the region. I am not, but I am saying we should listen to the successful military leaders who succeeded in the surge in Iraq and to a large degree succeeded in Afghanistan. I am speaking of General Petraeus, General Keane, and Admiral McRaven. There are a number of people, both military and civilian, we should listen to. Ryan Crocker, to me, is the most respected member of the diplomatic corps I have ever seen. Those people ought to be brought together and asked for their views to see if we can develop a strategy—a strategy, by the way, which the President of the United States just a few days ago stated is nonexistent. They should be called, and we need to develop a strategy. There is no strategy. If we had a strategy—and these numbers of a record high of the world's displaced of 60 million people, half of them children—perhaps we could turn this situation around.

No one believes we are winning in the struggle against ISIS. We are at the negotiating table in various luxuriant hotels and resorts in Europe, negotiating with the Iranians over a nuclear deal while they are moving and controlling four nations, and the latest, of course, is that they are supplying weapons to the Taliban.

We need to have a strategy that is inclusive, and we need to draw on the experience and knowledge from some of the most respected men we have in this country with a military, political, diplomatic, and economic background and come up with a strategy.

I will tell my colleagues there is no good answer. There is the least of bad options. But we have to exercise an option rather than run in place for the next year and a half until we have a new President of the United States.

This legislation is not going to solve those problems. This legislation has certain policy implications. This legislation does not achieve the goals I was just speaking about. But this legislation does do the things we need to do—we, as the people's elected representatives whose first obligation is the defense of this Nation. This legislation addresses many issues that will make our defense establishment more responsive, more responsible, more efficient, and most of all will provide the equipment and the capabilities for the men and women who are serving in the military, many of them still in harm's way, so that they can defend this Nation. Anybody who believes ISIS would be content to remain in the Middle East and not export that terror to the United States of America has not listened to the Director of the CIA, the head of the FBI, and every other military expert. ISIS is bent on harming America.

When Mr. Baghdadi left Camp Bucca, where he spent 4 years—Mr. Baghdadi, obviously, as we know, is the leader of ISIS. He spent 4 years at Camp Bucca in Iraq. When he left, he said: I will see you in New York. Mr. Baghdadi wasn't kidding. ISIS is bent on attacking us. Can they destroy us? No. But the ability of ISIS to be able to launch some attacks on the United States of America grows every time there are thousands of young men and some young women who go to Syria and Iraq and are radicalized even more and return, sooner or later, to the country from which they came.

I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle put aside the smaller

differences we have. And there are differences with my colleagues on this side of the aisle concerning, for example, the sage-grouse and a number of other provisions in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to put aside those differences—and in the view of many, there are significant differences—and vote in favor of this legislation and send a message that at least on the issue of defending the Nation, we will provide the men and women who are putting their lives on the line on our behalf the best possible capabilities we can possibly provide for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled ''Refugee crisis hits tipping point'' in the Washington Post this morning be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 2015]

REFUGEE CRISIS HITS TIPPING POINT

(By Griff Witte)

LONDON.—The number of people uprooted from their homes by war and persecution in 2014 was larger than in any year since detailed record-keeping began, according to a comprehensive report released early Thursday by the U.N. refugee agency that will add to the evidence of a global exodus unlike any in modern times.

Just a year after the number of refugees, asylum-seekers and people forced to flee within their own countries surpassed 50 million for the first time since World War II, it surged to nearly 60 million in 2014—''a nation of the displaced'' that is roughly equal to the population of the United Kingdom.

The rapidly escalating figures reflect a world of renewed conflict, with wars in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Europe driving families and individuals from their homes in desperate flights for safety. But the systems for managing those flows are breaking down, with countries and aid agencies unable to handle the strain as an average of nearly 45,000 people a day join the ranks of those either on the move or stranded far from home.

''We are witnessing a paradigm change, an unchecked slide into an era in which the scale of global forced displacement as well as the response required is now clearly dwarfing anything seen before,'' U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres said in a statement. ''It is terrifying that on the one hand there is more and more impunity for those starting conflicts, and on the other there is seeming utter inability of the international community to work together to stop wars and build and preserve peace.''

The annual report on global trends in displacement, issued by the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, or UNHCR, offers perhaps the most authoritative look at who is being uprooted by conflict, where they come from and where they go. The agency, created in 1950 to support Europeans displaced by World War II, said the figures for 2014 were higher than it has ever recorded.

The overall number, which does not include those displaced by natural disasters or economic migrants in search of a better life, had been relatively stable, at around 40 million, since the start of the 21st century.

But it abruptly shot up in 2013, and the pace accelerated last year. Although the report does not cover 2015, there is no indication that the trajectory has changed.

The four-year-old war in Syria has been the single biggest driver of the surging numbers. Last year, 1 in 5 displaced persons worldwide was Syrian. The country in 2014 became the planet's largest source of refugees, displacing Afghanistan, which had held that dubious distinction for three decades.

The impact of a Syrian population on the move has been felt across the Middle East. Neighboring Turkey now hosts more refugees than any other nation, knocking Pakistan to No. 2. Lebanon has the world's highest concentration, at nearly a quarter of those living in the tiny Mediterranean nation.

The vast majority of refugees last year were hosted by poor countries that can least afford the added strain. Nearly 9 out of 10 refugees were living in the developing world—a figure that hit a two-decade high.

Meanwhile, with nations across the developing world either at war or in crisis, some of the world's wealthiest nations have focused on how to beat back the rising tide of those seeking escape.

France and Austria have stepped up police checks at crossings with Italy, leaving migrants to camp out at train stations in Rome and Milan. Hungary on Wednesday announced plans to build a 12-foot fence along its border with Serbia. Nations across Europe have balked at proposals to more equitably share the burden of asylum-seekers while rushing to approve plans to blow up smuggler ships in the Mediterranean.

The tough response has been largely due to political pressure among populations hostile to the influx of migrants. But it prompted Pope Francis on Wednesday to suggest that those ''who close the door'' to migrants seeking protection should ask forgiveness from God.

The UNHCR and other aid groups have pleaded for more assistance to keep pace with the ever-growing numbers, but to little avail.

''There's a real risk that we're seeing the unraveling of the refugee regime that was created in the aftermath of the Second World War on the basis of cooperation and reciprocity,'' said Alexander Betts, director of the Refugee Studies Center at Oxford University.

Betts said that unlike during other conflicts, including those in Southeast Asia, the Balkans and Central America, governments are not stepping up to offer assistance commensurate with the scale of a problem that now touches virtually every corner of the globe.

''This isn't a regional problem,'' he said. ''It's a global challenge.''

The UNHCR's report identifies at least 15 wars across three continents that have either erupted or reignited in the past five years, and that together have forced millions to abandon their homes. A total of 13.9 million people were displaced in 2014 alone.

About a third of those were in sub-Saharan Africa, where wars in the Central African Republic, South Sudan, Somalia, Nigeria and Congo all flared. Somalia alone is the source of more than a million refugees, the world's third-highest total.

Europe experienced the biggest proportional increase in displaced persons last year, with a staggering 51 percent increase over 2013.

While much of that was due to Syrian refugees streaming into Turkey, it also reflected the 219,000 people who entered the continent via the perilous journey across the Mediterranean. And as Russian-backed rebels brought war back to European soil, more than 800,000 people were left internally displaced in Ukraine. About 200,000 Ukrainians applied for asylum in Russia.

Worldwide, the number of internally displaced people vastly outstripped the number of refugees. Once people fled their home countries, they had little hope of returning. Just 126,800 refugees went back to their home countries in 2014 out of a global refugee population of 14.4 million. That marked the lowest level of return since 1983.

Mr. MCCAIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would note for my colleagues the presence of General Dunford, Commandant of the Marine Corps, a great combat leader and leader of our military and considered to be the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a man we all admire a great deal.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, like many have said here today, I would like to express my deepest condolences to the victims of the shooting at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, SC, last night. This was a senseless act of violence. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims, their families, and all affected by this horrible tragedy.

I know we all hope the perpetrator is swiftly brought to justice. I pray for the safety of the entire Charleston community. This was an act of senseless violence, to be sure. But as I understand it, the perpetrator saved one woman and told her: ''I want you to tell everyone what happened here.'' That is beyond sinister. That is evil. That evil must be stopped and must be dealt with.

OBAMACARE

What I would like to talk about now is the Supreme Court's critical ruling on the most recent review of the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare. It is important to highlight many of the ways this law is negatively impacting our health care system as a whole, my constituents in Kansas, the Presiding Officer's constituents in her neighboring State of Nebraska—all over the country.

Trying to list all of the problems with this law is nearly impossible. Perhaps the best way is to review the promises of the President of the United States. The crafting of this law was supposed to follow his promise of being the most transparent administration in

history. The problem is that there has been a lack of transparency—not to mention the oversight of this law since it was originally being crafted and throughout its implementation.

Despite hearing the contrary from our docs and nurses about practices and hospitals closing and premiums and copays increasing, the administration continues to turn a blind eye. The administration continually moves the goal posts to which they measure success and have claimed victory.

In 2012, the Congressional Budget Office projected there would be 14 million people enrolled in exchange plans this year. Then late last year, the administration back-pedaled on its projections for the second year of enrollment, moving the goal posts. The most recent data out of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the infamous CMS, shows that when you look at how many individuals had effectual coverage or actually paid their first month's premium and continued to have an active policy, that number is 10 million. Madam President, that is nearly 30 percent below the 2012 enrollment projections—30 percent. That is not transparency. That is not victory.

So why is this number lower? Why aren't folks signing up? First, we had a Web site that crashed and that didn't work. Then Americans tried to shop around and view the policies available to them. But as it turns out, the law didn't lower premiums for the average family by $2,500—remember that promise—as the President promised. This didn't happen. Premiums are increasing.

The President also promised you could keep your same health care plan and your doctor. We have known for some time that is just not true. It didn't happen.

Yet just last week the President responded to questions regarding his signature law—his legacy law, if you will—at a press conference following the G–7 summit. He said: ''The thing is working.'' Now, one might add that the ''thing'' is a pretty good term for the Affordable Care Act.

The President also said: ''I mean, part of what's bizarre about this whole thing is we haven't had a lot of conversation about the horrors of ObamaCare because none of them have really come to pass.''

Really?

President Obama concluded: ''It hasn't had an adverse effect on people who already had health insurance.''

Well, I am not sure what data has been presented to the President or which American family he has been listening to, but it is certainly not the reality that I have experienced and that Kansans are experiencing. The real-life threats of this law we hear from Kansans back home have not stopped. They are increasing.

A small business owner in Cummings, KS, called my office to inform me his premium this year went up over $500 a month—more than double last year's.

Eddy, in Spring Hill, says his premium has doubled and his deductible has doubled. He is being forced to choose between running his company and buying health insurance. He says he can't do both.

Let's go back to the President's comments about this ''thing'' having no adverse effect. Just a couple of weeks ago his own administration published the proposed double-digit—double-digit—premium increases for 2016—next year. The plans on the list affect more than 6 million people across the country and are seeking an average increase of 21 percent.

The Kansas Insurance Department tells us that premiums for some individual and small group health care plans are likely to increase by as much as 38 percent.

According to the administration's list, 14 insurance plans are seeking premium increases above 10 percent for next year. That covers 100,000 Kansans. When you look at just two insurance plans, those two insurance plans have increases of 28 and 38 percent. Perhaps the President does not categorize these 100,000 Kansans as being adversely affected by this ''thing.''

Simply put, premiums will continue to spiral upward if we do not act. Facts and reality are really very stubborn things. Even ObamaCare's chief architect, Jonathan Gruber—we all remember Jonathan Gruber—was quoted last year as saying if ''you made it explicit that healthy people pay in and sick people get money, it would not have passed. Lack of transparency is a huge political advantage.'' So said Mr. Gruber.

Still quoting Mr. Gruber: ''And basically, call it the stupidity of the American voter or whatever, but basically that really was really, really critical for the thing to pass.'' That is his quote.

Those comments belittle the American people and try to rationalize why, when you have an agenda, the government should not be transparent. The President and proponents of ObamaCare all said publicly this was the first step to nationalized health insurance. That certainly has become transparent.

Now, not only are individuals adversely affected in terms of their own insurance coverage, but also due to the law's mandate on employers, many are seeing the law's negative repercussions at their jobs. The law's employer mandate hinders job creation and growth. Its new definition of full-time employment at 30 hours a week has been a real problem. According to one estimate, 2.6 million workers—2.6 million workers—could potentially have their hours and therefore their paychecks reduced as a result of this provision.

Most concerning is that this new definition of full-time employment hits low-wage earners who work in the service industries. Of the individuals at risk, about half work in retail and half in restaurants. If these folks were previously working the traditional 40 hours per week, you are not just taking 10 hours from them, but you are reducing their paycheck by 25 percent a week. That is why they work in two different jobs. That is a very noticeable adverse effect.

The concerns I have outlined today are only a few of the many reasons why we need to repeal this law, both the individual and employer mandates. We need to fix health care. Everybody knows that. But we don't need to fix ObamaCare. We need to give peace of mind to the families hurt by ObamaCare.

Now, no one is saying go back to the system we had before. We need reforms to our health care system every day. ObamaCare is costing millions of dollars. But with this law—what the President has called ''this thing''—we may have mandated greater coverage for all but not access to care and at a cost that is unaffordable. Let me repeat that. We may have mandated greater coverage for all—if that was the goal of my friends across the aisle—but not access to care and at a cost that is unaffordable. That is not a health care plan.

Perhaps some can afford the rising premiums, but can you actually go see your doctor and receive treatment or is your deductible too high? And is your doctor still available to you? Will your doctor spend at least 5 minutes with you—5 minutes with you—or more time filling out forms or electronic medical records? And are those records secure?

Any day now the Supreme Court will hand down its decision in King v. Burwell. This is the case that will determine the legality of the administration's regulation extending health insurance subsidies to people in States that use the Federal insurance exchange. And we will see—we will see—if the Court decides that the law should be implemented as written by this Congress—with all of us on this side of the aisle voting no—or implemented as interpreted by the administration.

This is similarly troubling for Kansas, where we have a federally facilitated exchange. If these tax subsidies go away, 77,000 Kansans and millions of Americans, will be affected. These individuals would be confronted with ObamaCare's true cost—true cost—and would face much higher premiums, with only the administration to blame for recklessly offering tens of billions of dollars in subsidies they had no authority to offer, if the Court rules that way.

A ruling against the administration would also free many of these Kansans from the individual mandate penalty if that coverage is too expensive for them and they, therefore, would qualify for an affordability exemption.

The employer mandate penalties would also be unenforceable. Employers can then add employees above the 50 threshold without fear of penalty and increase workers' hours to more than 30 hours per week.

If the Court invalidates the subsidies, we will be ready. We will be ready on this side of the aisle with our solutions to help mitigate the pain for those individuals harmed by the administration and provide States greater flexibility and build a bridge away from ObamaCare.

However the Court rules, I know that I and everybody on this side of the aisle will continue fighting to repeal this harmful law and replace it with true health care reforms that lower costs, lift the burden on our job creators, and restore the all-important relationship between a doctor and a patient.

The test to fix health care, not ObamaCare, is coming soon. Let's fix health care.

I yield the floor.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, on June 4, I was not present to vote on Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN's amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2016, amendment No. 1494 to H.R. 1735. I would have voted against this measure.

Madam President, as well, had I been present for the vote on amendment No. 1889, I would have voted no on this amendment. I do not support telegraphing to the enemy what interrogation techniques we will or won't use and denying future Commanders in Chief and intelligence professionals important tools for protecting the American people and the U.S. homeland.

MARITIME PARTNER CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORTS IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, in the interests of moving the defense bill forward I withdraw my amendments, Nos. 2038 and 2056.

These amendments were intended address a set of issues where I share a concern with the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee that the U.S. needs to make additional concerted effort and provide additional focus to our maritime partner capacity building efforts in the Asia-Pacific region. Indeed, the chairman included a significant provision in this bill for a South China Sea initiative which I support. My efforts were intended to compliment the work of the chairman and assure that we have a fully articulated and whole-of-government approach to this issue, with both the Department of Defense and the Department of State fully and appropriately engaged.

The chairman and I have had some positive discussions on this issue in recent days, and I have received his assurances that my concerns will be addressed as this legislation moves forward. And I also intend to make sure that other aspects of this issue are addressed in legislation that the Foreign Relations Committee will take up, and where I look to the chairman for his partnership and continued leadership on this issue.

With those assurances—and given the deep and shared commitment the chairman and I have on this issue—I do not see a need to press forward for a vote on my amendments at this time.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his consideration. I can assure him that we share a common set of concerns and common set of goals on this issue. We have discussed a pathway forward that addresses the questions raised by his proposed amendments, and I look forward to working with him going forward. And I very much look forward to continuing to work with him on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to thank colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the debate and votes we will be casting today on the National Defense Authorization Act. We have come together in a bipartisan fashion, and we have spent significant time in committee and now on the floor to deal with countless provisions. This act is nothing if not detailed with countless provisions that are critical to the defense of the Nation.

We have a long tradition of bipartisanship in this body on the NDAA. The Senate passes an NDAA in one form or another every year, and that can't be said about any other piece of legislation. I want to congratulate the new chairman, Senator MCCAIN, and the new ranking member, Senator REED, and I want to congratulate my colleagues who serve together on the committee, including our Presiding Officer, and also all of our staff, both our personal staff and committee staff—I see some committee staff here—because this is a significant amount of work.

There are many important provisions in the NDAA that affect our national security, and my Commonwealth of Virginia is deeply connected to the American military. In addition to grand items, the NDAA also examines in some excruciating detail some very, very fine points.

Just to give a few examples, the NDAA includes a provision dealing with storage facilities that are needed to help us combat rust on military vehicles, the transmission systems that are used in some army land vehicles, the reflective markings and lights that are used on military air fields, one particular military barracks that has sewage, mold, hot water, and rodent problems, and we even deal in the NDAA with some details of West Point's football program—some of the athletic programs at West Point.

But after all this minute analysis and debate and discussion over the past weeks, both in committee and on the floor, I do notice something a little bit strange. While Congress is very willing to debate and vote on all things great and small concerning our military, there is one thing we don't want to debate or vote on—whether the United States should be at war, whether we should be at war with ISIL. We will vote on shipbuilding, we will vote on military pensions, we will vote on vehicle rust, and we will vote on barracks mold. But we don't want to vote on whether the Nation should be at war.

I proposed an amendment to the NDAA with Senator FLAKE and Senator MANCHIN expressing the sense of the Senate that we should have an authorization debate about whether we should be at war with ISIL, and the amendment that I proposed was ruled nongermane—so barracks mold, yes; vehicle rust, yes; the athletic programs at West Point, yes; whether we should be at war, nongermane to the Defense authorization act.

Interestingly, we even took a vote on the floor of the Senate in the NDAA about whether we should arm the Kurds in a war that Congress has not authorized that we could debate and vote on; but whether we should be at war we have not debated and voted upon.

So I went back and looked at article I of the Constitution. I found that there is no requirement that Congress vote on barracks mold or rust prevention or military airfield lighting. Certainly we can and should take up those matters because each of those matters—even if they just affect one barracks or one airfield—is about the safety of our troops and military personnel. Of course we should take them up. But there is nothing in the Constitution that requires that we take them up and debate and vote on them. But we are required to debate and vote to authorize war. Article I, section 8, clearly declares that Congress shall have the power to declare war—not the President; Congress. Yet, on this item, on this large item, on this largest of items, we are unwilling to debate and vote.

The war against ISIL is now in its 11th month; more than 3,500 U.S. airstrikes, more than 3,000 U.S. forces now in Iraq. U.S. servicemembers and American hostages have lost their lives in the battle against ISIL. The cost of the war to the American taxpayer is now more than $2.5 billion—an average cost of $9 million a day. The ISIL threat is spreading, the mission expanding.

In response to ISIL advances in the Anbar Province, the administration recently announced that an additional 450 trainers would be deployed to train and support Iraqi security forces.

So my question as a strong supporter of the NDAA is a simple one: How much longer will we allow war to be waged without Congress even being willing to have a debate about the strategy and scope of the mission? How much longer will we keep asking servicemembers to risk their lives without Congress doing the basic job of authorizing this war?

U.S. airstrikes started on August 8—313 days ago. Let me put this in a historic perspective. The 1-year anniversary of this war is approaching quickly. Congressional inaction on it is already of historic proportions.

World War I: It took President Wilson 33 days to bring an authorization to Congress. Congress acted in 4 days.

World War II: It took President Roosevelt 1 day to bring a request to Congress. Congress acted on the same day.

The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution: President Johnson brought a resolution to Congress within 3 days. Congress acted 5 days thereafter.

The invasion of Kuwait in gulf war 1: It took 160 days for the President to bring an authorization to Congress, but Congress acted within 4 days in approving an authorization.

The 9/11 attacks: President Bush came the same day to Congress. It took 3 days for Congress to act.

In this war against ISIL, it took the President nearly 6 months to bring an authorization to Congress, and it is now more than 4 months since that happened—313 days—and Congress has said virtually nothing.

I appreciate that Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN have made a recent commitment to discuss an ISIL authorization in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction. I understand that. Senator FLAKE and I have introduced a bipartisan proposal to show that there is bipartisan support for this mission, and we have been pushing to have the matter heard.

Yesterday, in a debate on the House floor, the chairman of the HASC committee stated plainly that it is time that we ''ought to have a real AUMF debate.''

So I am here to support the NDAA and the good work our chair and ranking member and all the members have done. But I am here to point out that on day 313, if we are willing to deal with important, narrow, small issues, we should be finally willing to address the most important issue we have before us. I challenge my colleagues to do this and to bring the same amount of attention and bipartisanship to debating whether we should send American troops to war as we are willing to apply to barracks mold and vehicle rust.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, with the bill managers' permission, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I know the bill managers are working on a final agreement, and I would defer to them at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1974, AS MODIFIED; 2030; 1472, AS MODIFIED; 1890; 1705; 1720; 1708; 1908; 1678; 1811; 1825; 2020; 2050, AS MODIFIED; 1474; 1901; 1902; 1563; 1703; 1944, AS MODIFIED; 1747; 2006; 1931; 2011; AND 1916 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, the ranking member and I have a small package of amendments that have been cleared by both sides.

Notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII and adoption of the McCain substitute, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up and agreed to en bloc: McCain No. 1974, as modified; Murkowski No. 2030; Vitter No. 1472, as modified; Daines No. 1890; Coats No. 1705; Flake No. 1720; Gardner No. 1708; Enzi No. 1908; Paul No. 1678; Hatch No. 1811; Fischer No. 1825; King No. 2020; Menendez No. 2050, as modified; Coons No. 1474; Murphy No. 1901; Warren No. 1902; Blumenthal No. 1563; Durbin No. 1703; Tester No. 1944, as modified; Casey No. 1747; Schatz No. 2006; Leahy No. 1931; Ayotte No. 2011; and Bennet No. 1916.

These have been agreed to by both sides, and I thank all Members for the agreement of this package. I am sorry it is not larger, but it is equally divided between both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1974, as modified; 2030; 1472, as modified; 1890; 1705; 1720; 1708; 1908; 1678; 1811; 1825; 2020; 2050, as modified; 1474; 1901; 1902; 1563; 1703; 1944, as modified; 1747; 2006; 1931; 2011; and 1916) agreed to en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1974, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on the security and protection of Iranian dissidents living in Camp Liberty, Iraq)

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE SECURITY AND PROTECTION OF IRANIAN DISSIDENTS LIVING IN CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The residents of Camp Liberty, Iraq, renounced violence and unilaterally disarmed more than a decade ago.

(2) The United States recognized the residents of the former Camp Ashraf who now reside in Camp Liberty as ''protected persons'' under the Fourth Geneva Convention and committed itself to protect the residents.

(3) The deterioration in the overall security situation in Iraq has increased the vulnerability of Camp Liberty residents to attacks from proxies of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps and Sunni extremists associated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(4) The increased vulnerability underscores the need for an expedited relocation process and that these Iranian dissidents will neither be safe nor secure in Camp Liberty.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) take prompt and appropriate steps in accordance with international agreements to promote the physical security and protection of Camp Liberty residents;

(2) urge the Government of Iraq to uphold its commitments to the United States to ensure the safety and well-being of those living in Camp Liberty;

(3) urge the Government of Iraq to ensure continued and reliable access to food, clean water, medical assistance, electricity and other energy needs, and any other equipment and supplies necessary to sustain the residents during periods of attack or siege by external forces;

(4) oppose the extradition of Camp Liberty residents to Iran;

(5) implement a strategy to provide for the safe, secure, and permanent relocation of Camp Liberty residents that includes a relocation plan, including a detailed outline of the steps that would need to be taken by recipient countries, the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and Camp residents to relocate the residents to other countries;

(6) encourage continued close cooperation between the residents of Camp Liberty and the authorities in the relocation process; and

(7) assist the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in expediting the ongoing resettlement of all residents of Camp Liberty to safe locations outside Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 2030

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on the coordination of hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities on military land)

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COORDINATION OF HUNTING, FISHING, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY LAND.

It is the sense of Congress that, in situations where military lands are open to public access for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities, the Department of Defense should seek to ensure that coordination with State fish and wildlife managers, tribes, and local governments occurs sufficiently in advance of traditional hunting, fishing, and recreational use seasons to facilitate communication with hunting, fishing, and recreational user groups.

AMENDMENT NO. 1472, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To exclude AbilityOne goods from the authority to acquire goods and services manufactured in Afghanistan, central Asian states, and Djibouti)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. EXCEPTION FOR ABILITYONE GOODS FROM AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE GOODS AND SERVICES MANUFACTURED IN AFGHANISTAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.

(a) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ITEMS NOT MANUFACTURED IN AFGHANISTAN.—Section 886 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and except as provided in subsection (d),'' after ''subsection (b),''; and

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

''(d) EXCLUSION OF ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT CATALOG.—The authority under subsection (a) of this section shall not be available for the procurement of any good that is contained in the procurement catalog described in section 8503(a) of title 41 in Afghanistan if such good can be produced and delivered by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or a nonprofit agency for other severely disabled in a timely fashion to support mission requirements.''.

(b) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ITEMS NOT MANUFACTURED IN CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.—Section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2399) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''and except as provided in subsection (h),'' after ''subsection (b),''; and

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

''(h) EXCLUSION OF ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT CATALOG.—The authority under subsection (a) shall not be available for the procurement of any good that is contained in the procurement catalog described in section 8503(a) of title 41 if such good can be produced and delivered by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or a nonprofit agency for other severely disabled in a timely fashion to support mission requirements.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1890

(Purpose: To modify the immediate applicability of basic allowance for housing for married members assigned for duty within normal commuting distance)

On page 213, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(3) PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BAH FOR CERTAIN OTHER MARRIED MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amount of basic allowance for housing payable to a member of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, shall not be reduced by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) unless—

(A) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station requiring a change of residence;

(B) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing; or

AMENDMENT NO. 1705

(Purpose: To provide for military exchanges between senior officers and officials of the United States and Taiwan)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN SENIOR OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense should carry out a program of exchanges of senior military officers and senior officials between the United States and Taiwan designed to improve military to military relations between the United States and Taiwan.

(b) EXCHANGES DESCRIBED.—For the purposes of this section, an exchange is an activity, exercise, event, or observation opportunity between members of the Armed Forces and officials of the Department of Defense, on the one hand, and armed forces personnel and officials of Taiwan, on the other hand.

(c) FOCUS OF EXCHANGES.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

(1) Threat analysis.

(2) Military doctrine.

(3) Force planning.

(4) Logistical support.

(5) Intelligence collection and analysis.

(6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.

(7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(d) CIVIL-MILITARY AFFAIRS.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include activities and exercises focused on civil-military relations, including parliamentary relations.

(e) LOCATION OF EXCHANGES.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall be conducted in both the United States and Taiwan.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''senior military officer'', with respect to the Armed Forces, means a general or flag officer of the Armed Forces on active duty.

(2) The term ''senior official'', with respect to the Department of Defense, means a civilian official of the Department of Defense at the level of Assistant Secretary of Defense or above.

AMENDMENT NO. 1720

(Purpose: To authorize transportation to transfer ceremonies for the family and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who die overseas during humanitarian operations)

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. TRANSPORTATION TO TRANSFER CEREMONIES FOR FAMILY AND NEXT OF KIN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE OVERSEAS DURING HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS.

Section 481f(e)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(including during a humanitarian relief operation)'' after ''located or serving overseas''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1708

(Purpose: To require a strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. STRATEGY TO PROMOTE UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) STRATEGY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop an overall strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Such strategy shall be informed by the following:

(1) The national security strategy of the United States for 2015 set forth in the national security strategy report required under section 108(a)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 5043(a)(3)), as such strategy relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(2) The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(3) The 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(4) The strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region as contained in the report required by section 1251(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3570).

(5) The integrated, multi-year planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of United States policy in Asia submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7043(a) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76)).

(b) PRESIDENTIAL POLICY DIRECTIVE.—The President shall issue a Presidential Policy Directive to appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government that contains the strategy developed under subsection (a) and includes implementing guidance to such departments and agencies.

(c) RELATION TO AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS AND ANNUAL BUDGET.—

(1) AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS.—In identifying agency priority goals under section 1120(b) of title 31, United States Code, for each appropriate department and agency of the United States Government, the head of such department or agency, or as otherwise determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall take into consideration the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

(2) ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President shall, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, includes a separate section that clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded in the annual budget that relate to the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

(Purpose: To provide for a small business procurement ombudsman)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT OMBUDSMAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The small business offices in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments shall serve as intermediaries between small businesses and contracting officials prior to the award of contracts in cases where a small business prospective contractor notifies the small business office that it has reason to believe that the contracting process has been modified to preclude a small business from bidding on the contract or would give another contractor an unfair competitive advantage.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude a contractor from exercising the right to initiate a bid protest under a contract.

AMENDMENT NO. 1678

(Purpose: To provide for the more accurate and complete enumeration of members of the Armed Forces in any tabulation of total population by the Secretary of Commerce)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. IMPROVED ENUMERATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN ANY TABULATION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all members of the Armed Forces deployed abroad on the date of taking such tabulation are—

''(1) fully and accurately counted; and

''(2) properly attributed to the State in which their permanent duty station or homeport is located on such date.''.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the residency status of any member of the Armed Forces under any provision of law other than title 13, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 1811

(Purpose: To provide for sustainment enhancement)

On page 375, line 4, insert '', which includes a sustainment strategy,'' after ''strategy''.

On page 377, line 13, strike ''(d) In this section'' and insert the following:

''(9) A sustainment strategy which includes all aspects of the total life cycle management of the weapon system, including product support, logistics, product support engineering, supply chain integration, maintenance, acquisition logistics, and all aspects of software sustainment.

''(d) INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATE.—The Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation shall perform an evaluation of the

sustainment portion of the acquisition strategy required by subsection (c)(9) prior to the Milestone B decision.

''(e) In this section

On page 410, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 852. SUSTAINMENT ENHANCEMENT.

(a) ASSESSMENT EXPANSION OF FUNCTIONS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR LOGISTICS AND MATERIEL READINESS TO INCLUDE SUSTAINMENT FUNCTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of—

(1) assigning to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness—

(A) functions relating to the sustainment strategy required under section 2431a(c)(9) of Title 10, United States Code, as added by section 841 of this Act; and

(B) functions relating to manufacturing and industrial base policy currently being carried out within the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and

(2) redesignating such Assistant Secretary (with such functions so assigned and together with the current logistics and material readiness functions of such Assistant Secretary) as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department of Defense does not place sufficient emphasis on sustainment of a weapon system during the entire acquisition process; and

(2) the Department of Defense should address this deficiency and ensure that all aspect of weapon system sustainment are carefully considered throughout the entire Integrated Defense Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Life Cycle Management System.

AMENDMENT NO. 1825

(Purpose: To authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 8, 2015, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 2020

(Purpose: To demonstrate the effects of a method to facilitate the disposal of excess Army property and management of underutilized and unutilized property by providing an exemption from certain requirements for off-site use and off-site removal only of non-mobile properties)

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. EXEMPTION OF ARMY OFF-SITE USE AND OFF-SITE REMOVAL ONLY NON-MOBILE PROPERTIES FROM CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Excess or unutilized or underutilized non-mobile property of the Army that is situated on non-excess land shall be exempt from the requirements of title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411 et seq.) upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that—

(1) the property is not feasible to relocate;

(2) the property is located in an area to which the general public is denied access in the interest of national security; and

(3) the exemption would facilitate the efficient disposal of excess property or result in more efficient real property management.

(b) CONSULTATION.—Before making an initial determination under the authority provided under subsection (a), and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of the Army shall consult with the Executive Director of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness on types of non-mobile properties that may be feasible for relocation and suitable to assist the homeless.

(b) SUNSET.—The authority under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2017.

AMENDMENT NO. 2050, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To require a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus)

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1274. REPORT ON THE SECURITY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of ongoing military and security cooperation between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(2) A discussion of potential steps for enhancing the bilateral security relationship between the United States and Cyprus, including steps to enhance the military and security capabilities of the Republic of Cyprus.

(3) An analysis of the effect on the bilateral security relationship of the United States policy to deny applications for licenses and other approvals for the export of defense articles and defense services to the armed forces of Cyprus.

(4) An analysis of the extent to which such United States policy is consistent with overall United States security and policy objectives in the region.

(5) An assessment of the potential impact of lifting such United States policy.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1474

(Purpose: To propose an alternative to section 1204, relating to the National Guard State Partnership Program)

Strike section 1204 and insert the following:

SEC. 1204. PERMANENCE AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 897; 32 U.S.C. 107 note) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: ''to support the national interests and security cooperation goals and objectives of the United States, including applicable policy and guidelines for United States security sector assistance''.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting ''that is not'' after ''an activity that the Secretary of Defense determines is a matter''.

(c) PROCEDURES.—Such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall—

''(A) establish, maintain, and update as appropriate a list of core competencies to support each program established under subsection (a), collectively and for each State and territory, and shall submit for approval to the Secretary of Defense the list of core competencies and additional information needed to make use of such core competencies; and

''(B) designate a director for each State and territory who shall be responsible for the coordination of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.

''(2) MILITARY-TO-CIVILIAN CORE COMPETENCIES.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may conduct an activity under a program established under subsection (a) relating to military-to-civilian core competencies.''.

(d) NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.—Subsection (e) of such section (as redesignated) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(i) BOOKS OF DOD.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary of Defense shall establish on the books of the Department of Defense a National Guard State Partnership Program Fund.

''(ii) BOOKS OF TREASURY.—If not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that in the opinion of the Secretary a fund such as the Fund described in clause (i) should be established on the books of the Department of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish on the books of the Treasury on that date a Fund to be known as the National Guard State Partnership Program Fund.

''(B) CREDITS.—In administering the Fund established under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall, to the extent the Secretary determines it to be appropriate, provide for the following amounts to be credited to the Fund:

''(i) Amounts authorized and appropriated to carry out operations under this section.

''(ii) Amounts that the Secretary of Defense transfers, in such amounts as provided in appropriations Acts, to the Fund from amounts authorized and appropriated to the Department of Defense, including amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard.

''(C) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President shall include the Fund established under subparagraph (A) in the budget that the President submits to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year in which the authority under subsection (a) is in effect.''.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting ''or other government organizations'' after ''and security forces'';

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: ''and country'';

(3) in clause (v), by striking ''training'' and inserting ''activities''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).

''(vii) The list of core competencies required by subsection (c)(1) and any update to any changes to the list of core competencies required by subsection (c)(1).''.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (h) of such section (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) the congressional defense committees; and

''(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as amended) the following:

''(2) CORE COMPETENCIES.—The term 'core competencies' means military-to-military and military-to-civilian skills and capabilities of the National Guard, consistent with the roles and missions of the Armed Forces as established by the Secretary of Defense.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

''(5) TERRITORY.—The term 'territory' means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.''.

(g) PERMANENT AUTHORITY.—Such section is further amended by striking subsection (i).

AMENDMENT NO. 1901

(Purpose: To require reporting on foreign procurements)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. ANNUAL REPORT ON FOREIGN PROCUREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2338. Reporting on foreign purchases

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional defense committees a report listing specific procurements by the Department of Defense in that fiscal year of articles, materials, or supplies valued greater than $5,000,000, indexed to inflation, using the exception under section 8302(a)(2)(A) of title 41. This report may be submitted as part of the report required under section 8305 of such title.

''(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

''2338. Reporting on foreign purchases.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1902

(Purpose: To require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING BEHAVIOR AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on gaming facilities at military installations and problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) With respect to gaming facilities at military installations, disaggregated by each branch of the Armed Forces—

(A) the number, type, and location of such gaming facilities;

(B) the total amount of cash flow through such gaming facilities; and

(C) the amount of revenue generated by such gaming facilities for morale, welfare, and recreation programs of the Department of Defense.

(2) An assessment of the prevalence of and particular risks for problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces, including such recommendations for policies and programs to be carried out by the Department to address problem gambling as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) An assessment of the ability and capacity of military health care personnel to adequately diagnose and provide dedicated treatment for problem gambling, including—

(A) a comparison of treatment programs of the Department for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction with treatment programs of the Department for problem gambling; and

(B) an assessment of whether additional training for military health care personnel on providing treatment for problem gambling would be beneficial.

(4) An assessment of the financial counseling and related services that are available to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents who are impacted by problem gambling.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1563

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly submit to Congress a report on the implementation of new or updated electronic health records in certain environments)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF DATA SECURITY AND TRANSMISSION STANDARDS FOR ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the standards for security and transmission of data to be implemented by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs in deploying the new or updated, as the case may be, electronic health record system of each such Department (required to be deployed by each such Department under section 713 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note)) at military installations and in field environments.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF DATA.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include information on standards for transmission of data between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs and standards for transmission of data between each such Department and private sector entities.

AMENDMENT NO. 1703

(Purpose: To authorize the provision of post-traumatic stress disorder training to military and security forces of the Government of Ukraine)

On page 636, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(10) Training and best practices to identify and treat post-traumatic stress disorder among Ukrainian Armed Forces and National Guard personnel.

AMENDMENT NO. 1944, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To reform and improve personnel security, insider threat detection and prevention, and physical security)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL SECURITY, INSIDER THREAT DETECTION AND PREVENTION, AND PHYSICAL SECURITY.

(a) PERSONNEL SECURITY AND INSIDER THREAT PROTECTION IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) PLANS AND SCHEDULES.—Consistent with the Memorandum of the Secretary of Defense dated March 18, 2014, regarding the recommendations of the reviews of the Washington Navy Yard shooting, the Secretary of Defense shall develop plans and schedules—

(A) to implement a continuous evaluation capability for the national security population for which clearance adjudications are conducted by the Department of Defense Central Adjudication Facility, in coordination with the Suitability Executive Agent, the Security Executive Agent, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(B) to produce a Department-wide insider threat strategy and implementation plan, which includes—

(i) resourcing for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center (DITMAC) and component insider threat programs, and

(ii) alignment of insider threat protection programs with continuous evaluation capabilities and processes for personnel security;

(C) to centralize the authority, accountability, and programmatic integration responsibilities, including fiscal control, for personnel security and insider threat protection under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(D) to align the Department's consolidated Central Adjudication Facility under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(E) to develop a defense security enterprise reform investment strategy to ensure a consistent, long-term focus on funding to strengthen all of the Department's security and insider threat programs, policies, functions, and information technology capabilities, including detecting threat behaviors conveyed in the cyber domain, in a manner that keeps pace with evolving threats and risks;

(F) to resource and expedite deployment of the Identity Management Enterprise Services Architecture (IMESA); and

(G) to implement the recommendations contained in the study conducted by the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation required by section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 1564 note), including, specifically, the recommendations to centrally manage and regulate Department of Defense requests for personnel security background investigations.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the plans and schedules required under paragraph (1).

(b) PHYSICAL AND LOGICAL ACCESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall define physical and logical access standards, capabilities, and processes applicable to all personnel with access to Department of Defense installations and information technology systems, including—

(A) periodic or regularized background or records checks appropriate to the type of physical or logical access involved, the security level, the category of individuals authorized, and the level of access to be granted;

(B) standards and methods for verifying the identity of individuals seeking access; and

(C) electronic attribute-based access controls that are appropriate for the type of access and facility or information technology system involved;

(2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall design a capability to share and apply electronic identity information across the Government to enable real-time, risk-managed physical and logical access decisions; and

(3) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in conjunction with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall establish investigative and adjudicative standards for the periodic or regularized reevaluation of the eligibility of an individual to retain credentials issued pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004), as appropriate, but not less frequently than the authorization period of the issued credentials.

(c) SECURITY ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) formalize the Security, Suitability, and Credentialing Line of Business;

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committee that describes plans—

(A) for oversight by the Office of Management and Budget of activities of the executive branch of the Government for personnel security, suitability, and credentialing;

(B) to designate enterprise shared services to optimize investments;

(C) to define and implement data standards to support common electronic access to critical Government records; and

(D) to reduce the burden placed on Government data providers by centralizing requests for records access and ensuring proper sharing of the data with appropriate investigative and adjudicative elements.

(d) RECIPROCITY MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council shall ensure that—

(1) a centralized system is available to serve as the reciprocity management system for the Federal Government; and

(2) the centralized system described in paragraph (1) is aligned with, and incorporates results from, continuous evaluation and other enterprise reform initiatives.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Security Executive Agent, the Suitability Executive Agent, and the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly develop a plan to—

(1) implement the Security Executive Agent Directive on common, standardized employee and contractor security reporting requirements;

(2) establish and implement uniform reporting requirements for employees and Federal contractors, according to risk, relative to the safety of the workforce and protection of the most sensitive information of the Government; and

(3) ensure that reported information is shared appropriately.

(f) ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER PURPOSES.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 9101(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) The terms 'Security Executive Agent' and 'Suitability Executive Agent' mean the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent, respectively, established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.''.

(2) COVERED AGENCIES.—Section 9101(a)(6) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) The Department of Homeland Security.

''(H) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

''(I) An Executive agency that—

''(i) is authorized to conduct background investigations under a Federal statute; or

''(ii) is delegated authority to conduct background investigations in accordance with procedures established by the Security Executive Agent or the Suitability Executive Agent under subsection (b) or (c)(iv) of section 2.3 of Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

''(J) A contractor that conducts a background investigation on behalf of an agency described in subparagraphs (A) through (I).''.

(3) APPLICABLE PURPOSES OF INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''the head of'';

(ii) by inserting ''all'' before ''criminal history record information''; and

(iii) by striking ''for the purpose of determining eligibility for any of the following:'' and inserting '', in accordance with Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Suitability Executive Agent and Security Executive Agent, for the purpose of—

''(A) determining eligibility for—'';

(C) in clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''Access'' and inserting ''access''; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(D) in clause (ii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''Assignment'' and inserting ''assignment''; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting ''or positions;'';

(E) in clause (iii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''Acceptance'' and inserting ''acceptance''; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting ''; or'';

(F) in clause (iv), as redesignated—

(i) by striking ''Appointment'' and inserting ''appointment'';

(ii) by striking ''or a critical or sensitive position''; and

(iii) by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) conducting a basic suitability or fitness assessment for Federal or contractor employees, using Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent in accordance with—

''(i) Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto; and

''(ii) the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum 'Assignment of Functions Relating to Coverage of Contractor Employee Fitness in the Federal Investigative Standards', dated December 6, 2012;

''(C) credentialing under the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004); and

''(D) Federal Aviation Administration checks required under—

''(i) the Federal Aviation Administration Drug Enforcement Assistance Act of 1988 (subtitle E of title VII of Public Law 100–690; 102 Stat. 4424) and the amendments made by that Act; or

''(ii) section 44710 of title 49.''.

(4) BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES.—Section 9101(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2)(A) A State central criminal history record depository shall allow a covered agency to conduct both biometric and biographic searches of criminal history record information.

''(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Bureau of Investigation from requiring a request for criminal history record information to be accompanied by the fingerprints of the individual who is the subject of the request.''.

(5) USE OF MOST COST-EFFECTIVE SYSTEM.—Section 9101(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) If a criminal justice agency is able to provide the same information through more than 1 system described in paragraph (1), a covered agency may request information under subsection (b) from the criminal justice agency, and require the criminal justice agency to provide the information, using the system that is most cost-effective for the Federal Government.''.

(6) SEALED OR EXPUNGED RECORDS; JUVENILE RECORDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 9101(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: '', and includes any analogous juvenile records''; and

(ii) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: ''The term includes those records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law if such records are accessible by State and local criminal justice agencies for the purpose of conducting background checks.''.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not uniformly reject applicants for employment with the Federal Government or Federal contractors based on—

(i) sealed or expunged criminal records; or

(ii) juvenile records.

(7) INTERACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES ABROAD.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) Upon request by a covered agency and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this section, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services shall make available criminal history record information collected by the Deputy Assistant Secretary with respect to an individual who is under investigation by the covered agency regarding any interaction of the individual with a law enforcement agency or intelligence agency of a foreign country.''.

(8) CLARIFICATION OF SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRACTORS CONDUCTING BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101 of

title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) If a contractor described in subsection (a)(6)(J) uses an automated information delivery system to request criminal history record information, the contractor shall comply with any necessary security requirements for access to that system.''.

(9) CLARIFICATION REGARDING ADVERSE ACTIONS.—Section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''or'';

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting '', or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) a suitability action taken by the Office under regulations prescribed by the Office, subject to the rules prescribed by the President under this title for the administration of the competitive service.''.

(10) ANNUAL REPORT BY SUITABILITY AND SECURITY CLEARANCE PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY COUNCIL.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) The Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, an annual report that—

''(1) describes efforts of the Council to integrate Federal, State, and local systems for sharing criminal history record information;

''(2) analyzes the extent and effectiveness of Federal education programs regarding criminal history record information;

''(3) provides an update on the implementation of best practices for sharing criminal history record information, including ongoing limitations experienced by investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency with respect to access to State and local criminal history record information; and

''(4) provides a description of limitations on the sharing of information relevant to a background investigation, other than criminal history record information, between—

''(A) investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency; and

''(B) State and local law enforcement agencies.''.

(11) GAO REPORT ON ENHANCING INTEROPERABILITY AND REDUCING REDUNDANCY IN FEDERAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ACCESS CONTROL, BACKGROUND CHECK, AND CREDENTIALING STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the background check, access control, and credentialing requirements of Federal programs for the protection of critical infrastructure and key resources.

(B) CONTENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report required under subparagraph (A)—

(i) a summary of the major characteristics of each such Federal program, including the types of infrastructure and resources covered;

(ii) a comparison of the requirements, whether mandatory or voluntary in nature, for regulated entities under each such program to—

(I) conduct background checks on employees, contractors, and other individuals;

(II) adjudicate the results of a background check, including the utilization of a standardized set of disqualifying offenses or the consideration of minor, non-violent, or juvenile offenses; and

(III) establish access control systems to deter unauthorized access, or provide a security credential for any level of access to a covered facility or resource;

(iii) a review of any efforts that the Screening Coordination Office of the Department of Homeland Security has undertaken or plans to undertake to harmonize or standardize background check, access control, or credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs overseen by the Department; and

(iv) recommendations, developed in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, regarding—

(I) enhancing the interoperability of security credentials across critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(II) eliminating the need for redundant background checks or credentials across existing critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(III) harmonizing, where appropriate, the standards for identifying potentially disqualifying criminal offenses and the weight assigned to minor, nonviolent, or juvenile offenses in adjudicating the results of a completed background check; and

(IV) the development of common, risk-based standards with respect to the background check, access control, and security credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the term ''Performance Accountability Council'' means the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

AMENDMENT NO. 1747

(Purpose: To require the Department of Defense to support the security of Afghan women and girls during and after 2015)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SUPPORT FOR SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN AND GIRLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Through the sacrifice and dedication of members of the Armed Forces, civilian personnel, and our Afghan partners as well as the American people's generous investment, oppressive Taliban rule has given way to a nascent democracy in Afghanistan. It is in our national security interest to help prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism and to solidify and preserve the gains our men and women in uniform fought so hard to establish.

(2) The United States through its National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security has made firm commitments to support the human rights of the women and girls of Afghanistan. The National Action Plan states that ''the engagement and protection of women as agents of peace and stability will be central to United States efforts to promote security, prevent, respond to, and resolve conflict, and rebuild societies''.

(3) As stated in the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the Department of Defense and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) ''maintain a robust program dedicated to improving the recruitment, retention, and treatment of women in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), and to improving the status of Afghan women in general''.

(4) According to the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the ''Afghan MoI showed significant support for women in the MoI and is taking steps to protect and empower female police and female MoI staff''. Although some positive steps have been made, progress remains slow to reach the MoI's goal of recruiting 10,000 women in the Afghan National Police (ANP) in the next 10 years.

(5) According to Inclusive Security, women only make up approximately 1 percent of the Afghan National Police. There are about 2,200 women serving in the police force, fewer than the goal of 5,000 women set by the Government of Afghanistan.

(6) According to the International Crisis Group, there are not enough female police officers to staff all provincial Family Response Units (FRUs). United Nations Assistance Mission Afghanistan and the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees found that ''in the absence of Family Response Units or visible women police officers, women victims almost never approach police stations willingly, fearing they will be arrested, their reputations stained or worse''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROMOTION OF SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to prevent Afghanistan from again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism;

(2) as an important part of a strategy to achieve this objective and to help Afghanistan achieve its full potential, the United States Government should continue to regularly press the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to commit to the meaningful inclusion of women in the political, economic, and security transition process and to ensure that women's concerns are fully reflected in relevant negotiations;

(3) the United States Government and the Government of Afghanistan should reaffirm their commitment to supporting Afghan civil society, including women's organizations, as agreed to during the meeting between the International Community and the Government of Afghanistan on the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF) in July 2013;

(4) the United States Government should continue to support and encourage efforts to recruit and retain women in the Afghan National Security Forces, who are critical to the success of NATO's Resolute Support Mission and future Enduring Partnership mission; and

(5) the United States should bid on no less than one gender advisor billet within the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit and continue to work with other countries to ensure that the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit billets are fully staffed.

(c) PLAN TO PROMOTE SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—

(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3550)—

(A) an assessment of the security of Afghan women and girls, including information regarding efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF; and

(B) an assessment of the implementation of the plans for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, treatment, and provision of appropriate facilities and transportation for women in the ANSF, including the challenges associated with such implementation and the steps being taken to address those challenges.

(2) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the extent practicable, support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during and after the security transition process through the development and implementation by the Government of Afghanistan of an Afghan-led plan that should include the elements described in this paragraph.

(B) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Defense, working with the NATO-led Resolute Support mission should encourage the Government of Afghanistan to develop—

(i) measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of existing training for Afghan National Security Forces on this issue;

(ii) a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence, including ensuring the Afghan National Police's Family Response Units (FRUs) have the necessary resources and are available to women across Afghanistan;

(iii) mechanisms to enhance the capacity for units of National Police's Family Response Units to fulfill their mandate as well as indicators measuring the operational effectiveness of these units;

(iv) a plan to address the development of accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel who violate codes of conduct related to the human rights of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF; and

(v) a plan to develop training for the ANA and the ANP to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces.

(C) ENROLLMENT AND TREATMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministries of Defense and Interior, shall seek to assist the Government of Afghanistan in including as part of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) the development and implementation of a plan to increase the number of female members of the ANA and ANP and to promote their equal treatment, including through such steps as providing appropriate equipment, modifying facilities, and ensuring literacy and gender awareness training for recruits.

(D) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghan Security Forces Fund for Fiscal Year 2016, no less than $10,000,000 should be used for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the ANSF as well as the recruitment, training, and contracting of female security personnel for future elections.

(ii) TYPES OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Such programs and activities may include—

(I) efforts to recruit women into the ANSF, including the special operations forces;

(II) programs and activities of the Afghan Ministry of Defense Directorate of Human Rights and Gender Integration and the Afghan Ministry of Interior Office of Human Rights, Gender and Child Rights;

(III) development and dissemination of gender and human rights educational and training materials and programs within the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior;

(IV) efforts to address harassment and violence against women within the ANSF;

(V) improvements to infrastructure that address the requirements of women serving in the ANSF, including appropriate equipment for female security and police forces, and transportation for policewomen to their station

(VI) support for ANP Family Response Units; and

(VII) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers.

AMENDMENT NO. 2006

(Purpose: Relating to the policies of the Department of Defense on the travel of next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas)

At the end of subtitle C of title VI , add the following:

SEC. 622. POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON TRAVEL OF NEXT OF KIN TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DIGNIFIED TRANSFER OF REMAINS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WHO DIE OVERSEAS.

(a) REVIEW OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a review of the current policies of the Department of Defense on the travel for next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The review required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the changes to Department instructions and Federal regulations necessary to provide Government funded travel to the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurred in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(B) An action plan and timeline for making the changes described in subparagraph (A).

(b) MODIFICATION OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to modify the policies of the Department in order to provide Government funded travel for the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurs in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary is not required to modify the policies of the Department as described in paragraph (1) if, by not later than March, 1, 2016, the Secretary certifies, in writing, to the congressional defense committees that such action is not in the best interest of the United States. The certification shall include the following:

(A) An assessment and reevaluation by the Secretary of the rational for excluding the next of kin from Government funded travel if the death of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the Department overseas occurs in a non-combat area.

(B) Recommendations for alternative plans to ensure that the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas in a non-combat area may participate in the dignified transfer of the remains of the deceased at Dover Port Mortuary, including through the actions of appropriate non-governmental organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1931

(Purpose: To improve the annual reports of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau on the ability of the National Guard to meets its mission)

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU ON THE ABILITY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD TO MEETS ITS MISSIONS.

Section 10504(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The Chief of the National Guard Bureau'';

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by striking '', through the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force,'';

(3) by striking the second sentence; and

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

''(2) Each report shall include the following:

''(A) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out its Federal missions.

''(B) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the chief executive officers of the States and territories, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out emergency support functions of the National Response Framework.

''(3) Each report may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2011

(Purpose: To provide for cooperation between the United States and Israel on anti-tunnel capabilities)

Strike section 1272 and insert the following:

SEC. 1272. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath civilian or military infrastructure.

(2) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for years.

(3) In the conflict in Gaza in 2014, terrorists used tunnels to conduct attacks against Israel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries;

(2) the Administration should, on a joint basis with Israel, carry out research, development, test, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel; and

(3) the Administration should use developed anti-tunnel capabilities to better protect the United States and deployed United States military personnel.

(c) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH ANTI-TUNNEL CAPABILITIES PROGRAM WITH ISRAEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel. Such authority includes authority to construct facilities and install equipment necessary to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation so authorized. Any activities carried out pursuant to such authority shall be conducted in a manner that appropriately protects sensitive information and United States and Israel national security interests.

(2) REPORT.—The activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (d) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the following:

(A) A memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1), and any supporting documents.

(B) A certification that the memorandum of agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the memorandum of agreement; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive quarterly reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(d) ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide procurement, maintenance, and sustainment assistance to Israel in support of the anti-tunnel capabilities research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in subsection (c)(1).

(2) REPORT.—Assistance may not be provided under paragraph (1) until 15 days after the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a detailed description of the assistance to be provided.

(3) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—Assistance may not be provided under this subsection unless the Government of Israel contributes an amount not less than the amount of assistance to be so provided to the program, project, or activity for which the assistance is to be so provided.

(e) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress on a quarterly basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent quarterly report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(iii).

(f) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(g) SUNSET.—The authority in this section to carry out activities described in subsection (c), and to provide assistance described in subsection (d), shall expire on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1916

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate a construction agent for certain construction projects by the Department of Veterans Affairs)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DESIGNATION OF CONSTRUCTION AGENT FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall seek to enter into an agreement subject to subsections (b), (c), and (e) of section 1535 of title 31, United States Code, with the Army Corps of Engineers or another entity of the Federal Government to serve, on a reimbursable basis, as the construction agent on all construction projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs specifically authorized by Congress after the date of the enactment of this Act that involve a total expenditure of more than $100,000,000, excluding any acquisition by exchange.

(b) AGREEMENT.—Under the agreement entered into under subsection (a), the construction agent shall provide design, procurement, and construction management services for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of facilities of the Department.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on H.R. 1735 expire at 1:45 p.m. today, with the time equally divided between the managers or their designees for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I have asked the members of the committee to convene in the President's Room at 1:30 p.m., if they would, because there is a portion of the bill, the annex, that needs to be approved. We need a quorum for that so that we can move forward with the final vote on the bill.

I also wish to thank all Members on both sides of the aisle for the conduct of this debate in consideration of a very large and very complex piece of legislation.

I especially thank my friend from Rhode Island, who has worked diligently, along with his staff, to see that we arrive at this point. We have a lot of other hurdles to go through, but without getting through this one, we couldn't have been prepared for those that are laid before us before the President puts his signature on this most important piece of legislation.

I yield to my friend from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I, too, want to commend the chairman and his staff for extraordinarily diligent, cooperative, and careful work. I am pleased to be here to support this block of amendments. As the chairman noted, we are on the verge of passage of the legislation. Then we will be able to move forward and address other issues.

I thank the chairman for his cooperation and his great leadership.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee for this heroic effort, doing, as the chairman said, the most important business we can do as part of the Federal Government; that is, keeping America safe and making sure we keep our commitments to those who volunteer to serve, many in harm's way, to protect our liberties.

In a couple hours, we will vote to pass the Defense authorization bill, and that is an important bipartisan accomplishment. It is just another step in a new Congress which has acted in a bipartisan way to deal with a number of challenges confronting the country.

I am more optimistic today than I have been in a long time that the Senate is finally back to work and Congress is doing what the American people who elected us sent us here to do, and that is to do their work and to represent them to the best of our ability, which is one reason why I have come to the floor to express some of my concerns at what we have heard from the Democratic leadership about their intentions with regard to the next piece of legislation we turn to—the Defense appropriations bill. As we all know, the Democratic leader and some Democrats in his caucus have threatened not to move forward on this Defense appropriations bill.

I want to talk about the consequences in the real world of holding up this Defense appropriations bill and particularly how it will affect my home State of Texas.

Obviously, the Defense appropriations bill will provide the military with resources necessary to meet the significant demands they face and we face as a country around the world but most basically to defend our country and to keep us safe.

This bill provides for training and readiness funds and makes sure our troops are well prepared to carry out any mission that might be assigned to them anywhere in the world.

The appropriations bill provides the money for critical modernization of our aircraft, ships, ground vehicles, and other equipment so that our troops can fight with the best cutting-edge weapons systems at our disposal so they can accomplish their objective.

Perhaps most importantly, this legislation helps make sure our troops and military families enjoy a good quality of life. We have an all-volunteer military, and the family members of those who wear the uniform serve no less than the ones who wear the uniform. So making sure the families of our military members enjoy a good quality of life is very important. We will never be able to repay our troops for all they

have given us, but we can at least provide appropriate benefits to their families to help make their lives a little easier.

This bill also includes funding to actually pay our troops their salary and provides them a modest, well-deserved raise.

Like the Presiding Officer, I am proud of those who serve our Nation and our military and our home States. Nearly 120,000 Texans are serving on Active Duty today, as well as more than 55,000 Guardsmen and Reservists. We have 15 major military installations in Texas, which have more than 168,000 Active and Reserve component servicemembers assigned to them. These world-class bases, posts, air stations, and depots are critical facilities where our troops train for combat and learn the skills they need in order to accomplish their mission and where we maintain essential military equipment. So when I consider the possibility that for a cynical political reason some might decide to block this appropriations bill that actually literally pays the salary of the troops, I am very disappointed. I hope they will reconsider.

These resources we will vote on—starting this afternoon, we will start that process—go to places such as Fort Bliss and Fort Hood, TX, homes to the finest heavy ground combat units in the world.

Fort Bliss in El Paso sits on more than 1 million acres. It is an irreplaceable training range for our troops, and it is the Army's second largest installation by size. It is the proud home of the Army's famed 1st Armored Division. And Fort Hood, which serves as home to both III Corps and the storied 1st Cavalry Division, has more Army brigades than any Army installation in the country.

When I think about Members of the Senate actually considering the possibility of blocking pay for our troops and support for our military, I also think about bases such as Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, TX. This key base is home to units that have deployed time and time again in recent years in support of combat missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, including the 317th Airlift Group. Dyess is also home to the 7th Bomb Wing, one of only two B–1 strategic bomber wings in the U.S. Air Force. The 7th has been the tip of the spear in the fight against ISIL, conducting airstrikes against the terrorist army in Iraq and in Syria.

We are also proud in my State to boast the Corpus Christi Army Depot, the largest rotary wing repair facility in the world. When our Army helicopters come back from battle, many of them are pretty beat up and barely operable. They typically make a pit stop in Corpus Christi to make sure our battle-tested warfighting equipment is ready for the next challenge.

Between our naval air stations at Corpus Christi and Kingsville, Texas provides the proving ground and crucible for more than 1,000 new Navy and Marine aviators each year. Shortly after they leave Texas, they find themselves in skies over Iraq or Syria or landing in rough seas, in near-zero visibility, on aircraft carriers bordering hostile shores around the globe. But these bases represent only a fraction of the U.S. military presence in Texas. All of our military installations are integral to making sure our military is prepared, trained, healthy, and ready for action.

The Defense appropriations bill that some have threatened to filibuster in order to extract a negotiation about more government spending makes sure that the servicemembers assigned to those bases and countless others across our Nation have what they need.

We ask a lot of our men and women in uniform. The very least we can do is pass legislation that provides for the training and equipment they need in order to accomplish their mission and to ensure them the quality of life they and their families have so richly earned.

I find it very troubling and, indeed, dumbfounding that some of our colleagues from across the aisle who have already voted overwhelmingly to move forward on the Defense authorization bill would today talk about blocking the necessary appropriations bill to actually carry out that policy that we will pass shortly in the Defense authorization bill.

I believe that to be consistent after such a big vote, as I anticipate we will have on the Defense authorization bill, any notion of blocking the appropriations bill that would actually pay for those policies to be carried out should simply evaporate.

So I hope our colleagues across the aisle—many of whom have said they actually support the policies behind this legislation—will defy their party's leadership and their misguided advice about blocking this legislation in order to extract a negotiation on more government spending and will decide instead to move this legislation forward. The brave men and women in Texas and throughout the country who are fighting on our behalf deserve nothing less. And I hope our colleagues who are even considering for a moment the idea of blocking the funding that would actually help pay our troops will reconsider and cast their vote in support of the troops and not cast their vote in favor of some cynical political strategy which will undermine our support for our troops.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, 3 years ago, President Obama announced that DREAMers—young people who were brought to the United States as children—would have the opportunity to apply for temporary protection from deportation through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program or what has become known as DACA.

Today, more than 660,000 young people across this Nation have benefitted from DACA, including more than 7,000 in my home State of New Mexico. These are some of our brightest students and veterans who no longer have to fear deportation. Not only do DREAMers want to earn an education and work, they want to give back to their communities and their country. In fact, I would suggest that DREAMers don't know how to be anything but American.

We hear again and again of the remarkable stories of immigrants overcoming very difficult challenges in the genuine pursuit of a better life. Across the country, there are DREAMers working to become doctors, scientists, lawyers, and engineers. They want to start businesses or teach in classrooms. They want to contribute to America's success.

I had the privilege of meeting these twin sisters who are pictured here, Jazmin and Yazmin, earlier this year. They immigrated to the United States with their mother from Mexico when they were just 3 years old.

As students at Del Norte High School in Albuquerque, Jazmin and Yazmin worked hard to earn good grades, and as juniors and seniors, they took dual credit courses at Central New Mexico Community College.

Jazmin will graduate magna cum laude from the University of New Mexico with a bachelor of business administration, concentrating in finance. She earned an interdisciplinary studies distinction from the University of New Mexico Honors College, and her sister Yazmin would go on to graduate magna cum laude from the University of New Mexico with a bachelor of science in biology and Spanish, a minor in chemistry, and completed the University Honors Program. She received departmental summa cum laude honors.

These two young women are working tirelessly to ensure they have a better future for themselves and their mother.

In August, Jazmin will begin her second year at the University of New Mexico School of Law, and Yazmin will begin her first year at the University of New Mexico School of Medicine.

Given their immigration status, the journey for Jazmin and Yazmin to get to where they are today was anything but easy. They have overcome many hardships, including homelessness and hunger.

After their mother—who is a single mom—suffered a stroke, it was up to them to find work to support their family, cover her medical costs, and pay for their education. To this day, there is another heavy burden these young women carry with them; it is

living with the fear that at any moment their mother, whom they love dearly, will be deported because of her immigration status. Under these circumstances, you have to ask what drives these two bright young women and what keeps them going, and it is simple: They want to give back to their communities.

Jazmin, who is currently a summer law clerk at New Mexico's Center on Law and Poverty, wants to be a lawyer to ensure that every person has equal access to the law.

Yazmin, who is currently a medical assistant at the Casa de Salud Medical Office in the South Valley, wants to be a primary care physician so she can help families gain access to quality health care.

This is who DREAMers are, and I think their stories are absolutely inspiring.

This young man's name is Cesar. He is 26 years old and a DACA recipient.

Cesar and his family moved from Ciudad Juarez to Las Cruces, NM, when he was in the fifth grade.

As a middle and high school student, he earned great grades, and through local scholarships he enrolled at New Mexico State University. He earned a bachelor degree in biology, microbiology, and Spanish, not to mention minors in chemistry and biochemistry.

When he graduated from college in 2011, Cesar couldn't put his degrees to work because of his immigration status. So instead of working in the laboratory, he went to work as a landscaper.

When the President made his DACA announcement, Cesar immediately applied and was approved for deferred action. Because of DACA, Cesar was able to work and earn an income to help pay for graduate school.

This year, Cesar earned his master's degree in biology and a minor in molecular biology from New Mexico State University, where he focused his research on bioinformatics.

Cesar makes it a point to get involved in the local community. He has volunteered at La Casa and helped with the biology graduate organization. He said:

> Once you start volunteering, you wish you had more time because you love it so much. It can improve your outlook on everything you're doing.

Cesar's dream is to become a doctor so he can work to help prevent disease. Soon he will take a major step toward that goal. This coming school year, Cesar will be a medical and Ph.D. student at Loyola University in Chicago. ''DACA has changed my life,'' he said. ''Within two to three years, I went from working in landscaping to becoming a medical student.''

The stories of Cesar, Jazmin, and Yazmin represent what makes this country great. They are inspiring, and there are hundreds of thousands of DREAMers like them across this country.

Immigrants make the United States a more prosperous nation. In New Mexico, our State's remarkable history is rooted in our diversity, our history, and our culture, which has always been enriched by our immigrant communities and their family members.

My own father is an immigrant who came to America from Nazi Germany in the 1930s, and I am sure many of us in this Chamber have immigrant roots in our own families which have contributed to America's success story. We are not a country that kicks out our best and brightest students, and we are not a nation that tears families apart.

The current DACA Program is only a temporary solution. DACA recipients have to renew every 2 years in order to maintain their deferred status, but that is no way to live. It is unfair for these DREAMers to live their lives 2 years at a time. We desperately need robust immigration reform.

Now, let's step back for a moment and remember that the Senate passed a comprehensive, bipartisan immigration bill almost 2 years ago now. That bill would have modernized our immigration system to meet the needs of our economy, provided an accountable pathway to earned citizenship for the undocumented workers currently living in the shadows, including making the DREAM Act the law of the land, and it would have dramatically strengthened security at our borders. Accountable immigration reform received 68 votes in this body and demonstrated the kind of legislation we can pass when we work together.

As a nation, we value the twin promises of freedom and opportunity. Those ideals are important no matter where you were born. However, too many of my Republican colleagues don't see it that way. Several of them want to rescind or even defund DACA and roll back the progress we have made over the past 3 years.

Why would we end such a successful program? What I would say to those who do this is come back to the table and work with us to pass immigration reform. We need pragmatic solutions to fix our broken immigration laws, and we need them now. Let's make the dream a reality after all.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be waived with respect to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak about the terrible news out of Charleston, which is a true tragedy. That an event such as this could occur at a house of worship makes it even worse.

It is always awful when one of these events takes place, but to have it happen at a house of worship makes it even worse. Churches should be a place of refuge, a place where people feel safe and secure, a place of mercy, a place of compassion. The depth of loss these families must be feeling is simply awful.

I want the American people to know the Senate is thinking of the families today and the victims they loved. We are also thinking of the entire congregation at this historic church. We will continue to do so as more about this tragedy is learned in the hours and days to come.

Our hearts go out to the families who have been affected by this awful tragedy.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, after almost 3 weeks, we are completing consideration of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. Again, I want to thank Senator MCCAIN for what has largely been a bipartisan, serious consideration of issues important to the Department of Defense and to the national security of the United States. He has led the way, initially with a series of very thoughtful hearings with foreign policy experts setting the context for our debate.

Then we listened to our uniformed military leaders and our Defense Department officials. In the process of drafting the legislation, before it went to the subcommittees, there was a collaboration that was inspired by his commitment—which he has always demonstrated—to do what he thought was in the best interest of the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States. His presence and his leadership, has, I think, brought us to this point where we are getting ready to consider a major piece of legislation on behalf of the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States and of the country.

We have considered many issues. We were briefly sidetracked by the cyber amendment. We all understand that the cyber bill is absolutely critical. In fact, I think it has to be addressed as soon as possible. That is probably the next piece of business we should take up in this Senate. But it was brought up in a procedure—in an unexpected way, in a way in which we could not give it the full consideration it deserves. So, once again, I think we should commit ourselves as a Senate to

bringing up this bill as rapidly as possible—in fact, I would suggest it as the next major piece of legislation.

In the process of considering this National Defense Authorization Act, we brought a bill to the floor which had some very thoughtful and important provisions. Six hundred amendments were filed. We were able to consider many of them, both Republican and Democratic, either through votes on the floor in a very open process or through managers' packages which we put together and approved. We debated on very important issues—interrogation techniques, sexual assault in our military, and U.S. policies in Iraq and elsewhere. I think these debates and votes ensured that this authorization bill is better than it was when it left the committee.

There is, however, one overarching problem that remains with this bill, and it is one that I have persistently pointed to and persistently argued has to be corrected, and it is the fact that the bill is funded through the OCO accounts in a significant way, using an escape valve from the Budget Control Act, which OCO provides exclusively for defense, with some minor deviations for other some national security programs and other agencies, but essentially this is the defense funding mechanism. As a result, what we are confronted with is a bill that is overreliant upon the overseas contingency account. Ironically, it provides the same level of resources that the President asked for, but instead of putting it in the base budget, it grows OCO from roughly $50 billion to $90 billion, and that is all deficit spending. So this is not a way in which we are improving our fiscal situation; we are just adding $40 billion of deficit spending.

The other aspect of this that is so critical is that if we adhere to the Budget Control Act, we will not adequately fund other agencies, and many of these other agencies are as vital to our national security as the Department of Defense—the FBI, Homeland Security, and the State Department.

We have had speakers on floor talk about—rightfully so—this huge refugee crisis we are seeing all through the Middle East because of the instability in Iraq and Syria. Those refugees—when we try to help them, that help is typically sent through the State Department, through USAID, through those agencies, and they are still within the sequester caps.

As a result, I was very pleased to offer both in the committee and on the floor an amendment that would essentially say: Let's stop for a second. We have this $39 billion of additional OCO spending that we are giving to the Department of Defense because it is not subject to BCA. Before we do that, let's put a fence around it, to put it in colloquial terminology, let's just say that money is there because we recognize that the needs of the Department of Defense are critical and they have to be fulfilled, but it is going to stay there until we fix the underlying issue, in my view, and that is the BCA, the sequestration issues that affect the State Department and every other Department in the government.

We had a very good debate. I am thankful to the chairman for encouraging that debate, allowing it to take place, and for it coming to a vote. We lost, 54 to 46. It had strong support on our side of the aisle, but it was a fair and full debate and we lost. The result, though, is that the problem remains. We are in a situation where, if we continue down this pathway, we will see the OCO account as an escape valve for defense while everyone else is subject to sequestration. I don't think that is good. I don't think it is good for defense. I certainly don't think it is good for these other agencies, and it is not good for our overall national security.

There are many who say: Don't worry about that. This is just an authorization bill. The appropriations bill is where we will have the appropriate discussion and debate.

I think that is going to happen, but my view is that authorizations and appropriations are so closely related that we couldn't ignore one and we couldn't ignore this authorization.

So, again, I think we have to recognize that underpinning this authorization, with all of its worthy programs, is this very difficult issue of overreliance on OCO funding.

Then there are some who say: Well, even so, it is a 1-year fix.

Well, I don't think that is the case at all. I think if we use these types of gimmicks—as some have called them—and accounting tricks once, our tendency to use them again will be there. In fact, once we use it once, it is easier to use it two, three, four, five times.

We have had this discussion on the floor, for example, interestingly enough, about how medical research in the Department of Defense went from $25 million or so in 1992 to $13 billion today. Well, the answer is easy. Back then, because we had similar—not identical—arrangements where we capped discretionary domestic spending but uncapped defense spending, people went to where—the chairman referred to the Willie Sutton approach—the money was. It was defense. And it has grown and it has grown. I think that is what is going to happen again if we take this trajectory, this pathway, using OCO.

I sense that if we make tough decisions today, it will benefit us in the long run. One of those tough decisions—and one I make very reluctantly—is to oppose this legislation. It is worthy legislation in many respects. I think we have to fix this problem, and I think we have to fix it now. I have tried in my efforts to focus the attention on the need to correct the BCA, the need to get us on a sustainable pathway where we do include within the base of the Department of Defense those funds they need to operate and then OCO really is for overseas contingency operations.

Let me conclude my comments by saying there has been tremendous cooperation and support. It starts with the chairman. I particularly want to thank his staff director, Chris Brose, for his great work.

I thank my colleagues on the Democratic side: Liz King, Gary Leeling, Creighton Greene, Kirk McConnell, Bill Monahan, Mike Kuiken, John Quirk, Jon Clark, Jonathan Epstein, Arun Seraphin, Carolyn Chuhta, Mike Noblet, Ozge Guzelsu, Maggie McNamara, Jody Bennett, and, once again, my staff director, Liz King.

I would like to thank the floor staff. I have come to appreciate more than I ever knew how vital a role they play on both sides of the aisle, and I thank them for what they have done.

Finally, this bill has some extraordinarily good provisions in it. Many of them are tough, hard, path-breaking provisions that are there because the chairman decided he was going to go all in on many different aspects, from acquisition, to troop support efforts, to incorporating provisions of the commission on pay and retirement, all of those things, and I commend him for that. It is just that I think I have to stand and say we have to fix this issue with respect to the underpinning fundamental budget approach which says: We will let BCA stand for every other agency, but we will be able to exploit, in a way, this OCO exception, and we will use it. And I think that is not the path we want to pursue.

With that, and again with my thanks to the chairman, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as we approach a final vote on the National Defense Authorization Act, I take this opportunity to thank my friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED. Despite his lack of substantive education somewhere on the Hudson River, he has been thoughtful, bipartisan, and he has maintained that throughout the consideration of this legislation.

We worked together through hundreds of amendments in markup and hundreds more during the past 2 weeks, and obviously we have some differences from time to time. Senator REED has never stopped searching for common ground and consensus, and so this legislation would not be what it is without his leadership and his cooperation.

I would just remind my friend, however, that the title of this legislation is ''to authorize appropriations''—not to appropriate but to authorize appropriations. That is the task of the Appropriations Committee. So the OCO issue, which he and I are largely in agreement on, should have been repeal of sequestration. That is an issue which should be addressed where the authority lies—in appropriations, not in authorization. We can't increase or decrease a single penny of authorization except what was given to us through the Budget Committee process, which

was votes and decisions made on this floor on the budget.

So I say with respect and friendship, if there is a problem here, it is not with the authorization. We don't spend a penny. We authorize the expenditure of money. And that is an issue that my friend from Rhode Island and I disagree on, but it did not prohibit him, me, our staffs, and members of the committee on both sides of the aisle from working on a piece of legislation that, in my view, which is clearly subjective, is a reform bill—a reform bill, working together, that is almost unprecedented, at least in the last 30 years when you look at the extent and the nature of the reforms in this legislation.

I thank the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, for his commitment to resuming regular order. Under Senator MCCONNELL's leadership, the Senate has been able to take up this critical national security legislation on time, allowing for thoughtful consideration of amendments. This is how the Senate should operate—regular order, on time, giving our military the certainty they need to plan and execute their missions.

For 53 consecutive years, Congress has passed a National Defense Authorization Act. That is testimony to the vital importance of this legislation, which provides the necessary funding and authorities for our military to defend the Nation.

But perhaps at no time in the last half century has this legislation ever been so critical. Over the past few months, the Senate Armed Services Committee has received testimony from many of America's most respected statesmen, thinkers, and former military commanders. These leaders had a common warning, and that warning is clear: America is facing the most diverse and complex array of crises since the Second World War.

I won't go into all the different events that have taken place that authenticate that assertion by the most respected leaders who served under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

We have faced challenges before. We marshalled our power—both soft and hard power—to defend the rules-based national order that is the foundation of our prosperity and security. We have deterred aggression, defended allies, defeated adversaries, and built peace through strength. As we look at our challenges today, the question being asked all over the world by both friend and foe alike and the question we must answer now is, Are we equal to those challenges again?

There is only so much one piece of legislation can do to answer that question, but the National Defense Authorization Act before the Senate today is a strong first step toward rising to the challenge of an increasingly dangerous world. This is an ambitious piece of legislation, but in the times we live, we cannot afford business as usual in the Department of Defense. To prepare our military to confront our present and future national security challenges, we must champion the cause of defense reform, rigorously root out Pentagon waste, and invest in modernization and next-generation technologies to maintain our military technological advantage. That is what this legislation is all about. It is a reform bill. It tackles acquisition reform, headquarters and management reform, military retirement reform, and personnel reform.

The bill authorizes every dollar of the President's budget request of $612 billion but focuses these resources more directly on our warfighters. The Committee on Armed Services identified $10 billion of excess and unnecessary spending in the budget request, and we reinvested those savings in the military capabilities our troops need to succeed. We did all of this while upholding our commitments to our servicemembers, retirees, and their families.

My friends, America's military technological advantage is eroding—and eroding fast. One of the primary causes of this is a broken Defense Acquisition System that takes too long, costs too much, and wastes billions of dollars—often on weapons programs that never become operational and with no one ever being held responsible. That is why this legislation includes the most sweeping acquisition reforms in a generation. We put the services back into the acquisition process, create new mechanisms to ensure accountability for results, streamline regulation, and open the defense acquisition process to our Nation's innovators.

This bill advances unprecedented reforms to our military retirement system. Under the current 70-year-old system, 83 percent of servicemembers leave the service without any retirement assets. This system excludes the vast majority of current servicemembers who will not complete 20 years of uniformed service, including many veterans of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The NDAA creates a modernized retirement system and extends retirement benefits to the vast majority of servicemembers through a new plan, offering more value and choice. Under this new plan, 75 percent of servicemembers would get retirement benefits. This reform is estimated to save $15 billion a year in the out years.

In addition to retirement reform, the NDAA focuses on improving the quality of life of our military servicemembers, retirees, and their families. It authorizes a 1.3-percent pay raise for members of the uniformed services at the grade of O–6 and below. The bill authorizes $30 million in support for schools serving military dependent children, including those with severe disabilities. It includes many provisions to improve the military health system and TRICARE. The NDAA allows a TRICARE beneficiary up to four urgent care visits without making them get a preauthorization and requires the Department of Defense to focus more on health care quality, patient safety, and beneficiary satisfaction by making them publish health outcome measures on their Web sites.

The NDAA builds on military justice reforms of the past few years to prevent and respond to military sexual assault. It contains a number of provisions aimed at strengthening the authorities of Special Victims' Counsel to provide services to victims of sexual assault. The legislation also enhances confidential reporting options for victims of sexual assault and increases access to timely disclosure of certain materials and information in connection with the prosecution of offenses.

On management reform, the NDAA ensures the Department of Defense and the military services are using precious defense dollars to fulfill their missions and defend the Nation, not expand their bloated staffs. While staff at Army Headquarters increased 60 percent over the past decade, the Army is now cutting brigade combat teams. The Air Force evaded mandated cuts to Headquarters personnel by creating two new Headquarters entities, while at the same time complaining it had insufficient personnel to maintain combat aircraft. The NDAA directs targeted reductions in Headquarters and administrative staff that would generate $1.7 billion in savings in just the next fiscal year.

With these savings and billions more identified, this bill invests in providing critical military capabilities for our warfighters and meeting the unfunded priorities of our service chiefs and combatant commanders.

Even as challenges to maritime security increase in the Middle East and the Western Pacific and pressures on our shipbuilding budget increase, the Navy remains well below its fleet size requirement of 306 ships. The NDAA directs savings identified in the budget request to accelerate Navy modernization and shipbuilding, to mitigate impacts of the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine replacement, and to grow the Navy to meet rising threats.

As adversaries seek to counter and thwart American military power, the NDAA looks to the future and invests in the technologies that will maintain America's military technological superiority. It provides $400 million in additional funding to support the so-called third offset strategy to outpace our emerging adversaries.

The NDAA details robust assistance to our allies and partners as they confront urgent challenges. The legislation authorizes nearly $3.8 billion in support of the Afghan National Security Forces.

After an overwhelming bipartisan vote on an amendment offered by Senator FEINSTEIN and myself, the NDAA reaffirms the prohibition on torture and ensures that every U.S. Government agency always applies the same effective, humane interrogation standards as the U.S. military. Past interrogation policies compromised our values, stained our national honor, and

did little practical good. This legislation provides greater assurances that never again will the United States follow that dark path of sacrificing our values for our short-term security needs. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her hard work on this vitally important issue.

Finally, this legislation contains a bipartisan compromise on how to address the challenge of the detention facility of Guantanamo Bay. President Obama has said from day one of his Presidency that he wants to close Guantanamo. But 6½ years into his Presidency, the administration has never provided a plan to do so. This legislation requires the administration to submit that plan. We are simply asking the executive branch to explain where it will hold those set for trial, how it will continue to detain dangerous terrorists pursuant to the laws of war, and how it will mitigate the risks of moving this population.

If the administration can provide answers to these basic questions to the satisfaction of the American people and their elected representatives, then congressional restrictions on the movement of these detainees will be lifted and the plan can be implemented. If the Congress does not approve the plan, nothing would change. The ban on domestic transfers would stay in force, and the certification standards for foreign transfers included in the NDAA would remain.

My friends, America has reached a key inflection point. The rules-based international order, which has been anchored by U.S. hard power for seven decades, is being seriously stressed, and with it the foundation of our security and prosperity. It does not have to be this way. We can choose a better future for ourselves, make the right decisions now, and set our Nation on a better course.

That is what this legislation is all about—living up to our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense, increasing the effectiveness of our military, and restoring America's global leadership. This legislation is a small step towards accomplishing these goals, but it is an important step we can take right now, together. We owe the brave men and women in uniform nothing less.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Ernst	Murray
Ayotte	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Bennet	Flake	Portman
Blumenthal	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Rounds
Burr	Heinrich	Rubio
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Sasse
Capito	Heller	Schatz
Carper	Hoeven	Sessions
Casey	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cassidy	Isakson	Shelby
Coats	Johnson	Stabenow
Cochran	Kaine	Sullivan
Collins	King	Tester
Coons	Kirk	Thune
Corker	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cornyn	Lankford	Toomey
Cotton	McCain	Udall
Crapo	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Warner
Donnelly	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	

NAYS—25

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Leahy	Reid
Boxer	Manchin	Sanders
Brown	Markey	Schumer
Cardin	Menendez	Warren
Cruz	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Graham	McCaskill
Lee	Scott

The bill (H.R. 1735), as amended, was passed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the Democratic leader would like to make some remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. To respond to the majority leader, I have nothing to say until I hear what he has to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, America asks a lot of the men and women of its voluntary military force: to undertake dangerous missions in far-off lands, to spend months and years away from their families, and always to sacrifice so that we might live in freedom.

These brave men and women do it all without reservation. They ask precious little in return, save for the resources they need to do the job and the support they need to look after their families. It is the least we can do, to provide for them. We just voted 71 to 25 for a bill that promises a lot of things for our men and women.

It would be very cruel indeed for any Senator who just made that promise to turn around now and block the rest of us from fulfilling the pledge to our troops. Passing the legislation before us is a way to fulfill the promise we just made, 71 to 25. That is why nearly every Democrat voted to pass it in committee, 27 to 3. That is why Democrats have hailed this bill as a win-win-win and a victory for each of their States.

They know it gives President Obama the same level of funding he asked for. They know it adheres to a bipartisan spending level that both parties agreed to, that President Obama signed into law, and that President Obama campaigned on in the last Presidential election.

Now our friends face a choice.

Option 1: Allow the promise just made to our troops to be fulfilled by voting for a bill they can't stop praising.

Option 2: Break the promise they just made by killing a bill they claim to love, all in the service of some unrelated and completely incomprehensible partisan plan.

It is the road of bipartisanship and support for our troops that brought us this far. We shouldn't let partisan politics trip us up now. We don't have to—not if commonsense Democrats continue to prioritize pay raises and medical care for our troops over some unrelated gambit to funnel more cash to bureaucracies such as the IRS and the EPA.

I will just leave my colleagues with something one of our Democratic friends said of men and women in the military. Here is what he had to say: ''Just as we called on them to protect us, they are calling on us to provide them with the resources they need. . . .''

They are. Senators just promised they would, 71 to 25. They just made the promise. So now they shouldn't block us from fulfilling that promise by preventing us from getting on the Defense appropriations measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the bill that just passed the Senate, the Defense authorization bill, has 52 Republicans voting to fix sequestration. Only 2 voted against it. We are all in favor of fixing the sequester.

My friend, the Republican leader, is talking in a dreamland.

Ash Carter, the Secretary of Defense, is a very good man. We are so fortunate

that he has dedicated his life to public service. He is a scientist and has worked for the defense establishment for a while in public service. He, the Secretary of Defense, says this bill my friend talks about is a bad bill. It doesn't help the military. This funny funding that is in this bill is not good. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee was on the floor this morning talking about that.

It is important that we solve the sequester problem. It is not good, but we cannot, and we should not, fix one part of our government and not the other part.

We support the Pentagon. We support the troops. Of course we do. But as the Secretary of Defense has so implored us, don't do this to the military. To have a secure nation involves more than the people in the armed services. The people in the armed services, while their families are at home, want them to be protected as they travel to an airport. The TSA needs to be funded, the FBI needs to be funded, the Drug Enforcement Administration needs to be funded, Homeland Security needs to be funded, and in the process, we need to fund education properly. We need to fund research for health. We need to make sure the National Institutes of Health are not whacked again with sequestration the way they were the first time. They lost $1.6 billion. They have never recovered from that. They have never gotten their money back. Do we want to give them another sequestration? Of course we don't.

We have until this fiscal year ends in the fall to work this out, and that is what we should do. We are legislators. I agree with the 52 Republicans who said we should fix sequestration, but this bill only fixes sequestration for the Department of Defense.

Let's sit down and do what we, as legislators, are supposed to do. Legislation is the art of compromise. We are not going to get everything we want, but the Republicans shouldn't get everything they want, and we should not fund this government by using funny money for defense and using the really unfunny money on the rest of the government. It is unfair, and above all the Republican Party, which used to stand for fiscal responsibility, should get fiscally responsible and help us work this out.

We are ready and willing at any time to sit down and work through this, and we need to start that now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as the Democratic leader reminded me, on a virtually daily basis for 8 years, the majority leader always gets the last word.

Here is the issue, I say to my friends on the other side: You just voted for the troops. And now you are going to vote against them? Are you going to vote against the troops right after you voted for the troops? That is the fundamental question before us in deciding whether to go to the Defense appropriations measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know my friend gets the last word, and I am looking forward to his last word. However, the logic of my friend is illogical. We stand on our record, and we will continue in that fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Kelly Ayotte, Lindsey Graham, John McCain, John Thune, Jerry Moran, Richard C. Shelby, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Ayotte	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Sessions
Collins	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Isakson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Johnson	Thune
Cotton	Kirk	Tillis
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Donnelly	Murkowski	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Reid
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Coats	Lee	Scott
Graham	McCaskill	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, the yeas are 50, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

(The remarks of Mr. CARDIN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 204 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a constituent of mine. Ilse is a 23-year-old graduate of the University of Washington who works at the Seattle Children's Hospital and is studying to become a nurse. She has faced a lot of challenges in her 23 years, not the least of which was being diagnosed with cancer when she was a teenager, going through treatment, and working to put herself through college.

And if the outstanding costs of cancer treatment weren't difficult enough for her, Ilse was brought to the United States by her mother when she was 6 months old as an undocumented immigrant, which makes navigating our health care system even harder.

Ilse persevered through her cancer treatment. She worked her way through high school with an impressive list of extracurriculars and went on to earn a scholarship that eventually got her to the front steps of her dream school, the University of Washington.

When I met Ilse in 2013, she told me that after 15 years of waiting for her petition to obtain a visa, she lost the opportunity to obtain legal residency when she turned 21 years old. But thanks to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA, she had a second chance. She said she doesn't know where she would be now without that second chance. She told me that DACA opened doors that were previously closed to her. And thanks to the increased certainty DACA brought and the amazing work ethic she has, Ilse was able to find jobs that helped pave her way through school.

Today she is able to continue to pursue her dream of helping others as a nurse and building a life in Washington State, her home.

I am pleased to report that Ilse has now been cancer free for over 14 years. So while I rise to talk about Ilse, I also wish to celebrate DACA.

Three years ago this week, Americans celebrated a historic step forward in protecting young, undocumented immigrants known as DREAMers, people such as Ilse. When DACA was enacted, the national dialogue on immigration policy forever changed. The administration announced that America is not a place that will deport someone who plays by the rules but through no fault of their own is an undocumented immigrant, someone who has known no other home than the United States, someone who is an American in all but name. This was a major step toward changing the lives of so many immigrant families.

During the past 3 years, more than 600,000 young immigrants have benefited from deferred action. In my home State of Washington, almost 15,000 DREAMers have been able to receive the stability and peace of mind that DACA brought.

Too often in this debate, it is difficult for some people to understand that millions of undocumented families in our country are already an important part of our community. Immigrants—documented or not—work hard. They send their children to schools throughout this country. They pay their taxes, and they help weave the fabric of our society. In all but name, they are Americans, and America would not be the same without them.

Despite the steps this administration has taken, only legislation from Congress can solve the underlying problem of a very broken immigration system.

So I am here today to say I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve that. Until Congress truly passes comprehensive immigration reform, I am going to continue working each day to help the families and businesses—people such as Ilse—that are trapped by a broken system.

We must never forget the past and the fact that our Nation has long offered generations of immigrants a chance to achieve their dreams. Ilse is no different.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about the National Defense Authorization Act, which was just passed on the floor after almost 3 weeks of debate on the Senate floor. Today, a very strong bipartisan majority passed this legislation. It is a very important bill.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to start by offering prayers and thoughts—I think of every Member of the Senate—to the families of those who were killed in last night's horrific, horrific shooting in South Carolina. No words can undo the incredible pain that they are going through, but I think knowing that Members of this body and the entire Congress are thinking and praying for these families is something that I just wish to state on the Senate floor before I begin to talk about this very important bill.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as I mentioned, we passed the NDAA this afternoon after almost 3 weeks of debate, and I do wish to extend congratulations to the leadership, particularly to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator MCCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator REED, who did such an outstanding job of working in a bipartisan fashion on this bill.

In many ways, this bill is about something that is so critical to American foreign policy and national security interests. What is that? It is credibility, the credibility of the United States. In many ways it is the coin of the realm in international security—how our friends, how our allies, and how our adversaries view American credibility, particularly in the realm of national security, international affairs, and foreign policy. They pay close attention to what we are doing on this floor, in the White House, and overseas—credibility.

Unfortunately, as many are aware, both at home and certainly overseas, we are rapidly losing credibility around the world. In fact, much of the world is puzzled. What is happening to American credibility in terms of foreign policy? We used to be the shining city on the hill, a beacon of strength, a beacon of freedom. Countries that wanted to do us harm didn't because they feared us. Our allies respected and trusted us. But, unfortunately, that is starting to change. It is changing. Red lines have been crossed with no consequences in places such as Syria, Ukraine, Russia, and in the Iranian negotiations. Many say American credibility has declined. Some say American credibility overseas is in shambles. Nations that once counted on us as friends, as allies, are having a harder time trusting the United States and in some ways are even suspicious of our motives and our policies.

So it is a critical, critical issue. How do we, as a country, regain credibility in the world. It is something that everybody in this body and everybody in the Federal Government should be focused on.

The NDAA bill that we just passed, the National Defense Authorization Act, is a way to start regaining credibility for our country, and we did that this afternoon. A very strong bipartisan majority in the Senate, 71 Senators, voted to pass this very important bill. It is one of the most important bills that we are going to vote on all year.

This is an important signal. U.S. foreign policy—our national security is strongest when we act in a bipartisan manner, as we did on the Senate floor today, and when the executive and legislative branches are working together on foreign policy and national security issues. That is what this bill does.

In many ways, this bill does pretty much exactly what the President has asked in a whole host of areas regarding the military. For example, it funds the Department of Defense at the levels requested by the President. And again I congratulate Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED for many of the key programs, many of the key reforms, and such a powerful bill that got through this body.

This bill also strongly endorses one of the President's signature foreign policy issues—the rebalance of our military focus to the Asia Pacific. There are many provisions in the NDAA that support this rebalanced strategy. Most Members—Republicans and Democrats—of this body are supportive of the President's rebalance strategy.

There is even a directive in the bill from the Congress to the Department of Defense and our military leaders that states: ''In order to properly implement the U.S. rebalance policy, United States forces under operational control of the U.S. Pacific Command should be increased''—increased, not decreased. That is strong language. That is supporting the President's rebalance. The Department of Defense needs to heed this language from Congress, and of course we will be keeping a close eye on whether they do.

So the NDAA just passed on the floor helps—it can help and it will help restore America's credibility in the world. But it would be another blow to our credibility—to U.S. credibility globally—if, after all the hard work that has gone into this bill, after the strong bipartisan support this bill achieved, the President would then decide to veto the NDAA. What would the world think of that? What would the world think of our commitment to our troops with a bill that strongly passed in the House and Senate to fund the U.S. military, to set policies that support the President's policies, if the President then vetoed the bill? This would further undermine U.S. credibility in the world right at a moment when the Congress is trying to be supportive and rebuild this credibility.

After today's vote, after passing the NDAA, it is not clear that Members of this body are going to move forward to actually appropriate the money to fund the military. Think about that. The NDAA passes with strong bipartisan support out of the Committee on Armed Services and strong bipartisan support on the Senate floor this afternoon and the President of the United States vetoes it. That is not going to help America's credibility.

Now we are moving to Defense appropriations, again with strong bipartisan support out of the Committee on Appropriations. Yet we are hearing rumors that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not going to fund the military, that they are going to filibuster this bill.

Playing politics with the funding of our defense, the funding of our men and women in uniform, is not going to help enhance America's credibility anywhere. I think Members are going to have a hard time explaining votes that don't look to fund the men and women who so courageously defend us day in and day out here and abroad. It just doesn't make sense. We have to recognize that these actions that are being taken on the floor and in the White House are not only being watched by Americans, they are being watched by our allies and our adversaries overseas.

Another way to start to restore America's credibility in the world and to support the President and the White House's rebalance strategy in the Asia Pacific is to pass trade promotion authority next week. We have all talked about that. We debated that here on the floor for many weeks. It will help increase jobs. It will make sure that we, the United States, are setting the rules of the road for international trade in the Asia Pacific and not China. But it also goes to America's credibility.

I had the honor of traveling a couple of weeks ago with Chairman MCCAIN, Ranking Member REED, and the Senator from Iowa, Mrs. ERNST, to Vietnam and Singapore. We met with the Prime Minister of Singapore. All the discussion was on American engagement in the Asia Pacific. They want us there. They want us leading. But the consensus was that if we can't move forward on TPA, it would be disastrous for our credibility.

So, again, the world is watching. We cannot afford to lose U.S. credibility in another region of the world. I am hopeful that next week, as this bill comes to the floor of the Senate, we will once again vote to pass trade promotion authority because that goes to not only helping spur economic growth and greater job growth in our own country, but it goes to America's leadership and credibility in the world.

Finally, I want to talk about another area of the world where U.S. credibility is at stake, and that is the Arctic. Fortunately, Congress has begun to recognize this fact. In the bill we just debated and passed on the floor today, the NDAA, there is an important provision about the national security of the United States in the Arctic. It is now up to the administration and the Department of Defense to start to focus on this very important area of the United States but also the world.

Nobody spoke more eloquently and compellingly about peace through strength and about our country's credibility in the world than former President Ronald Reagan. President Reagan's philosophy to win the Cold War was simple. As he put it, ''We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.''

The important thing President Reagan did was he matched his rhetoric with credible actions. Under President Reagan, we strengthened our NATO allies, strengthened our military, provided strong funding for the men and women who defend us, modernized our strategic defense systems, and countered potential Soviet threats throughout the world.

As a result of this credible policy that people and countries around the world believed whether they were our allies or adversaries, the efforts of the Soviet Union to build an empire based on aggression were thwarted and the Soviet Union itself ended up collapsing.

Today, the Soviet Union no longer exists, but make no mistake—the imperialist dreams of expansion that have dominated much of Russian history since the days of the czars is still alive. Today's Russia is again a threat to its neighbors and to the peace of the world. Think about Russia's unlawful military aggression in the Ukraine. But that is not all. There are other vital areas of the world in which Russia is now taking new actions that should concern us. One of these areas is the Arctic.

We don't hear much about the Arctic from the mainstream media. That is largely because it is hard to get reporters and television cameras out to the Arctic. But America is an Arctic nation. We are an Arctic nation because of my State, the great State of Alaska. And there is much at stake in the Arctic—new transportation routes, huge opportunities for energy. As a recent column in the Wall Street Journal pointed out, ''No wonder Moscow has been racing to reopen old Soviet bases on its territory across the Arctic and develop new ones.''

The signs are everywhere that Russia is making a new push into the Arctic. Let me provide a few examples. Earlier this year, the Russian military held 5 days of Arctic war exercises that included close to 40,000 troops, 50 surface ships, 13 submarines, and 110 aircraft. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, said recently that the Russians are increasing their military forces by six combat brigades, four of which will be stationed in the Arctic. President Putin has said he wants to build at least 13 new airfields, and they are starting in the Arctic. They are establishing a new Arctic command, with several new icebreakers to add to their robust fleet.

In the paper just today, there was another report of the Russians planning yet another large-scale exercise in the Arctic involving two Arctic brigades.

Just last week, in a study called ''America in the Arctic,'' CSIS talked about what the Russians are doing. The article said:

> Recent actions taken by Russia do not instill confidence that the Arctic will be exempt from recent geopolitical tensions. The Kremlin continues to hold unannounced military exercises in the Arctic, which engage significant numbers of forces . . . and simulate the use of nuclear weapons. Moscow's authorization of the use of military force to protect Russian interests in the Arctic . . . the planned reopening of over 50 Soviet-era bases along Russia's Arctic coastline, and Russia's recently Unified Arctic Command, as well as Russian Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin's pronouncement that ''the Arctic is Russia's Mecca,'' have all raised serious questions regarding Russia's intent in the Arctic.

I want to put this in perspective with a map. This shows the new push by the Russians into the Arctic. It shows the new airfields, the new bases. If we look at the map here, we see red on these different spots. These red spots are the new or existing Russian bases and airfields in the Arctic. The three blue spots on this map are the U.S. presence—a small airfield and radar station in Greenland and Alaska. America's Arctic. Two combat brigades in the great State of Alaska.

Our U.S. military commanders are starting to wake up to the fact that the red is clearly expanding on this map, and it is concerning them. Even Secretary of Defense Ash Carter said just 2 months ago:

> The Arctic is going to be a major area of importance to the United States, both strategically and economically in the future—it's fair to say that we're late to the recognition of that.

We are late. So what are we doing? The Russians have Arctic exercises, new airfields, a new Arctic command, and four new Arctic combat brigades, according to our own Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What are we doing? The Department of Defense has

a 13-page Arctic strategy. That is it—13 pages. That is what the United States of America has—the greatest military force in the world right now—as this is happening. We have this.

I want to talk about credibility. This is not credible. This is not credible. Worse—much worse—the Department of Defense is thinking about removing one or maybe two brigade combat teams from America's Arctic.

Let me repeat that. As the Russians are building up everywhere, we are looking at possibly removing the BCTs right here—these two blue dots—one or two, gone. That is not credible. These are the only U.S. soldiers in the Arctic. They are Arctic-tough soldiers, cold-weather trained. This is the only Arctic airborne brigade in the United States. This is the only airborne brigade in the entire Asia-Pacific, right here, Fort Richardson, Alaska. These soldiers, thousands of them, are capable, well-trained, tough U.S. soldiers, and they are the only ones capable of protecting our country's interests in the Arctic, as that part of the world becomes more and more an area that Russia becomes interested in.

So we have this, 13 pages. We have announced we are seriously contemplating removing these forces from the Arctic. Let me just say, Vladimir Putin must surely be smiling somewhere in Moscow as he makes these moves and he hears that the Department of Defense is thinking about removing our only Arctic forces out of the Arctic. This is not credible.

We are not only showing a lack of credibility, removing Army troops from the Arctic, removing them from Alaska, will show the world weakness. As President Reagan noted, weakness is provocative. We can be assured of that.

This strategy defies logic. Importantly, it also defies the direction of the U.S. Senate and the NDAA, which we just passed by large bipartisan numbers. As I mentioned at the outset, the bill we just passed states that the Department of Defense should increase troops in the Asia-Pacific region—increase troops—under the command of the PACOM commander, which includes these troops right here.

Fortunately, as I said, there are also provisions in the NDAA to start making sure our country wakes up to the security interests we have in the Arctic. The bill we just passed on the floor provides an important first step toward ensuring that the Arctic remains a peaceful, stable, and prosperous place.

The NDAA requires our military to lay out a specific strategy—not just 13 pages—in the Arctic region that protects our interests there. It requires the Secretary of Defense to update the Congress on the U.S. military strategy in the Arctic region, and, importantly, requires a military operations plan for the protection of our security interests in this important region of the world.

The Department of Defense, the U.S. Army, should not even contemplate moving one single soldier out of America's Arctic until all of this has been completed, and they should look hard at this bill—that we hope the President will not veto—with regard to the direction of the Congress on the importance of increasing U.S. military forces in the Asia-Pacific to add credibility to our rebalanced strategy. That means keeping appropriate troop levels in appropriate places—like the Asia-Pacific, like the Arctic, and like Alaska—as required by the bill that we just passed by an overwhelming majority.

Alaska is the northern anchor of the Pacific rebalance. It is the gateway to the Arctic. It is what makes America an Arctic nation. It is our only Arctic State, and it probably is the single greatest repository of untapped energy resources that will power our Nation's future. That is why, in the words of Gen. Billy Mitchell—the father of the U.S. Air Force—it is the most strategic place in the world.

We need a strong rebalanced strategy that is credible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, let me say, before turning to the topic at hand, those of us from Connecticut—especially those of us in and around Sandy Hook, CT—our hearts go out to the community in Charleston. The grief and tragedy they are working and sifting through today is hard for anyone to imagine. All I can say is I hope they will find, as we did in Newtown, CT, that an internal strength over time comes from unlikely spots; that friends arrive from far-off places; that there is a community that is much bigger than one church or one city that is going to wrap its arms around families and friends of the victims during this terrible time.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I was so glad to see Senator STABENOW down on the floor a week ago talking about a pretty simple issue, which is the tax increase that is going to occur to 6.4 million Americans if the Supreme Court rules this week, next week, for the plaintiffs in the case of King v. Burwell. We wanted to come down to the floor and accentuate this message so people all around this country know what is at stake.

What is at stake is 6.5 million people losing their health insurance. That maybe gets the headlines. But the way in which people get affordable health insurance under the Affordable Care Act is by tax credits. So the immediate effect of a reversal of subsidies for Federal exchange States is that 6.5 million Americans are going to have their taxes dramatically increased by thousands of dollars if this body refuses to act in the face of a Supreme Court finding for the plaintiffs.

So we wanted to come down to the floor just to talk a little bit about what the stakes are for people's tax bills and how this is going to be a gut punch for millions of American families if the Supreme Court rules the way we hope they don't.

I think it is, first of all, important to say at the outset that most of us who have followed the Affordable Care Act and its legal interpretation think this is a sham of a case. This is a political attack on the Affordable Care Act masked as a legal case.

There is absolutely no question that the Affordable Care Act is built in a way to deliver subsidies to both State exchanges and Federal exchanges. I will not go into all the details as to why that is the clear case. But though we are talking about what might happen if King v. Burwell comes down for the plaintiffs, many of us think that would be an absolutely ludicrous legal result, one that would be a stunning act of judicial overreach, essentially a political substitution of the Court for the legislature. But I want to talk about a couple case studies and then turn the floor over to my colleagues.

I have come down and talked about people from Connecticut. I talked about Christina, a small business owner from Stratford; Susie, a two-time breast cancer survivor from North Canaan, CT; and Sean and Emilie, two freelancers from Weston. All of these people have gotten tax credits through the Affordable Care Act, and it has allowed them to have a lower tax bill but also get insurance. Many of them, it was the first time in their lives or in recent history that they have been able to afford insurance. But there are stories all over the country that are parallel to the stories from Connecticut I have been telling on the floor of the Senate over the course of the last year.

For instance, there are 832,000 Texans who are receiving an average tax credit of $247 a month. If the Supreme Court strips away these tax credits, those 800,000 people in Texas are going to see a tax increase of around $3,000. People like Aurora, a 26-year-old from Houston, got health insurance coverage through Texas's Federal marketplace. She works at a small nonprofit where she helps her LGBT peers get the coverage they need. She is saving $1,500 a year getting insurance she would have never been able to afford. She says, quite simply:

> I wouldn't be able to afford my policy otherwise. It has really helped me be able to get my well person exam and other preventions screenings that I'd not had in years.

She is one of 832,000 people in Texas who are going to have their taxes increased, their insurance stolen away.

I am a big New York Giants fan, so I get to watch a lot of games in which the Giants are playing in this stadium, which is, as Cowboy fans know it, AT&T Stadium. You could fill AT&T Stadium 10 different times. This is a huge stadium. People see the giant jumbotron on the roof of this stadium.

You could fill AT&T Stadium 10 times with the number of people in Texas alone who could lose their health care and lose their tax cut—$3,000, on average, per person a year in Texas—if King v. Burwell is decided in favor of the plaintiffs.

But I will tell another story of a young woman named Celia. She is a self-employed Pilates instructor in Florida. Since 2005, she hasn't been able to find health care coverage. Since 2005, she has been uninsured. Now, she has been lucky because she didn't get really sick during that time, but she only had a $900-a-month plan that she could find. That was the cheapest. With the Affordable Care Act, Celia finally has insurance. Celia is able to finally sign up for a health insurance plan that has meant something to her because last year she had a minor accident in her home. She had to go to the emergency room. With her insurance, she received a bill of $57. She said, ''I couldn't have even imagined what that would have cost me out-of-pocket—more than I could ever afford.'' This year, Celia has reenrolled in another silver plan, and for around $200 a month she knows that she is going to be covered if she gets sick or if she has another minor accident.

In Florida—we think this is a lot of people, 832,000. In Florida, there are 1.3 million people who are receiving health care tax credits right now. Now, I root for the University of Connecticut Huskies, and so we don't necessarily get to play in stadiums this big when you are playing out of the American Athletic Conference. But everybody in Florida knows The Swamp, and you could fill The Swamp 15 times over with the 1.3 million people who could lose their health care tax credit. Those are more people than attend Gator football games on an annual basis. Those are more people than attend Gator football games over a 2-year period of time. So 1.3 million people are going to lose their coverage in Florida alone.

So let's call a spade a spade. This is about health care. It is about our belief that for people who are working hard and playing by the rules, they should have a shot at being healthy, but it is also about keeping people's tax bills low. If we ever contemplated a bill on the floor of the U.S. Senate that raised 1.3 million people's taxes in Florida by an average of $3,500, my friends from the Republican side of the aisle—our friends would be screaming bloody murder that this was an unjustifiable, unconscionable, unworkable tax increase on the American people. But there is largely silence or temporary fixes and patches that are proposed.

So I am glad to join my colleagues to talk about what this means.

Now, I am from Connecticut and we have a State exchange. We have a State exchange. Conventional wisdom is that those of us who have State exchanges are going to be protected because we will continue to get subsidies. But this is going to be a death spiral nationally. We have no idea how this will actually play out. When you have all of these subsidies ripped away with the insurance reforms still baked in, even in States such as Connecticut, where you have a State exchange, we are not immune. Nobody is immune. The primary victims here are going to be the people in States such as Florida and Texas, as I mentioned. But this is going to be a national catastrophe.

We hope we don't ever have to have a conversation on the floor of the Senate as to how to fix this. But we better be clear ahead of time as to what the implications are.

I yield the floor.

I know my colleague will seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first I want to thank my friend from Connecticut, not only for those very powerful words but for his ongoing advocacy and leadership in the whole realm of health care and the importance of something as basic as being able to take the kids to the doctor, to make sure that you have the health care and the affordable health insurance that you need. I want to thank Senator MURPHY, and I also want to thank Senator BALDWIN as well, my partner and neighbor from Wisconsin. Senator BALDWIN is also a champion as it relates to quality, affordable health care for every American. Both of them are very important voices and leaders on what we call the HELP Committee. I am their partner on the other committee that does the financing of health care, which is, in fact, the Finance Committee.

As the ranking Democrat—the lead Democrat—on the Health Care Subcommittee and someone deeply involved through the Finance Committee as we were putting together the Affordable Care Act, I think it is appropriate for me to be able to talk about legislative intent. That is what I want to do for a moment. We knew that in putting together a way for everyone to be able to purchase affordable health insurance and indicating the expectation that we would, it had to be affordable.

I worked very hard to make sure that we had a tax credit system that would essentially lower people's taxes so they could take those funds and be able to use those to be able to afford health insurance. In fact, at the time, Senator Baucus, the chairman of the committee, would razz me and call me ''Senator Affordability'' in all the meetings.

We spent a lot of time focusing on how to make sure health insurance was affordable. What is happening, as Senator MURPHY said, is that if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position, 6.4 million Americans are going to see tax credits go away and their taxes go up. The worst part is that their taxes are going to go up and their health care is going to go down. It is not a good deal for anybody.

Unfortunately, one of those States is my State of Michigan.

But let me talk a little bit more, first, about the broad picture, because we are looking at $1.7 billion in tax increases to people all over America if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position. Basically, somehow we would have to say it is rational that Members from all of these States actually voted for a system that didn't help their own people, which makes absolutely no sense.

I can't believe anybody would do that. People wouldn't do that. Basically, we are saying that Members of Congress said that people in Massachusetts, where there is a State exchange, can have a tax cut, but if you live in Oklahoma you can't. Or if you live in the District of Columbia, right here, you can have a tax cut, but if you live in Louisiana, you can't. Or if you live in New York, you can have a tax cut, but if you live in Texas, you can't.

We can go right around looking at some of the numbers. I will not go through all of the charts that I did last week. I am very grateful for Senator MURPHY for pointing out two very important States.

Let me talk about my State of Michigan. I happen to be a baseball fan. I am a big Detroit Tigers fan. When we look at Comerica Park in Detroit, it is a beautiful stadium. Mr. President, we welcome you to come and watch a game and get our folks engaged in what they do best at winning games. The fact of the matter is that you would have to fill up Comerica Park five times—that is what it would take—to get the number of people who are going to lose their health care tax credits if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position—228,388 people.

A couple of other States: In Illinois, 232,371 people will see their taxes go up. In New Jersey, 172,000-plus will see their taxes go up. In Ohio, another State right down from the great State of Michigan, 161,011 people will see their taxes go up. Finally, in Pennsylvania, it is 348,823 people.

When we look at all of this, all of the States together, 6.4 million people are going to see tax increases. It makes no sense that people who represent these States would have voted for a system that raises taxes on their people and doesn't give them the health care they need while other people, in fact, see lower taxes—tax credits that allow them to pay for their health care and get affordable health care. It makes absolutely no sense.

Let me also say this. When we look at the Chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate, the former distinguished chairman, Senator Max Baucus from Montana, all the time we were debating the Affordable Care Act, it was clear that Montana had absolutely no plan to set up their own exchange. They indicated that. In order for the Court to side with Republicans, we would have to somehow believe that Senator Baucus would write a health

care bill with tax cuts for other States and not his own State of Montana, which I can assure you he did not do. The same can be said for myself.

The legislative intent is absolutely clear on this. What the Court is deciding, in my opinion, is something that I can't believe they are even bringing in front of the U.S. Supreme Court because on the face of it, it makes no sense. Unfortunately, depending on how they rule, millions of Americans—millions of Americans—will see their taxes go up and their health care go away.

The intent is very real. It is very clear in the Affordable Care Act. Title I, page 1: Quality, affordable health care for all Americans. What was true 5 years ago when we wrote this bill is true today: The right to get the tax cuts has nothing to do with the State in which you live. If you are in America, then you deserve the opportunity to receive tax cuts that will make your health care affordable, whether you get your plan on an exchange run by the State or through healthcare.gov.

This is about moms and dads in Michigan and across the country being able to go to bed at night without having to say a prayer that says: Please, God, don't let the kids get sick because what am I going to do? The Affordable Care Act has provided an answer and the peace of mind for millions of Americans. We certainly hope that the Supreme Court will not take that away.

I would now like to yield the floor to the great Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, before I begin my focus on the Affordable Care Act, I want to simply state that my heart goes out to the victims of last night's shooting in Charleston, SC, as they participated in a prayer service at Emanuel AME Church. The victims and their families and the entire community are in my thoughts and prayers in the wake of this unspeakable hate crime.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. My colleagues and I gathered here on the floor today to share some good news—something we unfortunately don't get to hear quite enough on the Senate floor. I am here today with Senators MURPHY and STABENOW to talk about how the Affordable Care Act is working to strengthen and improve the economic security and the health security of our families all across the United States.

Before the Affordable Care Act, over 50 million Americans were uninsured, and seniors paid higher out-of-pocket costs for their prescription drugs. Insurance companies wrote their own rules and jacked up premiums. They denied coverage to people with preexisting health conditions. And in too many cases they dropped your coverage because you got sick, got older or had a baby.

Making the Affordable Care Act the law of the land marked a critical turning point that was essential to stopping these predatory practices and to giving our families the quality, affordable health care they deserve and they need. Now the story has changed.

As my colleagues have noted, we have seen a historic reduction in the number of uninsured since Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010. Thanks to the law, over 16 million previously uninsured Americans have received health coverage. This year more than 10 million individuals have an affordable, quality health plan through the law's new health care marketplaces. Nearly 8.7 million people are benefiting from the health insurance cost assistance provided under the new law.

I want to make it clear that the law's important benefits are making a real difference in my home State of Wisconsin. In Wisconsin, over 180,000 people have a quality insurance plan through our Federally facilitated Affordable Care Act marketplace.

More than 90 percent of these Wisconsinites are receiving support to make their coverage more affordable. More importantly, the insurance companies don't get to make their own rules anymore.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies can no longer deny coverage to the more than 2 million Wisconsinites who have some type of preexisting health condition. Insurance companies can no longer charge copays or deductibles for critical preventative services such as contraception or cancer screenings for over 1 million Wisconsin women. Thanks to the new law, 89,000 Wisconsin seniors on Medicare will see their prescription drug doughnut hole closed by 2022. In the meantime, these same seniors on average have saved $913 each on prescription drugs.

I could continue on to share more numbers that prove that the ACA is working for our families in Wisconsin and in States across the country. But the real proof, the real story is about the faces and the people behind these numbers. It is about real people, real Wisconsinites, who are realizing the benefits of this law every day—real Wisconsinites such as Doug from Colgate, WI. At age 62, Doug was worried about becoming uninsured. He and his wife had been insured through her employer, but she was about to apply for Medicare. Fortunately, Doug was able find an affordable health plan on the Affordable Care Act marketplace. He did not have to lie awake at night worrying about being denied coverage due to his recent heart surgery or another preexisting condition.

There are real Wisconsinites such as Kim of West Allis. Kim runs a small costume shop. She lost Medicaid coverage when her son turned 18 years old. She went without medical care because she could not afford it, even though Kim's doctor had found an indication of cancer during a hysterectomy. But then she signed up for the affordable coverage on the Affordable Care Act's marketplace that costs only $79 a month. And when she renewed her coverage this year, her premium dropped to $20 a month. Without this coverage and the premium tax credits, she wouldn't have been able to afford the extra checkups she needed to keep track of the possibility of the cancer emerging.

Joelisa is a real Wisconsinite. She is a community health worker. Joelisa lost her health insurance when she switched jobs but was able to quickly find a new plan through the ACA marketplace. The plan cost only $87 per month with premium tax credits—a tremendous tax savings from her $500 monthly premiums through her previous job. Joelisa's health care coverage helps her manage several chronic conditions, including a metabolic syndrome that carries a high risk of progressing to diabetes, and it also makes sure that her daughter gets immunizations and stays as healthy as possible.

One part of this story has not changed, and that part is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want the Affordable Care Act to work. In fact, they continue to root for its failure. They don't want you to know about Joelisa's lower health insurance premiums or about Kim's affordable plan that is helping her prevent cancer.

Regrettably, what they do want is crystal clear. They want to repeal the law and turn back the clock to the days when only the healthy and wealthy could afford the luxury of quality health insurance. Since its passage, Republicans have spent countless days trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act by any and all means. They have tried to repeal the law in Congress by voting over 50 times—that is 5–0—to repeal all or parts of the Affordable Care Act. They have also tried to repeal the law by advancing politically motivated lawsuits, including the most recent one that would rob millions of Americans of the health insurance they have today. In Wisconsin alone, this would mean that over 160,000 hardworking Americans would see their taxes increase if they were stripped of their health insurance subsidies. That is enough to fill historic Lambeau Field twice. It is one thing to say the numbers, it is another thing to imagine the number of Wisconsinites that affects.

It is not only Wisconsin families who would be impacted by this devastation but also families in our neighboring States—neighboring States with Federal exchanges—such as Michigan, Illinois, and Iowa.

Republicans have tried to say they have an answer, but their answer is really nothing more than another tired

attempt to dismantle and repeal the Affordable Care Act. One of these proposals was put forth by a Republican colleague from my home State of Wisconsin. It would eliminate the health insurance subsidies in all States, including the federally facilitated and State-run marketplaces. His proposal would rob over 166,000 Wisconsin constituents of their premium support. His plan would attack the health care security of Kim and Joelisa. According to the American Academy of Actuaries, it would expand the ranks of the uninsured and raise premiums.

Naturally, his proposal would hand over the reins to the insurance companies and allow them the freedom to take us back to the days when they offered bare-bones plans without essential health care coverage. In Wisconsin, this means going back to the days when there were no—none, zip, zero—individual health care plans in the entire State that offered maternity coverage for families. We cannot go back, we must not go back, and we will not go back.

We know the Affordable Care Act is providing access, affordability, and quality in the State of Wisconsin. We also know that in the United States of America, health care should be a right guaranteed to all and not just a privilege reserved for the few. That is what we have fought for, and that is what we are going to continue to fight for as we move the Affordable Care Act forward.

I wish to once again thank my colleagues, Senator STABENOW and Senator MURPHY, for joining me on the floor this afternoon.

We have a case that is about to be decided by the U.S. Supreme Court. There has been effort after effort in the Congress of the United States to repeal or defund all or part of the Affordable Care Act, but it is providing lifesaving coverage and good news for Wisconsinites and people across America.

I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

TRADE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe we are moving to a very important debate in the next week as the Senate moves forward with legislation passed by the House of Representatives today that would advance trade promotion authority. Trade promotion authority is a delegation by the U.S. Congress to the President of the United States, the Chief Executive—power that Congress has—authorizing and directing that the President go forward to negotiate a trade agreement. This trade agreement would then be brought back to the Congress and, through legislation, would be implemented. But the trade agreement would never be subject to full evaluation, full debate under the normal processes of Congress, nor would it be subject to any amendment. Indeed, if the trade promotion authority passes the Senate—maybe next week—this legislation, this trade agreement would be fast-tracked. That is why they call it a fast-track agreement.

The fast-track would mean that the treaty—they call it ''agreement'' to avoid the fact that a treaty requires a two-thirds vote—that this trade agreement would be brought up so that Congress—it would be on the floor for 20 hours, it would be subject to no amendment, and it would be voted on, up or down. It would be filed, for example, at 4 o'clock on a Monday afternoon and voted on final passage the next day at noon. That is the kind of situation we are faced with.

Fast-track has been used for a number of years, a number of times, but it has always been focused on trade—what the tariff rates might be between trading partners, details of trade agreements and definitions and those kinds of things. But this agreement is far more extensive. It is more extensive in the size and the scope of the trade agreement, the number of nations, and the fact that it would cover—if the Atlantic agreement is also approved—75 percent of the world's economy.

But even more significant to me is that it creates something that is a nontrading entity, a commission, a transpacific international commission. This commission will meet regularly. It will be created by legislation with certain rules. But according to the Trade Representative who is negotiating in advance of this legislation on behalf of President Obama and who is advocating for it, it will be a living agreement. That means the entity itself, the commission, will then be entitled to make the TPP say different things, eliminate provisions it does not like, and add provisions it does like. In fact, the commission is required to meet regularly and to hear advice for changes from outside groups and from inside committees of the commission so that they can update the situation to change circumstances.

It is a breathtaking event. It says it is designed to promote the international movement of people, services, and products—basically the same language used to start the European Union. In fact, I have referred to it as a nascent European Union. I do not think that is far off base.

So we will have 12 Pacific nations come together in this agreement. Well, the trade agreement, I would suggest, colleagues, is not that big of a deal—a part of it. We have free-trade agreements with big nations, such as Canada, Australia, Mexico, Chile. The negotiations—really have an impact with two nations of significance: Japan and Vietnam. Why we can't negotiate trade agreements with them in a bilateral fashion? I don't know. Why do we have to create a transnational union, an institution that has the power, as I will explain, to impact the laws of the United States of America? It is not necessary.

I voted for—it has not worked as well as we were told it would work, but I voted for the last bilateral agreement with South Korea. South Korea, like Japan, is our good friend. We do not have any fundamental disagreements with them. They are part of the civilized world and so forth. But they have a different view of trade than we have. They are mercantile. They have to be approached and considered in a different way. They just approach trade differently. They believe manufacturing and exports mean power. An actual study has shown not too long ago that mercantilism has enhanced their power. A nation with trading deficits like the United States has had their power diminished as their trade deficits have accrued.

So some of our colleagues reject mercantilism. It is not healthy to trade for sure. We would like to see it go away. But it is our trading partner's policy. We have to deal with that reality when we negotiate agreements.

So what I will say, colleagues, is that this is a significant event. I see no reason that when we are attempting to create a trade agreement, it can't be like South Korea in 2012. Why do we have to create an entirely new transnational union with the power where each nation has one vote? The Sultan of Brunei—Brunei is one of the countries, one of the 12—the Sultan of Brunei gets one vote, and the President of the United States gets one vote it appears, although from my reading of the document it is difficult to fully understand what they mean.

I would say, at the most fundamental level, this Congress should not fast-track any transnational union of which we are a part until we understand every word in it, we know exactly what it means, and the President can answer. I have asked questions. I have asked him what it means—the living agreement language—in a letter. No answer. I asked the President of the United States: Do you contend this agreement will reduce the big trade deficit we have or will it increase the trade deficit? They don't answer. The only thing advocates for this treaty say is that it will advance or enhance employment in the exporting industry. That is the only statement they have made. Why are they being careful about that? I have listened to them. No one has ever said much more than that.

Well, in 2011, the President of the United States asserted, when he was promoting the trade agreement with South Korea—this was his statement:

We don't simply want to be an economy that consumes other country's goods. We want to be building and exporting the goods that create jobs here in America . . .

Well, I agree with that. I think we do need to focus on that. We have a sustained trade deficit, we have a sustained decline in American manufacturing, and we have seen the wages of America's middle class decline for over a decade—since 2000. We have not had increases in wages but a decline in wages. Part of that is because of a decline in manufacturing, which is where higher wages are paid.

So this is what the President said with regard to the Korea Free Trade Agreement in his announcement back in 2011: ''I'm interested in agreements that increase jobs and exports for the American people.''

Well, I am, too. Well, what do we know about the Korea trade agreement? Did it work? President Obama said this at that announcement. I hate to recall what he said, but this is what the promise was when he made this announcement. This is the President's statement that he personally delivered: ''In short, the tariff reductions in this agreement alone are expected to boost annual exports of American goods by up to $11 billion.'' Annual exports would be increased by $11 billion: ''This would advance my goal of doubling U.S. exports over the next 5 years.''

So what happened after the trade agreement was signed? We have had less than $1 billion in 3 years in export increases to South Korea. They have had a $12 billion increase in imports to the United States, virtually doubling the trade deficit that was already large between our countries.

This is a chart which shows how that worked. This black line is when the treaty was signed. This is the trade deficit we have been running with South Korea. This is zero. These are the deficits we have been running. Then when the treaty was signed—the agreement was signed—we had a marked decline in exports. I wish it were not so. I voted for it. I bought into free trade and drank the free trade Kool-Aid. But did it work? I have to say it hasn't worked yet. The reason? Mr. Clyde Prestowitz, who was a trade negotiator for President Reagan with the Pacific and with Japan in the 1980s, said: They have nontariff barriers. They have a mercantilist philosophy, and their philosophy is to buy the least possible from abroad, make everything they can possibly make at home, and export as much as possible, creating jobs in their country, creating surpluses in trade, creating wealth, they believe, and also creating power.

So I am concerned about this. I would just contend that we do not need to be listening to Pollyannaish promises that these trade agreements are going to be so great for working Americans. They have not been doing so well, in my opinion.

In fact, Mr. Prestowitz, whom I just mentioned, wrote a book on trade. In January of this year, he wrote an op-ed for the Los Angeles Times in which he said this. Instead of saying that we are going to have a $10 billion increase annually in exports, let's look at the facts. This is Mr. Prestowitz:

Over the last 35 years, the U.S. has brought China into the World Trade Organization and concluded many free-trade agreements, including one with South Korea three years ago. In advance of each, U.S. leaders promised the deals would create high-paying jobs, reduce the trade deficit, increase [gross domestic product] and raise living standards. But none of these came true. In fact, the U.S. non-oil trade deficit continued to grow, millions of jobs are offshored and mean household income has hardly risen since 2000. And economists overwhelmingly agree that rising U.S. income inequality is being driven in part by international trade.

That is President Reagan's adviser, a student of these issues who knows the Pacific well, who has written a book on trade and documents—contrary to what some people say—that for the first 150 years of our country we had high tariffs on products imported.

Now, I believe we should eliminate tariffs. I believe we should move to trade, and I have supported that over the years. But I just have to say I am less convinced that in a world where our partners aren't operating on the same policies we operate on, we have to be careful about these agreements.

What our trading partners want, in substance, is access to the U.S. market, access so they can sell their products in the U.S. market and bring home wealth to their countries. That is their goal. It just is. That is the way they approach life.

We want access to their markets. There is nothing wrong with that. That is just what the world is about, and we are not negotiating very effectively.

So many of these countries have nontariff barriers that cause difficult problems in trade. And we reduce our tariff barriers and we have virtually no other barriers to the sale of foreign products in the United States, while we are not able to export competitive products abroad because of their nontariff barriers or even sometimes their tariff barriers.

I just wish to say at the beginning that I am not of the view that we have to have a trade agreement passed this week and as part of it that we have to pass some union with 12 countries each having one vote. I don't see that has to be done.

If we don't sign a trade agreement that affects Japan or Vietnam today, what, is the world going to collapse? We have been getting along without it for decades, apparently, maybe since the beginning of the history of the Republic. So I would say let's slow down, and I say we have to focus more effectively on what is good for America.

Fast-track is a decision by Congress to suspend several of its most basic powers for 6 years, and any treaty that is created in the next 6 years can take advantage of fast-track, be brought directly to the floor, and be passed on a simple majority in the House and the Senate without an amendment.

One of my Republican colleagues said: Oh, well, we will have a Republican President, and we can really put up some good trade bills. Who knows who is going to be elected President next year. Who knows if the President, if he is a Republican, will send up a good trade bill. Congress has its duty to respond and study trade agreements and cast a knowledgeable vote on it. I don't think Congress, in this instance, should give up its procedural processes for passing any important legislation. I think a decision of the magnitude we are dealing with deserves the most careful scrutiny.

This is not a trade agreement with one friend and ally, South Korea, it includes 12 nations in the Pacific. As soon as that is inked, we have been told—and brought forward for passage in the Congress—and, historically, if we get trade promotion authority, the agreements that are presented have always passed. Once that is said and done, we will begin to debate the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, TTIP. This transatlantic agreement, I suppose, will also have some sort of commission, a transatlantic union with powers that discipline and set rules outside the powers of the Congress.

Then there is going to be a services agreement that has already been talked about. It has been leaked. Somebody leaked this. The other two are secret and cannot be seen by the American people.

So this services agreement has 10 pages on immigration. They are going to fast-track through changes in our immigration law. It is a very serious matter. We have other issues out there like environmental law—that I will mention in a minute—that absolutely the President intends to advance through this trade agreement.

So those are three major treaties, and those treaties would impact 75 percent of the GDP of America, but that is not all. For the next 6 years, any other treaty can be advanced in this same way. Presumably, three or four countries could get together and agree on some environmental regulation, and it could be advanced as some trade agreement in a fast-track procedure through Congress.

So I think the burden of proof rests on the promoters of fast-track to demonstrate why three-fifths of the Senate shouldn't be required to agree, since this is so akin to a treaty, and/or advance this contrary to the proceedings of Congress.

Some of my colleagues have been saying that the trade promotion authority, which the President is so desperately seeking—he has been hammering and bludgeoning his Members in the Senate and the House to get them to not vote their conscience but vote with what he wants—they say we should pass it because it restricts the power of the President.

Well, give me a break. If this were true, why would the President want it? If he could do all he wants to do without Congress, why isn't he doing it anyway? The entire purpose of fast-track is for Congress to surrender its power to the executive branch for 6 years. Legislative concessions include control over the content of the legislation. The President negotiates it, he brings it back, we can't amend it. He controls the content on it, the power to fully consider the legislation on the floor. It is filed on one day and voted the next day. The power to keep debate open until Senate cloture is invoked—on any other legislation, you have to get a cloture vote.

We couldn't get cloture on the Defense bill today. The Democrats refused to give 60 votes to pass the bill that appropriates the funds to defend America, but the President would be able to bring up this bill with a simple majority and no ability for extended debate that the Senate is famous for, and there is the constitutional requirement that a treaty receives a two-thirds vote.

When you are creating an international union, I mean, this crosses the line. May be someone can technically say that somehow this is an agreement and not a treaty. I don't know, lawyers could perhaps disagree, but Congress should assert its power.

We should say: Mr. President, we have seen you operate. We are not going to authorize you to enter into the creation of an international union where you get to impose additional powers on us without creating it through the treaty process.

The legislation, finally, is not amendable, which is exceedingly unusual.

So without fast-track, Congress retains all its legislative powers. Individual Members retain all their procedural tools, and every single line of trade text is publically available before any action is taken to grease the skids for its final passage. I think that is the important issue.

What about this union. What kind of powers is it that we are talking about? I am of the belief that the President hasn't been a strong advocate of trade. His supporters, many of them oppose this kind of trade agreement. I am coming to believe the primary part of his understanding of the importance of this legislation, and why he is breaking arms and heads over it, is the union, this international commission that has powers that he believes will allow him to advance agendas. I don't say that conspiratorially. I will explain in a moment that clearly seems to be one of the incentives this President has to advance this legislation.

In a Ways and Means House document on a new Pacific union being formed by President Obama, a committee in the House hints at some of this union's power, this international commission on trade:

If a proposed change to a trade agreement is contemplated [by the TPP Commission] that would require a change in U.S. law, all of TPA's congressional notification, consultation, and transparency requirements would apply.

In other words, Ways and Means is intimating that this new secret Pacific union would function like a third House of Congress, with legislative primacy, the ability to advance legislation, sending changes to the House and Senate under fast-track procedures—receiving less procedure, for example, than post office reform.

Further, this legislative fast-track, Ways and Means implies, is a change in U.S. law, meaning that if this President or the next argues it is simply an Executive action, not a legal action, the Executive would have a free hand to implement any agreement the Commission creates without any approval of Congress.

Well, he said he wouldn't do that. Did you see where people who were unlawfully in the country were given a photo ID card by the President of the United States, were given a Social Security number, and it says on the card ''work authorization,'' when the law says if you are in the country illegally you cannot have a Social Security number. He did that.

He made a recess appointment in blatant violation of a definition of what a recess is. It took 2 or 3 years for the Congress to take it to the Supreme Court, and in a unanimous 9-to-0 ruling, the Supreme Court overturned it.

So to say the President will not push his powers is naive indeed. How do you stop it? Do you file a lawsuit to say the President shouldn't have agreed to the Pacific Commission? Now a whole government bureaucracy is carrying out some global warming, some immigration, some trade issues that Congress opposes.

Is a President capable of doing something like that, actually carrying out ideas and policies that Congress doesn't approve of. Absolutely. We have seen it time and again.

So this is not merely a loophole, it is a purposeful delegation of congressional authority to the Executive and to an international body. We should understand what we are doing. Not enough of our people have read some agreement and fully understand. The fast-track-implementing legislation would have the ability to make these binding delegations binding as a matter of law, it seems to me. Well, maybe not. It probably wouldn't work that way. I don't think it works that way.

Look, that is why I wrote the President and I said: Mr. President, make this part of the proposed TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership public. Let's have the lawyers study it. You explain to us exactly what these words mean—which he has refused to do. As a matter of fact, I don't think the American people have fully grasped that this is not a normal trade agreement but that it is the creation of an international entity.

Amendments to specify Congress retains exclusive legislative authority and to actively prohibit foreign worker increases were blocked by the fast-track supporters. I offered legislation that would make clear that the President couldn't alter the constitutionally exclusive power of Congress over immigration, and they refused to give us a vote. It is not in the bill. Why not?

I said: Well, we are not going to change immigration law.

Some administration underlings say that. They don't have the power to bind the President. They are not lawyers, perhaps. They don't know what the words mean. The President of the United States hasn't said it publically, neither has his Trade Representative. He has come close, but if you read his words, you will see that they were clever words, in my opinion, with little meaning.

Fast-track supporters have tried to temper concerns about the formation of this transnational union and the subsequent Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, TTIP, and the Trade in Services Agreement, TISA, that would be approved through fast-track by adding additional negotiating objectives via a separate Customs bill.

However, negotiation objectives are, by design, not explicit or realistically enforceable. They include such vague language as saying it must be the goal of the White House ''to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multisectoral nature of trade and investment activity.'' Those are the kinds of things in this language. That is not enforceable and has virtually no meaning.

One of the vague goals is ''to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce.'' What does that mean?

Under the Ways and Means solution, TPP, TTIP, and TISA would establish broad goals for labor mobility—immigration—allowing Ways and Means to say their negotiating objective, about requiring or obligating certain changes, had not been violated. And the President would then implement those changes through Executive action or as a result of fast-track where the laws have changed.

So, together, TPP, TTIP, and TISA—these three trade agreements which we know are going to be advanced under fast-track—represent the goal of advancing the unrestricted global movement of goods and people and services.

The European Commission—this is how they started, how they were formed. In explaining TISA—presumably the second major trade agreement that would be submitted after the Pacific agreement and we move to trade in services—this is how the European Commission explains what it means:

TISA is open to all WTO members who want to open up trade in services. China and Uruguay have asked to join the talks. The EU supports their applications—

The EU supports their applications because it wants as many countries as possible to join the agreement.

TISA, of course, is the services agreement, and it will be worldwide. Anybody—even China—could be admitted to it. And the European Union Commission specifies that this services agreement, TISA, will be modeled on the General Agreement on Trade in Services, GATS. This provides insight into how TISA will affect U.S. immigration procedures.

When the United States became a member of the WTO in 1994, it signed on to the GATS and committed to issue certain numbers of work visas each year, immigration visas. Congress's ability to control the U.S. temporary entry programs has therefore been curtailed, as it would open up the United States to foreign lawsuits in an international tribunal.

In other words, they made an agreement on immigration visas under work ideas as part of GATS in the WTO, and it violates and complicates our ability to enforce American immigration law. But if we enforce the law the way it is written, then we will get disciplined by the foreign body. So when we sign up to a foreign body, we agree to rules. They say we have to do this. So it is not being enforced.

So who wrote the law for the United States of America with regard to immigration? Under the Constitution, it is Congress, but in reality, once you join an international union, they have certain powers to enforce their will over the elected representatives, the accountable representatives of the people of the United States, and some other group does it.

TISA—this services agreement—will, as the European Union suggests, require the United States to make additional legislative commitments on a much larger scale. Do we understand that? When people are voting for this trade agreement, this Pacific trade agreement, do we understand that we are opening up a mechanism for the services agreement and for the Atlantic agreement and perhaps another commission for the Atlantic? Will there be a commission set up under the TISA or TTIP bills? Do we know? Do we want to give a fast-track to grease the skids for the President to negotiate such a thing as this? I think not.

The preamble to the South Korea Free Trade Agreement, for example, states that a principal goal of the agreement is to ''create new employment opportunities, and improve the general welfare . . . by liberalizing and expanding trade and investment between their territories.''

In announcing that agreement, President Obama said:

> Because we don't simply want to be an economy that consumes other countries' goods. We want to be building and exporting the goods that create jobs here in America and that keeps the United States competitive in the 21st century.

That is what he said at that time.

So for too long the United States has entered into trade deals on the promise of economic bounty, only to see workers impoverished, industries disappear, and manufacturing jobs decline. And we have been on a steady decline in manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Dan DiMicco, one of the great CEOs in America and chairman emeritus of Nucor Steel, has written about these issues recently. He explains that these deals haven't worked as they have been promised. They haven't been, he says, free-trade deals at all. Instead, they have been ''unilateral trade disarmament,'' where we lower our barriers to foreign imports but they retain their barriers to our exports. Mr. DiMicco calls this the ''enablement of foreign mercantilism.''

So consider this in the context of automobiles. In May, the Wall Street Journal—who is a free-trade entity for sure—published a news story about how the American auto sector could be jeopardized by the TPP. The Wall Street Journal wrote:

> In the transportation sector, led by cars, the TPP could boost imports by an extra $30.8 billion by 2025, compared with an exports gain to Japan of $7.8 billion, according to a study co-written by Peter Petri, professor of international finance at Brandeis University.

I think that is exactly accurate. We are not going to have an increase in sales of automobiles in Japan. They have a 4 million automobile surplus capacity. They want to hire their people and they want to sell automobiles in Japan by producing automobiles in Japan, not by importing them. They are mercantilists in their approach. They have successfully resisted the penetration of their automobile market for decades, and it is not going to happen under this agreement. It is just not. But if we reduce our little 2.5 percent tariff on automobile imports to America, this, on the Japanese, has some sort of balancing effect for their failure to allow their markets to be open, and we will increase imports to the United States.

I am not condemning Japan. I am just saying that is how they operate, and we need to understand that and be more effective in defending American interests.

So what we hear from the promoters of this deal is ''We believe this trade deal will increase exports.'' Well, surely we will get some additional ability to sell products abroad. Surely the President can honestly say: If you sign the agreement with South Korea, well, we will have increased exports to South Korea. And we did—$800 million instead of the $11 billion he promised. So we got a little increase, but they got a $12 billion increase to the United States. And what did that do? That diminished manufacturing in the United States.

Additionally, Clyde Prestowitz, who also served as trade negotiator under President Clinton in addition to President Reagan, offered this warning about the TPP:

> Two intertwined elements pose a virtually insuperable barrier to mass market auto imports in Japan. First, Japan's capacity for vehicle production is 13 million. Annual domestic sales are 4 million and exports are another 5 million. That leaves 4 million vehicles equivalent of excess capacity that constitutes a heavy cost burden on the Japanese automobile industry. In the face of this, neither the Japanese industry nor the Japanese Government will want to make life easier for imports. The second structural element is auto dealerships. By law U.S. dealers are independent of the automakers and are free to sell any brand they wish. Exporters to the United States thus find it easy to achieve national distribution of their vehicles. Not so in Japan where the automakers effectively control the dealers.

And that is the big automobile manufacturing companies. I don't think anybody will dispute that.

The essence of what he is saying is that we are really not going to gain market share in Japan, while they are going to gain market share in the United States. So that is why people would like to see tougher, more vigorous negotiation of trade agreements.

Then there is the issue of currency manipulation. The President has made clear that he has no intention of enforcing currency manipulation, which can easily dwarf the impact of tariffs. A former Federal Reserve Chairman, a number of years ago—a great Chairman—said currency manipulation can dwarf the impact of tariffs. By manipulating their currency, our trading partners can artificially raise the price of our exports while lowering the price of their imports. This improper practice has resulted in closed plants, shuttered factories, and the shifting of U.S. jobs and wealth overseas. And China is a huge player in that.

The middle class has shrunk 10 percentage points in the United States since 1970, and real hourly wages are lower today than they were more than four decades ago. That is hard to believe. The real hourly wages are lower than they were 40 years ago. The percentage of men age 25 to 54 not working was less than 6 percent in the late 1960s; it has nearly tripled to 16.5 percent. The labor force participation rate for women—the percentage of women in their working years who are actually working—has fallen 3 full percentage points since 2009 alone.

We can't keep doing the same thing and expecting a different result. So last month, I sent a letter to the President asking how he planned to use fast-track authority and what it would mean for American workers. Those questions should not have been difficult to answer. These negotiators should have been having that on the front of their negotiating minds from the very beginning.

They have been working on this agreement for years. Not one of these questions have been answered—not one. Nor have they been answered by anybody promoting fast-track. They won't answer these questions—the questions about the trade pact, the text of which remains confidential, locked downstairs in a secret room.

This is a question I asked: Will it increase or reduce the trade deficit, and by how much?

Shouldn't we know that? Shouldn't that be discussed? Shouldn't that be the first thing we discuss? Is this going to help the U.S. economy?

No. 2, will it increase or reduce manufacturing employment and wages, including the auto sector, and accounting for jobs lost to imports?

No answer. Shouldn't we know that?

No. 3, will you make the ''living agreement'' section public and explain fully the implications of the new global governance authority known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership Commission?

Mr. President, shouldn't you tell us before we grease the skids to pass a new international commission? Shouldn't we know what it is about?

Congress should just say no on this, colleagues. We don't have to advance fast-track. We ought to insist that at least this new Commission part be fully public. We want to study it before we agree to committing this great Nation to an entity that has very small nations with the same vote as we have.

We asked: Will China be added to this Commission?

No answer. In fact, they have hinted they could be added, and apparently the Commission can vote in new members without Congress voting on it. That looks to me to be pretty clear, from my reading of it.

Will you pledge, we asked further, not to issue any Executive actions or enter into any future agreements impacting the flow of foreign workers into the United States?

No answer. Not one of these questions has been answered. Yet they want us to shut off debate, limit congressional procedural power, and advance this legislation with no amendments. I don't see how anyone can say Congress is not entitled to have at least these questions answered.

What about the American people? Shouldn't they know before their Members vote on whether it is going to improve their job prospects or reduce their job prospects, whether a new factory will be opened in Alabama or New Hampshire or closed? So we need to know about this.

We must know what powers this Commission will have, and how the United States will be represented, how the votes will be counted, how the Commission will impact immigration, environment or patent law, and how Congress can deal with decisions of the Commission it doesn't like.

The TPP is the agreement sitting in the basement room that lawmakers can go and read. It is the first secret fast-track agreement that would be put into effect.

But the TPP is just the first of three colossal agreements. There are two more.

Under what rationale should we in Congress acquiesce to such profound changes involving the global economy?

We will be talking about it in light of the rules of a new trade agreement—a new agreement that could impact 70 to 75 percent of the world economy, and we haven't given it sufficient thought.

Fast-track is an affirmative decision by the Congress of the United States to suspend several of Congress's most basic powers for the next 6 years and to delegate those powers to the Executive. A decision of this magnitude should only be based upon the most thorough debate, the most complete evidence, and the most compelling data provided by proponents on the key questions at stake. A burden of proof rests on the promoters of fast-track to compel three-fifths of the Senate to agree to give up these powers. Fast-track not only authorizes the President to enter the United States into Trans-Pacific Partnership but into an unlimited group of agreements and partnerships in the future.

The President will sign these agreements before Congress votes on them. He will then deliver implementing legislation to Congress that overrides previous law of the United States. This implementing legislation cannot be amended, cannot be filibustered, cannot be debated more than 20 hours, and cannot be subjected to the two-thirds treaty vote in the Senate.

Well, I have been analyzing and thinking about this Commission—this transpacific Union, it is fair to call it. This goes far beyond the normal trade agreement. While it appears to give some respect to our domestic law, this respect is undermined by the difference between the trade agreement—the TPP—and the implementing legislation. While a trade agreement alone may not trump U.S. law—although it could—the implementing legislation necessary for the trade agreement would. Indeed, the implementing legislation is law. And as the last-passed law of the United States, it overrules any previous laws with which it might conflict. Then it would appear that, by implementing the trade agreement, the trade agreement itself could have the impact of law.

So we pass a law that says: Mr. President, we agree with this treaty. Not a treaty—they call this an agreement. We agree with this agreement, Congress said, and the President implements it. Does it then become superior to any law in the United States? I think a good argument can be made that it does. We need to know that absolutely. Certainly, the implementing law states that the Congress agrees that the United States will be bound by the obligations under the trade agreement. The President signs a trade agreement with 12 nations, and when we ratify that, we then say we agree. The United States is bound by these provisions. As part of the provisions we are bound by is a new commission—one nation, one vote.

But there is a further danger. What happens if the Commission uses its living agreement powers—as it will—to alter the obligations under the agreement? The Commission is empowered then to change its rules, clearly, by the powers given it. Is the United States bound by new rules that we never saw but are passed by the 12 nations?

What if President Obama or some other President has an agenda, and they all get together and pass it? Is the United States bound by it? Does Congress have no control over it?

Well, we don't sufficiently know. That is why we ought not to be fast tracking an international agreement until we have had it made public and it is studied by good lawyers who understand these things.

Is the United States bound by the new rules they have changed? Can they add new members to the Commission? There are provisions about how new members should be added in the document itself. Does it say the Congress has to vote to do that? Can China be admitted?

How about this. Can this new 12-nation body adopt environmental regulations or adopt liberal immigration laws? We have discussed these things in Congress. Congress has rendered opinions and passed legislation and rejected legislation. Can this Commission pass things that impact and override the powers of Congress?

President Obama has said that climate change is one of his—actually, I think he said it is his highest—priority. His Trade Representative has been open and frank about this. The Trade Representative has negotiated this treaty. I am going to talk about that in a minute.

But some say: JEFF, you are wrong. But I don't think I am wrong. I think the issues I raised are very real, and I believe the concerns I raised may in fact be what this new treaty requires. I believe this is a plausible scenario.

But if you don't agree, bring the thing out, lay it out, bring lawyers in here, bring trade people, and explain every provision of it. Before I am going to vote to fast-track it, count that down. Congress should never fast-track any agreement for any transnational union that has the power to bind this Nation.

Goodness gracious, every word should be studied, and all consequences understood. A vote for fast-track is a vote to erase valuable procedural and substantive powers of Congress concerning a matter of utmost importance involving the very sovereignty of this Nation.

Without any doubt, the creation of this living Commission, with all its powers, will erode the power of the American people to directly elect or dismiss from office the people who impact their lives.

Do you remember that in England they woke up one morning and somebody in the European Union in Brussels had outlawed fox hunting? How did this happen? They said: Well, it started just like this.

Well, you say: JEFF, this is an exaggeration. They wouldn't use the Pacific

union to advance political agendas outside of trade, tariffs, and those kinds of things. Well, let's look.

This is an article in the American Thinker, ''Fast Tracking an International EPA,'' by Howard Richman, Raymond Richman, and Jesse Richman. They are professors, I think, all three. But this is on the Web site.

This is a statement by Mr. Froman, President Obama's Trade Representative. He laid out environmental protection as President Obama's bottom line in trade negotiations—environmental protection. This is a quote from the Trade Representative:

> The United States' position on the environment in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations is this: Environment stewardship is a core American value, and we will insist on a robust, fully enforceable environment chapter in the TPP or we will not come to agreement.

If they reach an agreement on the environmental issues that Congress won't pass, what happens then? The President signs off on it, votes for it, and then we will be disciplined by this Commission for failure to abide by the rules of the Commission.

His Trade Representative—I believe this is Mr. Froman—continues:

> Our proposals in the TPP are centered around the enforcement of environmental laws. . . .

Let me repeat that:

> Our proposals in the TPP are centered around the enforcement of environmental laws, including those implementing multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) in TPP partner countries, and also around trailblazing, first-ever conservation proposals that will raise standards across the region. Furthermore, our proposals would enhance international cooperation and create new opportunities for public participation in environmental governance and enforcement.

Well, that is a powerful statement. So there is no doubt that this President is intent on utilizing this agreement to drive his environmental agenda, whether the Congress or the American people agree with it or not. He is not bringing it up to the floor of the Senate, because Democrats and Republicans have no intention of passing his environmental agenda. I am not worried. This is the President's top negotiator on this trade agreement.

Mr. Joshua Meltzer at the Brookings Institute said this:

> As a twenty-first-century trade agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) presents an important opportunity to address a range of environment issues, from illegal logging to climate change and to craft rules that strike an appropriate balance between supporting open trade and ensuring governments can respond to pressing environmental issues.

Ensuring that governments respond to pressing environmental issues.

Who is going to ensure? Who has the power to ensure that the United States meets some environmental standard somebody somewhere has set or even the President would like to see set? That is a serious matter. I don't think we should treat it lightly.

I do believe that the American people are correct to be dubious about this trade agreement. Polling data, as I understand it, clearly shows that it is not supported by the American people. Yet forces are at work, breaking arms and breaking hands and bludgeoning people into acquiescence to vote for this thing. It cleared the House by the narrowest of margins. We had 62 votes when it passed through the Senate. They needed 60, and they got 62. The President was working, the Republican leaders were working, the chamber of commerce was working, Big Business was working, money was working and wheeling and dealing, and pork projects were promised, I am sure, to get the votes to pass this, to put it on a fast-track skid.

I am against it. I believe I am speaking on behalf of the working people of the United States of America. I don't believe their interests are being properly considered. I am confident that if this agreement goes into effect, the trade deficit we have with Japan and with Vietnam will increase. Vietnam has 100 million people. We will not be much different with places such as Canada or Australia or Mexico because we basically have a free-trade agreement with them.

So it is not necessary that we create some 12-nation entity, some commission. Why don't we just negotiate trade agreements that serve the interests of the American people with Japan and Vietnam and ensure exactly that they comply with what they say, that their markets are open to ours, as well as our markets are open to theirs? And we should have some reasonable expectation that if we enter into this agreement, it will be good for American workers, not just Japanese workers or workers in Vietnam.

I don't say we shouldn't have a trade agreement. I am saying let's be more careful about it. Let's negotiate some trade agreements for a change that advance the interests of the United States. We need to reduce our trade deficits, not increase them. They are weakening our GDP. The deficit subtracts from the current account trade deficit, subtracts from our gross domestic product. It is not healthy for America to have this kind of deficit.

One of the reports that was done lays out the argument that power comes from this mercantilist approach. The Richmans' and the American Thinker—I will quote a study, and it says this:

> To see if mercantilism works—

This is the exporting drive of our trading partners and competitors—

> [the Richmans'] conducted a statistical study of 11,623 country-year observations for 186 countries from 1870 through 2007 using panel data models. The results: a strong statistically-significant correlation between balance of trade and national power. A favorable balance of trade is associated with an increase in power (national material capabilities), an unfavorable balance with a decrease.

This is what China believes to the core. This is what most of the Asian countries believe and act on. And apparently the Richmans' conclude—an objective study—that it is accurate. I don't know. But those are the kinds of things we need to be careful about.

They have two scenarios they have laid out based on this scenario. The first envisions 20 years of trade deficits at the rate of the trade deficit we ran in 2007. The second scenario envisions balanced trade, where we don't have a trade deficit. Under trade deficit, their definition of ''national power'' declined 28 percent. So the national power declined 28 percent. Under a balanced trade, our national power remains basically stable, increasing by one-half of 1 percent. I think balanced trade is certainly preferable. It is certainly preferable for working Americans.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for your patience and allowing me to share these remarks. It could be that I am wrong. Maybe trade deficits make no difference. Maybe the loss of manufacturing is offset by the fact that we get cheaper goods. That is what some of our people in the United States say.

When somebody sends subsidized goods here and that closes the U.S. factory and people can purchase their goods for below cost, we should send those countries a thank-you note—no concern about the people who got laid off and the jobs lost. I am not sure that model is now appropriate. Maybe it was 20 years ago.

I sort of believe that cheaper products was the ultimate goal and voted that way, but I am reevaluating it. I think this country needs to go through a serious evaluation of that, No. 1. Secondly, we absolutely—colleagues, we absolutely should not fast-track a movement to the establishment of an international commission or international union and maybe creating two more of them as part of two more trade agreements—the three trade agreements that will be part of fast-track if it passes. And, of course, any number of other trade agreements for the next 6 years could be accelerated through this fast-track process, if it passes.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to again speak about the North Dakotans who made the ultimate sacrifice while serving our country in the Vietnam war.

Since March, I have had the honor of learning from families about the lives

of their sons, brothers, husbands, fathers, and uncles who died during the Vietnam war.

Before speaking about the 13 of the 198 North Dakota young men who didn't return home from Vietnam, I want to first talk about Dan Stenvold of Park River. Dan is a Vietnam veteran who survived the war.

While a student at Sargent Central High School, Dan thought about joining the military. After graduation, he felt he should grow up before going to college, and he enlisted in the Army. He was sent to Vietnam and served three continuous tours of duty there. His records count that he was in Vietnam for 802 days. After returning home from Vietnam, Dan enrolled in college at North Dakota State School of Science in Wahpeton so he could fulfill his dream of playing college football. The combination of Dan's time in Vietnam and a football knee injury made Dan feel old, and he left college. He then had a 33-year career with Polar Communications in Park River.

In 1999, the North Dakota Vietnam Veterans of America voted him as their State president, and he has served in that position for the last 16 years. For the last 6 years, he has served on the National Board of Vietnam Veterans of America. The national president asked him to run for another 2-year term, and I wish Dan well in that upcoming election.

Dan also serves his community as a member of the DAV, AMVETS, VFW, and the American Legion, and he is currently in his third term as mayor of the city of Park River in North Dakota.

Dan is proud of his three wonderful children and seven grandchildren.

Agent Orange exposure education is one of his top priorities. He has seen his own family affected by the side effects of Agent Orange. Dan is grateful to the North Dakota State Legislature for once again approving funding for education and outreach related to Agent Orange exposure.

I thank Dan for his continuing service to our country.

And please, Dan, keep up your good work on behalf of the citizens of your community and Vietnam veterans all across this country.

RICHARD ''RICH'' BOEHM

Richard ''Rich'' Boehm was born on June 23, 1951. He was from Mandan. He served in the Army's 198th Infantry Brigade. Rich died on March 26, 1971. He was 19 years old.

Rich was one of six children. All three boys served our country in the military—Marvin and Clarence in the Army National Guard and Rich in the Army.

Rich served in Vietnam with Myron Johnson from Mandaree, and they became very close friends. Rich was engaged, and Myron was going to be his best man.

Keith Nolan's book ''Sappers in the Wire: The Life and Death of Firebase Mary Ann'' includes details of the day Rich and Myron died. Rich and Myron were in a foxhole together, ran for safety, and were both shot in the back and killed.

Dennis Bollinger was assigned to escort Rich's body home, and his family knew Rich's family. Dennis continues to serve our State and my community of Mandan as the current city of Mandan chief of police. Rich's brother Marvin says he is grateful to Rich's squad leader who contacted him from Texas and shared memories and photos of Rich during his time in Vietnam.

LARRY JACOBSON

Larry Jacobson was from Norma. He was born on March 15, 1949. He served in the Army's 1st Aviation Brigade. Larry was 21 years old when he died August 26, 1970.

He was the second of six children and grew up on his family's farm near Norma. He attended grade school in Norma and high school in Kenmare. His best friend in high school, Craig Livingston, remembers Larry as a shy person who never had an enemy.

Larry's older brother remembers the week Larry was killed in Vietnam. The family had been in Fargo celebrating his sister's graduation from nursing school. They had planned to host a party at home, too, but when they arrived home, there were a sergeant and captain waiting for them to deliver the news of Larry's death.

This year on Memorial Day weekend, a large memorial was dedicated at the Mouse River Park honoring Renville County veterans. The memorial includes Larry's photo, images of the soldier's cross, and a helicopter like the one Larry was riding in when it was shot down and he was killed.

CARL WOODS

Carl Woods was from Bottineau. He was born June 8, 1933. He served as a Navy pilot. Carl was 32 years old when he died on September 28, 1965.

His father Monte also served our country during World War I, and six of the eight boys in Carl's family served in the military.

Carl was an honor student in high school and college in Bottineau, where he made the All-Conference Football team. He then chose to enlist in the Navy. He served our country as a Navy pilot for over 12 years, reaching the rank of lieutenant commander.

While serving in the Vietnam war, Carl's plane was hit by an anti-aircraft missile. Instead of bailing out over North Vietnam, Carl maneuvered the plane 40 miles to the Tonkin Gulf, where he died after his parachute failed to open.

The family is grateful to Carl's wingman for sharing with them the details of Carl's service and extraordinary flight skills the day he died.

In addition to his brother, Carl left behind his wife Elaine and three children, Mark, Jennifer, and Kathryn.

Carl is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

This summer, the Bottineau AMVETS Post 25 is going to rename themselves the Carl J. Woods Memorial Post 25 in honor of Carl's service and his sacrifice.

JOEL ELLINGTON

Joel Ellington was from Rolette. He was born January 21, 1945. He served in the Navy. Joel was 22 years old when he died on June 26, 1967.

Joel was the oldest of three boys. They were 3 years apart in age. At Rolette High School, Joel played in the band. Right after high school, Joel enlisted in the Navy. After serving 2 years, he returned home and worked in the local grocery store.

Due to the Vietnam war draft, Joel reenlisted in hopes that his brothers, Dennis and Doyle, would not have to serve in Vietnam. Dennis said of Joel's reenlistment, ''I think he did that to try to protect me; he didn't think they'd take two brothers.''

DAVID HAEGELE

David Haegele was from Napoleon. He was born on September 28, 1948. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. David died February 28, 1969. He was 20 years old.

He was the fifth of eight children and grew up on his family's dairy farm. His brother Tim also served our country in the Marines.

David's family said that he was such a kind person and a hard worker. They remember his jokes and how much he enjoyed playing fun pranks on people.

David's letters home to his family requested three things he and his fellow soldiers desired most: Kool-Aid, baked goods, and dry socks.

His mother gave David's niece Veronica a box she filled with David's things, such as the letters he mailed home from Vietnam and his wallet. She said that Veronica would know what to do with them. About 3 months before David's mother passed away at age 95, Veronica finished David's scrapbook, and his mother thought it was perfect.

GARRY KLEIN

Garry Klein was born November 22, 1947. He served in the Marine Corps' Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 9th Marines, 3rd Marine Division. Garry was 19 years old when he died on May 27, 1967.

He was third from the youngest of nine children. His sister Arlene said that Garry was an easygoing kid who was lighthearted and never caused any trouble. She remembers the cartoons he liked to draw.

Garry chose to enlist in the Marines to serve his country. When he went home during Christmastime on leave, he told Arlene and her children, ''I won't see you again, but you may see me.''

He died almost exactly 1 year after he graduated from high school.

RANDY LEE HANSEN

Randy Lee Hansen was born October 23, 1948. He was from South Dakota, but he was living in Williston when he enlisted. He served in the Army's 1st Signal Brigade as a field radio repairer. Randy died on Easter Sunday, April 6, 1969. He was only 20 years old.

Randy's brothers, Jim and Mike, served our country in the Navy. His stepbrother, Arthur, also served in the Army.

Randy's brother, Jim, remembers that Randy liked to fish. Jim believed Randy had some great stories from his time fishing, as many fishermen do.

While his brothers, step-brothers, step-sister, and mother remained in South Dakota, Randy attended Williston High School, where his father was working in Williston as a bricklayer.

In 1966, Randy enlisted in the Army before he graduated from high school. The product of a service-oriented family, Randy felt it was important that he serve his country.

FRED JOHNSON

Fred Johnson was born on November 3, 1939. He grew up in Watford City and Leeds. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Fred was 27 years old when he died on January 20, 1967.

Fred's wife's name was Jacqueline, and they had one son and three daughters. Their oldest child, Richard, said that Fred loved to hunt and fish. Fred's dad was a game warden and Fred would go to work with his dad sometimes. They would bring home injured animals and nurse them back to health. Among the most memorable animals were a white owl, a baby skunk that behaved like a pet cat, and a raccoon that he kept for 6 years.

After high school, Fred joined the Army. He served for 7 years before he was killed in action in Vietnam on his second tour of duty.

Fred's son, Richard, remembers going fishing with his dad often and fishing together the week before Fred left for Vietnam on his second tour of duty.

Fred's brother, Robert, said he took Fred to the airport before he returned to Vietnam the last time. Fred was scared and didn't know if he would be back again.

Fred died shortly thereafter when his vehicle hit a landmine.

LYLE JOHANNES

Lyle Johannes was born June 25, 1949, and spent his high school years in Kulm. He served in the Army as a radio operator. Lyle died January 29, 1970. He was 20 years old.

Lyle was the oldest of four children. His youngest sister, Sally, said that Lyle was a happy person who didn't get rattled by anything. He loved a good joke and had lots of friends. Sally said, ''You'd never want to turn your back on him because you never knew what he might do!'' He was a daredevil who loved motorcycles, had a number of Hondas—and crashes—over the years. He spent a lot of time hanging over the engine of a car. He would buy old cars and fix them up. He also worked on the cars of elderly women who lived in town. After high school, he attended a technical college in Denver for mechanics.

Lyle was glad to be in the Army serving in Vietnam. He kind of ''adopted'' a young Vietnamese boy. The boy really liked blue jeans and a turtleneck sweater, so Lyle asked his mom to send them for him. She said she sent them as well as other things, but for packing material she put popcorn in Lyle's packages. When the packages arrived, the soldiers would eat the stale popcorn because they were so happy to have something from home.

Lyle was accidentally killed by friendly fire. Since his death, the family occasionally finds items someone leaves on Lyle's grave.

Lyle had shipped cashmere sweaters home for the family as Christmas presents in late 1969. The package arrived after his funeral in January of 1970.

ERIC NADEAU

Eric Nadeau was born November 12, 1948. He was from Grand Forks and was a member of the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division, the Screaming Eagles. Eric died May 26, 1969, just days before his tour of duty was scheduled to end. He was 20 years old.

He was the eldest child of his family and had three sisters. Eric's sisters remember how much he loved hunting game in the Turtle Mountains before he enlisted in the Army, and they think that is part of the reason why he joined the Armed Forces.

Everyone liked Eric. He had a circle of friends he grew up with, and if he was ever in town on break from the service, Eric and his best friend Dale were inseparable. Wherever Dale was, one could find Eric, and vice versa.

His sister remembers a time when Eric came home and surprised their mother. She and her mother were playing bingo in the local church basement. When he walked into the room, everything stopped, and everyone stood up and sang the National Anthem. Eric's mother was shocked and thrilled.

Eric died when his company was outnumbered and overrun. He jumped back in to save his crew members, and did save some, but was killed in the process. Eric's sister thinks of Eric not only as her brother but her hero.

FRED JANSONIUS

Fred Jansonius was born June 23, 1948. He was from Jamestown. He served in the Army's 9th Infantry Division. Fred died February 2, 1968. He was only 19 years old.

He was the oldest of four children. His sister, Claire, said that Fred was a gentle soul and that his younger siblings looked up to him. In high school, Fred was a good student and enjoyed photography, golf, and tennis. After graduation, he attended Drake University and studied journalism.

One of his Drake professors told Fred's class, ''To be a good journalist, you really need to see the world.'' Fred's draft number was high, but he was deferred for being in college. So he quit college and traveled to New York City to see part of the world while waiting to be drafted.

Claire shared some of Fred's letters he wrote home to his family, which revealed a talent for writing and the wisdom of someone who had definitely seen his share of the world in his 19 years. Many of his letters included vivid descriptions of Fred's experiences in Vietnam, so you could imagine Fred sleeping in a cemetery, using a bag of grenades for a pillow or his fellow soldiers drinking Coca-Colas and using their imaginations to create their own entertainment.

After Fred was killed in Vietnam, his casket arrived in Jamestown on the train. The same conductor who drove the train the day Fred left to go to basic training was driving the train that delivered Fred's body back to Jamestown.

About a year ago, one of Fred's officers, Lee Moorman, was traveling the United States visiting the graves of the soldiers he knew in Vietnam. Lee told Fred's family that Fred liked to read and was well liked by everyone.

GREGORY KRUEGER

Gregory Krueger was born March 1, 1949. He was from Garrison. He served in the Army's 173rd Airborne Division. Gregory died July 17, 1970. He was 21 years old.

He was the oldest of three boys. His brother, Stephen, said that Gregory was hard-working, responsible, and well-liked by everyone who knew him.

Stephen remembers that Gregory loved everything to do with the farm. He had fond memories of working with Gregory, hauling many bales of hay on Saturdays. Their brother, Fred, continues to farm that family farm today.

Gregory had a special relationship with a nearby farmer who trusted him at a young age to run his farm equipment and to help on the farm. Gregory hoped to eventually take over the neighbor's farm after completing his service in Vietnam.

The Heritage Park in Garrison is currently in the process of adding a stone memorial in memory of Gregory's service and his family's sacrifice.

RICHARD HOVLAND

Richard Hovland was from Williston, and he was born August 12, 1946. He served in the Army's 20th Engineer Brigade. Richard was 21 years old when he died on January 31, 1968.

He was one of four children and his family and friends called him Ricky.

Growing up, Richard was active in the Boy Scouts. He played baseball and sang in the choir. His sister, Deanne, remembers his beautiful voice and him singing country music in their living room with his friend, Charles Hanson.

Deanne thought she and her brother were the coolest when he would drop her off at school in his Chevy Impala. She looked up to Richard very much. When he left for Vietnam, she was in junior high and was in awe about what he was going to do.

Deanne said Richard was a fun-loving and family-oriented man who was especially kind and good with their brother, Duane, who had Down Syndrome. Richard always mentioned Duane in his letters he sent home from Vietnam.

After completing his service in Vietnam, Richard had plans to go to college

and become a farmer. Deanne has drawings that Richard made of the farmhouse he wanted to build on the land he was picking out in the Williston area. His parents Arlene and Oscar often said Richard wanted to farm and loved the land so much that he didn't realize his true calling was becoming an architect.

These are just some of the stories of North Dakotans who sacrificed their lives on behalf of our country in Vietnam.

I have to say that every time I do this, I wonder who would they be today. Would they be standing here instead of me? But I do know the men and women in uniform who serve our country continue to serve when they take off the uniform. I also know our country suffers a great loss any time we lose a young man or a young woman in service of our country. That loss must be remembered, it must be respected, and we can never forget.

In this anniversary and commemoration of the Vietnam war, it is so important that we spend our time talking about the sacrifices our country and our servicemen gave in Vietnam and continue to give through the ravages of Agent Orange—the issue Dan worked so hard on. They continue to suffer the post-traumatic stress that was part of that service, and they continue to overrepresent in the homeless populations and populations of people who continue to be troubled from the experiences they suffered in Vietnam.

So today we celebrate these lives and we think about who they might have been. We offer a very humble and grateful thank-you to all of the family members who have helped us with these memorials but who have experienced this loss in a way we will never understand.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 2146.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2146) entitled ''An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes,'' with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2060

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with an amendment numbered 2060.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2061 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2060

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2061 to amendment No. 2060.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2062

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to refer to the Committee on Finance H.R. 2146 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer H.R. 2146 to the Committee on Finance with instructions being amendment numbered 2062.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment''

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2063

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2063 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 2146.

The amendment is as follows:

In the instructions

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2064 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2063

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2064 to amendment No. 2063.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment

Strike ''4 days'' and insert ''5 days''

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 1295.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill (H.R. 1295) entitled ''An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code,'' and that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the aforementioned bill, with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2065

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295 with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295 with an amendment numbered 2065.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2066 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2065

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2066 to amendment No. 2065.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.''

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2067

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to refer to the Committee on Finance H.R. 1295 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer H.R. 1295 to the Committee on Finance with instructions being amendment numbered 2067.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2068

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2068 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 1295.

The amendment is as follows:

In the Instructions

Strike ''2 days'' and insert ''3 days''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2069 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2068

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2069 to amendment No. 2068.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295, an act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, following today's encouraging vote over in the House, I wish to update the Senate on where we stand with regard to trade.

First, a brief look back at how we got where we are today. Back in April, the Finance Committee came together to advance four trade bills on a big bipartisan vote. It was everyone's goal at that time to consider all of those bills and to begin the process of passing this significant trade agenda, and it remains everybody's goal now. That is a point that has been proven many times over.

When our Democratic colleagues insisted on tying TAA to TPA, it was difficult for most on my side to swallow. Many in my conference opposed TAA. But with the larger goal in mind—and understanding that for my friends on the other side, TAA has often ridden alongside TPA—we put the two policies together. This was not an easy lift, but in the interest of moving forward, we compromised.

The process was not easy. We had a few close calls. We even worked through a filibuster to address our colleagues' concerns, but all the hard work paid off. It eventually led to a good result at the end of last month, a 62-to-37 vote in the Senate in favor of more opportunities for American paychecks, for American workers and farmers, and for the American economy.

Unfortunately, though, as we all know now, that was not to be the end of the Senate's role in the process. That is OK. Not every plan turns out perfectly every time, but the point is that you don't give up. The American people didn't send us here to sulk but to work through tough problems. So that is what we are going to do.

Here is what it is going to take: No. 1, working together toward the shared goal of a win for the American people; No. 2, trusting each other to get there. I think we can do that.

So here are the next steps. In the judgment of Members of both parties in the House and in the Senate, our best way forward now is to consider TPA and TAA separately. That means TAA will come second after TPA, but the votes will be there to pass it—reluctantly, not happily, but they will be there if it means getting something far more important accomplished for the American people.

To that end, I just filed cloture on the motion to concur with the House-passed TPA bill. I then filed cloture on the AGOA and preferences bill—with an amendment that adds to that bill TAA. This puts the Senate on a procedural glidepath to consider and then pass the TPA bill, the AGOA and preferences bill, and TAA. So assuming everyone has a little faith and votes the same way they did just a few weeks ago, we will be able to get all of those bills to the President soon.

I know there is a fourth bill, too, the Customs bill. Given the complex and thorny procedural processes at work on that bill, we will have to turn to that one as soon as we are able—but we will turn to it. It will have to go to a conference committee and then return to the Senate floor, where it, too, will be passed and sent to the White House.

I know it is hard to do, but if we step back a few paces and recall what we were all asking for just a few weeks ago, we should be able to take some

satisfaction in all of this. It means that before July 4, the President will have signed TPA, TAA, and the AGOA and preferences bill, and we will be well on our way toward enactment of a robust Customs package. All of that together would be quite an accomplishment. All it is going to take is some hard work, some faith in one another, and everybody voting the same way the next time they voted the last time.

TRIBUTE TO BOB LAWSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to one of Kentucky's greatest teachers, and a man who has served the public good and the law for 5 decades. My friend Professor Bob Lawson, who has taught law at the University of Kentucky College of Law for 50 years, will be retiring this July 1.

Over the course of his 50 years of teaching, Professor Lawson has become one of the most respected lawyers and teachers in the Commonwealth. He is also well known and admired for his work outside the classroom as the author of much of the Commonwealth's penal code for criminal offenses and its rules of courtroom evidence.

Professor Lawson was born in a small town in southwestern West Virginia, not far from the Kentucky border, in a coal community. Encouraged by his father to get an education and escape life in the coal camps, he attended Berea College in Kentucky and then earned his law degree at UK in 1963.

In 1965, he was asked to teach law at UK, which he has done ever since. His specialty is Kentucky criminal law and evidence law. In the 1970s, he worked with the State legislature to rewrite Kentucky's penal code, which was in need of an overhaul.

I would point out that of Professor Lawson's thousands of students, I was one of them. Bob Lawson was one of my favorite professors, and I still recall his teachings today. I am also proud to call him a friend over the years. UK has greatly benefitted from having him as a member of the faculty for all this time, and he will be sorely missed.

I want to thank Professor Bob Lawson for his five decades of service to the University of Kentucky and to the Commonwealth. For 50 years he led Kentucky's brightest young minds into the legal profession, and his many thousands of students serve as a fitting tribute to his legacy. I wish him all the best as he retires from UK and begins a new stage in life.

The Lexington Herald-Leader published an article detailing Professor Lawson's life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER 50 YEARS AT UK, PROFESSOR WHO WROTE MUCH OF KENTUCKY LAW AND INVESTIGATED UK ATHLETICS IS RETIRING

(By John Cheves)

Robert Gene Lawson, who is retiring July 1, wrote much of Kentucky law and taught thousands of the people who practice it.

Lawson spent 50 years as a professor at the University of Kentucky College of Law, and he was dean twice. Among his students were U.S. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, Gov. Steve Beshear, U.S. Reps. Andy Barr and Ed Whitfield, and most of the Kentucky Supreme Court.

''It's been really interesting watching my students go on in life,'' Lawson, 76, said Friday, sitting in a cluttered campus office that showed no sign of getting packed up any time soon. ''They've done important things and mostly have done them well.''

Lawson built an equally large reputation for himself outside the classroom. He authored the state's penal code for criminal offenses and its rules of courtroom evidence. He harangued the General Assembly, with what he considers limited success, for packing the state's jails and prisons with the mentally ill and the addicted. He led investigations into ethics violations at the UK Athletics Department, which didn't win him many friends, and into the nightmarish Beverly Hills Supper Club fire in 1977 that killed 165 people in northern Kentucky.

''He was Kentucky law,'' said Allison Connelly, a onetime Lawson student who later joined him on the law school faculty. ''He has done so much, when you look at his lifetime of work, to make Kentucky a better place.''

The son of a coal miner, Lawson was born in 1938 in a tiny Logan County, W.Va., community almost entirely owned by Island Creek Coal Co. His father urged him to escape the coal camp through an education. He worked his way through tuition-free Berea College and then earned a law degree at UK in 1963.

After two years of practicing law, which he enjoyed, Lawson accepted an invitation in 1965 to teach at UK.

''I never thought I'd stay here,'' he said. ''I thought I'd try teaching for a little bit, see what it was like, and get back into my law practice. But it was a wonderful experience from day one—for one thing: being around all of these bright young people.''

Lawson's specialty is Kentucky criminal law and evidence law. He wrote the books on those subjects, books that occupy the shelves of law libraries and judicial chambers. In the 1970s, he worked with the legislature to rewrite the state's penal code, which was hugely disorganized at the time. ''We had never reformed our criminal laws in Kentucky, so you had offenses that had been added one by one over a period of, what, 150 years, 180 years, and a lot of inconsistency in how these offenses were treated,'' he said.

To Lawson's frustration, within a decade of his penal code work, the national ''war on drugs'' and concern over urban violence led politicians in Kentucky and elsewhere to enact much tougher sentencing laws.

It's one thing to imprison a murderer for decades, but these new laws put even minor criminals behind bars for long stretches, Lawson said. For example: In dozens of Kentucky cases Lawson researched, people were convicted of the felony of ''drug trafficking within 1,000 yards of a school'' after police caught them with a small personal stash of drugs in their homes or cars several blocks from a school.

''Bob Lawson's philosophy was always, 'You lock up the people who genuinely scare you because they're dangerous, they're violent, and for the other people, you see if you can't rehabilitate them and make them productive members of society,' '' said Fayette Family Court Judge Kathy Stein, a former chairwoman of the state House Judiciary Committee.

In 1974, the year Lawson's penal code changes took effect, Kentucky spent $11 million housing about 3,000 inmates at two prisons. This year, the state expects to spend about $500 million to keep about 22,000 inmates in 12 prisons and dozens of county jails that are paid to hold the state's felon spillover.

The General Assembly's effort four years ago to cut the inmate population—at Lawson's urging—has fallen short ''because they aimed too low,'' he said. ''They tinkered; they did too little.''

Some county jails are so overcrowded that state inmates who are serving five to 10 years must sleep on the floor and seldom leave their cells, he said. There is little education or addiction treatment provided, so felons are no better off when they're finally released, and in many cases, they're probably harder than ever, he said.

''We got mad at the people who were committing criminal offenses, and we veered away from a philosophy of trying to correct them, which originally had been the thrust of our justice system,'' Lawson said. ''We jacked up the penalties on everything. As a result, we've created this huge problem of trying to pay for all of this. We're just making things worse for ourselves than they were.''

One of Lawson's other crusades over the years was trying to be a watchdog of UK's lucrative and popular sports programs. At the request of various UK presidents, he led investigations into possible ethics violations, including cases that brought about the departures of basketball coach Eddie Sutton in 1989 and athletics director Larry Ivy in 2002.

In 2002, as a member of the UK Athletics Administration's board of directors, Lawson cast the sole dissenting vote against hiring Mitch Barnhart as athletics director. Lawson said he didn't object to Barnhart, but the $375,000-a-year salary was ''ridiculous'' compared to the more modest sums paid to other UK faculty and staff. (Barnhart remains in the job and now makes $600,000 a year.)

Over the past 50 years, the UK Athletics Department evolved into its own universe with its own rules, Lawson said.

''They have become an independent entity, separate from the rest of the university, which is a problem,'' he said. ''Their budget is their budget. The athletics department regards the money that comes in for athletics as their money, not the university's money.

''And I guess I have felt, watching it through the years, that they sort of lost what I would consider to be a reasonable connection of these students to the university as compared to athletics. Let me just give you an example. When I first came here, the basketball season was 20 games. It's now 40. I have my doubts about how they can be a legitimate college student when they've got that problem.''

Lawson said he also regrets the explosion in tuition costs at UK and other state universities around the nation, largely because of shrinking public support from state governments. The next UK budget will get just eight percent of its revenue from state appropriations, the smallest share ever.

''I think everyone who is 50 years old and older—including me—ought to be ashamed of themselves for what we're doing to our young people, making an education all but unaffordable,'' he said.

''When Mitch McConnell and Steve Beshear were in my classroom, I doubt they paid much more than $100 a semester for

their tuition. They went to school almost without any cost, substantially free,'' Lawson said. ''A resident law student next year will pay between $21,000 and $22,000 in tuition. You can't work your way through school at that level. I have students graduating with $100,000 or more in loan debts that will affect them for the rest of their lives. Shame on us.''

EGYPT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week Egyptian government investigators working on behalf of a judge who is overseeing a 4-year-old case against international and Egyptian nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, visited the main office of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, or CIHRS, and asked for registration and financial documents. The investigators reportedly tried to pass off an informal search warrant as legal cover, but CIHRS staff made clear they couldn't search the office without an official one. The investigators left, but their message was clear: a new crackdown is on the way.

According to information I have received, CIHRS is the second organization to receive such a visit this year. The same investigators previously visited another organization, the Egyptian Democratic Academy, and looked into their activities and funding sources. Four members of the academy have since been banned from leaving Egypt.

Some Senators may remember this case: it is the same one that led to the conviction of 43 foreign and Egyptian NGO workers, including 16 Americans, in 2013. The fact that the Egyptian authorities have decided to resuscitate this old case against these NGOs shows that President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi's administration is confident that it can silence critical voices with little international objection.

Since the 2011 revolution, the government has made several efforts to replace a harsh 2002 law on associations—unevenly implemented under former President Hosni Mubarak—with even more draconian regulations, including a draft law that would have given the government and security agencies effective veto power over NGO boards of directors, foreign funding, and very existence. Although a new law has yet to be passed, the authorities have previously raided or detained staff from respected organizations such as the Hisham Mubarak Law Center, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and the Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights.

I am deeply concerned with the reinvigoration of this 4-year-old case and the message it sends about Cairo's intent to restrict independent NGOs. I am similarly concerned with recent press reports alleging that the authorities have disappeared a significant number of young people, some of whom later died, in a coordinated campaign, activists say, to silence dissent. Such actions, if true, are deplorable and are no way to effectively combat terrorism and related insecurity.

Support for a strong and flourishing independent civil society is a critical part of any pluralistic society, but we are seeing the reverse in Egypt. As the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of State and Foreign Operations which provides assistance for Egypt, I am dismayed by the al-Sisi government's rejection of basic freedoms, whether it is the right to express oneself or the right to assemble. Such repressive tactics are not likely to contribute to greater security or stability in Egypt—instead they are likely to do just the opposite.

VOTES ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT AND MOTION TO PROCEED TO DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the honorable men and women in Maryland—including the 28,939 men and women on Active Duty, the 6,223 in the National Guard, our Reservists, and our civilian employees and contractors—who are serving our Nation.

When I go around the State to bases such as Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Fort Meade, Fort Detrick, the U.S. Naval Academy, and others, I see the people who put their lives on the line every day to defend America.

I support you. I am fighting to make sure you and your families have the resources you need, from equipment, to training, to fresh, healthy food at our commissaries. That is why today I voted against the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act and the motion to proceed to the Defense appropriations bill. My vote was not a vote against our national defense; it was a vote for our national defense. It was a vote to end sequester and a vote for military readiness.

How will voting against a funding bill help end sequester? Because it brings us to the table now—in June—to agree on how we are going to fund the vital programs that we all agree are necessary to protect our Nation. Not in September. Not in November. Not when another funding deadline looms or when there is a clock ticking until the government shuts down. We are going to address this now, so the Senate can do its job to support our troops, our military families, our veterans, and our national security.

National security is more than the Department of Defense. We need diplomacy around the world to prevent conflicts when we can and end them once started. So we need our State Department. We need embassy security to keep our Foreign Service safe—and that is not funded by the Department of Defense.

Our law enforcement agencies here at home also protect our national security. The FBI, tracking down ''lone wolf'' terrorists; the Coast Guard, protecting our coasts from smugglers and drug traffickers; Customs and Border Patrol; the Drug Enforcement Administration; Immigration and Customs Enforcement—all standing sentry to protect America. Yet none are funded by the Department of Defense.

Nation states and organized crime are infiltrating our cyber networks, and we need the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to help us protect dot-com and dot-gov. Those key cyber warriors are not funded by the Department of Defense.

Finally, we need troops ready for duty. Sadly, only one in four recruits can pass muster, many for lack of education or lack of physical fitness. We need great schools turning out great graduates ready to work. We need childhood nutrition to feed them healthy meals that build healthy bodies. But education and nutrition are not funded by the Department of Defense.

In order make the Department of Defense successful, we need to stop hollowing out America. This means making sure our other agencies have the resources necessary to meet national security needs at home and abroad.

However, the Republican Budget uses two sets of rules—first, pretend funding for basic, essential military operations—things that are supposed to be in the base budget—taken from the Overseas Contingency Operations, OCO, account that was created for funding wars. This gimmick allows $38 billion of extra defense spending by evading the budget caps. The second rule the Republicans are using is saying: We are going to apply the sequester budget constraints to the rest of the Federal agencies. That is not acceptable, but we can fix it.

We need to end sequester for defense, without gimmicks, and we need to end sequester for the rest of our agencies. We need to make sure defense has the right resources, but we also need to make sure that the other agencies that protect our country and make it great and are not included in the Defense bill have the resources they need too. Today, I voted no to moving to the Defense appropriations bill, but that no is meant to speed up the process of getting a better outcome for our troops and our country.

Many of my colleagues fail to mention that we in Congress can go through these motions: We can pass funding bills, go to conference, and send them to the President's desk. But that will do no good if the President vetoes these bills, which he has said he will do if they include budget gimmicks.

I hope that after having this vote, our leadership will sit down and negotiate a new budget deal, now in June. We need to have a real solution for the budget constraints that impact all of

our Federal agencies, so that our Nation can be protected and the government can serve the people. That is what the people deserve.

RECOGNIZING THE SIXTH BIENNIAL JAMAICAN DIASPORA CONFERENCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today, I want to take a moment to recognize the important relationship between the United States and Jamaica and the role Jamaican Americans play in promoting trade and development between our two nations.

The United States has a robust and important relationship with Jamaica. President Obama's trip to Jamaica in April 2015 illustrated that we see Jamaica as a key regional leader and that we have a strong interest in strengthening our bilateral security relationship with Jamaica.

The United States is Jamaica's leading partner in trade, chief source of foreign direct investment, FDI, and home to the largest Jamaican diaspora in the world. The more than 1 million Jamaicans in the United States make crucial contributions to the Jamaican economy through remittances and support for friends and family still in Jamaica. Proud Jamaicans like Delaware's Lorraine Badley connect business leaders with opportunities for investment and trade, host ministers and other Jamaican officials, and strengthen community connections in both countries.

From Bob Marley, who first emigrated from Jamaica to my home State, to former NBA basketball player Patrick Ewing and former Secretary of State Collin Powell, first- and second-generation Jamaican Americans have made significant and lasting contributions to our economy, sports, art, and political system.

The Jamaican Government recognizes the critical role Jamaicans living abroad play in Jamaica's economic advancement, and this week they are hosting the Sixth Biennial Jamaica Diaspora Conference in Montego Bay. The conference brings together members of the Jamaican diaspora from the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and other countries to build connections and boost diaspora investment in the Jamaican economy. I would like to commend the Jamaican Government for their efforts to diversify their economy and become a regional leader in trade and investment.

The Diaspora Conference taking place this week will leverage that support into targeted investments to grow Jamaica's infrastructure, ports, and logistics capacity to make it the central hub for the transport of goods between Latin America and the United States.

As the Jamaica Diaspora Conference draws to a close, the United States looks forward to seeing new partnerships between the Jamaicans and the Jamaican diaspora emerge to further an economic development agenda that will result in mutual growth and benefit both our countries.

TRIBUTE TO SISTER MARGARITA BREWER

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a 2015 Northern Kentucky University Lincoln Award recipient, my friend and a community leader, Sister Margarita M. Brewer.

Sister Margarita has dedicated her life to serving the Latino community in Greater Cincinnati. Originally from Panama, Sister Margarita has taken an active role in programs assisting the underserved in her local community as well as in Central America.

Sister Margarita founded the English Language Learning—ELL—Foundation, Inc., in 2003 and continues to serve as its president, working with Cincinnati public schools to help English language learners become successful in their academic lives while fostering their cultural identities.

I had the privilege of being one of Sister Margarita's ELL tutors while serving in the House of Representatives. I had to stop tutoring when I was appointed U.S. Trade Representative, but during my time as a tutor, I had the chance to see her good work in action. More recently, my wife Jane has worked as an ELL tutor and shares my admiration for Sister Margarita and her service. Jane was honored to receive the English Language Learning Foundation Tutor of the Year Award in 2014.

In collaboration with Latino Programs and Services' English Language Learners Program at Northern Kentucky University, she also helped develop NKY's Fun with Science Camp, exposing students to all fields of science through hands-on learning activities.

Additionally, Sister Margarita has been involved with the Crossroad Health Center, Family Service of Cincinnati, and Christian Community Health Services.

I join the community in congratulating Sister Margarita, who has served the people of Greater Cincinnati and Ohio with distinction.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to honor Lincoln University of Jefferson City, MO, on the 125th anniversary of the signing of the Second Morrill Act of 1890, which provided Lincoln University and many other historically Black colleges and universities with land-grant institution status. Lincoln University has provided student-centered, post secondary education opportunities to countless students from a variety of backgrounds for more than a century.

On January 14, 1866, Lincoln University, at the time called the Lincoln Institute, was founded by soldiers and officers of the 62nd United States Colored Infantry, following their service in the Civil War. After its incorporation and the establishment of its board of trustees, the institution opened its doors to the first class in its history on September 17, 1866. Lincoln Institute moved to its current campus in 1871, where it would eventually gain land-grant university status under the Second Morrill Act of 1890.

Since then, Lincoln University, which changed its name from the Lincoln Institute in 1921, has continued to provide a wide variety of educational specializations with over 50 bachelor's degree programs along with master's degree programs in education, business, and the social sciences. Outside of its well-known, grant-funded research programs, Lincoln has also distinguished itself with its popular nursing program and state-of-the-art aquaculture facilities.

Lincoln University is an outstanding and diverse educational institution that continues to impact future generations by looking forward without ever forgetting its roots. I congratulate Lincoln University on more than a century of successes.•

RECOGNIZING THE CARSON CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 70th anniversary of the Carson City Chamber of Commerce, an important entity to Northern Nevada. I am proud to honor this chamber that gives so much support to local businesses and continues to fight to grow the capital city's economy and job market.

Growing up in Carson City and spending a lot of time working in my dad's automotive shop, I learned the importance of a day's work and what it took for my father to keep his business. No doubt, Carson City's businesses—small and large—play an important role in our State's growth.

It is through the hard work of the Carson City Chamber of Commerce that the business community continues to strive and maintain a high quality of life for Carson City residents. Even when Nevada's economy took a difficult turn, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce was there every step of the way to lift local businesses back up. It helped owners adapt to an adverse economic climate through innovation, creativity, and ingenuity. To say this chamber has had a positive impact on Northern Nevada would be an understatement. The strong foundation it has built will be felt for years to come.

Aside from helping local businesses expand and thrive, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce also offers Carson City's entrepreneurs networking opportunities, social functions, and educational programs. It is highly involved throughout the community, gathering volunteers to clean and revamp areas across the city, as well as supporting the sheriff and district attorney's offices. The chamber has 11 directors and 5 committee executives, all

dedicated to making Nevada's capital the best it can be. I am thankful for their leadership and for the great things they are doing for businesses in Northern Nevada.

For the past 70 years, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and true dedication to Nevada. Without the hard work of those who have served this chamber, Carson City would not have developed to be the city it is today. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Carson City Chamber of Commerce on its 70th anniversary and in thanking it for all it does to press on and find ways to unleash the Nevada comeback.●

CONGRATULATING SERGEANT JON WRIGHT, RETIRED

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate SGT Jon Wright, Retired, on receiving a Bronze Star with V-Device for valor, honoring his heroic actions while serving this great Nation. It gives me great pleasure to recognize Mr. Wright for both his bravery and his accomplishments during his time with the U.S. Army.

On March 24, 2010, Mr. Wright, who was serving in Afghanistan, led and acted as security for a squad of engineers and explosive ordnance disposal team members working to diminish improvised explosive devices, IEDs. Soldiers from Wright's squad noticed three bystanders, one of whom threw a grenade, landing between Mr. Wright and another sergeant. Mr. Wright quickly responded by picking up the grenade and throwing it away from his group, ultimately saving the lives of those around him. His lifesaving actions were heroic and selfless and remain invaluable to this country.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. Wright for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our nation.

His commitment to helping those around him, as well as serving the country, demonstrates his unwavering selfless character. His actions represent only the greatest of Nevada's values, including a sense of community and an obligation to help others.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. Mr. Wright's sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

Mr. Wright continues to serve his community and now lives in Lovelock with his wife and three children. He retired from the U.S. Army nearly 4 years ago and earned a degree in environmental science from American Military University. He now works for a mining company and the local youth football league.

Throughout his tenure, Mr. Wright demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the U.S. Army. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Jon Wright on his much-deserved accolade and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING DELTA FUEL

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses are often vital in driving rural economies. The success of these entities provides crucial job creation and economic opportunity—especially among low-income and minority populations. This week I am proud to recognize Delta Fuel of Ferriday, LA, as Small Business of the Week.

In 1977, a small bulk fuel distributor serving ranchers and farmers was founded in the heart of the Louisiana and Mississippi Delta region. Today, Delta Fuel has grown to employ over 65 workers between their eight operations—7 in Louisiana and 1 in Mississippi—serving a cross-section of the agriculture, construction, aviation, marine, government, manufacturing, automotive, emergency response, and trucking industries with a variety of fuels, lubes, tanks, trailers, oil stations, and lube equipment. In a State known for its robust energy and natural resource industries, Delta Fuel's reputation for dependability, reliability, and exceptional service standards has helped it become one of the fastest growing distributors in the southeast.

In rural east Louisiana, Clint Vegas, president of Delta Fuel, has led the company to exponential growth, earning the company numerous recognitions as one of the most successful Hispanic-owned businesses in the United States. Vegas' business skills have led to crucial job creation for the region. Delta Fuel's success can be attributed in part to their being located in a Historically Underutilized Business Zone, or HUBZone. The Small Business Administration's HUBZone program was created to spur economic activity in economically disadvantaged areas—helping small businesses in urban and rural communities gain preferential access to government contracting opportunities. By using the resources at hand, including the HUBZone program, Delta Fuel has been able to expand, resulting in the addition of numerous jobs and service centers throughout the rural east Louisiana region.

Congratulations again to Delta Fuel for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your continued commitment to creating quality jobs and advancing economic opportunity in East Louisiana.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:51 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2505. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans.

H.R. 2507. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage.

H.R. 2570. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2582. An act 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 make improvements to the Medicare Adjustment risk adjustment system, and for other purposes.

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2505. An act 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 Finance.

H.R. 2507. An act 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 Finance.

H.R. 2570. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2582. An act to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, to make improvements to the Medicare Adjustment risk adjustment system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–67).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1619. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–68).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1635. An original bill to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Lawrence B. Jackson and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Luke M. McCollum, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Christina M. Alvarado, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Katherine A. McCabe, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Grafton D. Chase, Jr., to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Daniel V. MacInnis, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Captain Alan D. Beal and ending with Captain Andrew C. Lennon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Brian K. Antonio and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Mark R. Whitney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Paul A. Sohl, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Nancy A. Norton and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Robert D. Sharp, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Terry J. Moulton, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Bret J. Muilenburg, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Mark L. Leavitt, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Ann M. Burkhardt, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. James P. Downey and ending with Capt. Stephen F. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Navy nomination of Capt. Michael W. Zarkowski, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. David G. Manero, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Paul Pearigen, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Anne M. Swap, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Peter G. Stamatopoulos, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. John W. Korka, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Col. Paul E. Bauman, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Antonio A. Aguto, Jr. and ending with Colonel Daniel R. Walrath, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. William W. Way, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Michael K. Hanifan and ending with Brig. Gen. Daniel M. Krumrei, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Hugh T. Corbett and ending with Colonel Gervasio Ortiz Lopez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. William C. Mayville, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Colonel Michael S. Cederholm and ending with Colonel Rick A. Uribe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. Clifford B. Chick, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. John W. Hesterman III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Leela J. Gray, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Donald B. Tatum, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Timothy E. Gowen, to be Major General .

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. William A. Brown, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Ronald F. Lewis, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert B. Abrams, to be General.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. John G. Baker, to be Brigadier General.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Daniel A. Lapostole, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Cynthia Aitaholmes and ending with Ryan J. Wang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Donald W. Algeo and ending with Amy L. H. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015. (minus 2 nominees: James V. Crawford; Colin A. Meghoo)

Army nominations beginning with Robert B. Allman III and ending with Edward J. Yurus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Lyde C. Andrews and ending with D012582, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nomination of Elizabeth M. Libao, to be Major.

Army nomination of John J. Morris, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher A. Wodarz, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Karen M. Wrancher, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Susan R. Cloft, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Robert A. Petersen and ending with Gene C. Wynne, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Ian D. Branum and ending with Bryan P. Hyde, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Josue M. Bellinger and ending with Donald E. Meserve, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with George J. Eberly III and ending with David Garlinghouse, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nomination of Gregory K. Emery, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel B. Copeland and ending with George W. Laskey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Scott W. Arnold and ending with Kurt J. Zahnen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher P. Brown and ending with Van T. Wennen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sabrina J. Bobkowski and ending with Diane C. Leblanc, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin R. Boardman and ending with Sean P. Mcdonald, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nomination of Carl O. Pistole, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jon E. Rugg, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Victor S. Chen and ending with Elizabeth A. Zimmermannyoung, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Donald W. Babcock, Jr. and ending with John J. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Glen A. Dieleuterio and ending with William Y. Pike, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard A. Braunbeck III and ending with Jeffrey J.

Pronesti, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Thurraya S. Kent and ending with Wendy L. Snyder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael E. Biery and ending with Ricky M. Ursery, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Neil T. Smith and ending with Dominick A. Vincent, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jason B. Babcock and ending with Christopher P. Slattery, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Nicholas E. Andrews and ending with Vincent S. Tionquiao, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sowon S. Ahn and ending with Craig M. Whittinghill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven W. Connell and ending with Michael A. Whitt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Christine J. Caston and ending with James V. Walsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael A. Hurni and ending with Elizabeth R. Sanabia, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert C. Bandy and ending with Douglas L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Dominic S. Caronello and ending with Michael J. Supko, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Fatmatta M. Kuyateh and ending with Michael J. Scarcella, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Maregina L. Wicks, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Nikki K. Conlin, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael R. Cathey and ending with Eric H. Twerdahl, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Teresa M. Allen and ending with Joon S. Yun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Martin J. Anerino and ending with Martha S. Scotty, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with David J. Bacon and ending with Richard G. Zeber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Arthur R. Blum and ending with Florencio J. Yuzon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Patrick K. Amersbach and ending with Nancy V. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Craig L. Abraham and ending with Scott Y. Yamamoto, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Chad M. Brooks and ending with Rod W. Tribble, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Heather J. Walton, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with William A. Hlavin and ending with Bashon W. Mann, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Jacky P. Cheng, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles S. Abbot and ending with David G. Zook, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with John J. Andrew and ending with Mark C. Wadsworth, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with David A. Backer and ending with Scott E. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Antonio Alemar and ending with John L. Young III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Lyle P. Ainsworth and ending with Juan C. Varela, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Karin R. Burzynski and ending with Francisco E. Magallon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Paolo Carcavallo, Jr. and ending with Matthew G. Zublic, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Shelley D. Caplan and ending with Mike E. Svatek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Audrey G. Adams and ending with Joel A. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Eugene A. Albin and ending with Kenya D. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Allan M. Baker and ending with Dennis M. Zogg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert E. Beaton and ending with James L. Willett, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul T. Antony and ending with Peter C. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey M. Clark and ending with Carol W. Watt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Laura M. Mussulman and ending with Kenneth W. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Kerry L. Abramson and ending with Ian K. Thornhill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Tamberlynn W. Baker and ending with Angelia W. Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Saravoot P. Bagwell and ending with Kathy M. Warren, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory T. Stehman and ending with Rodney E. Tugade, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Terry W. Eddinger and ending with David R. Glassmire, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Daryll D. Long and ending with Milton W. Washington, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Holman R. Agard and ending with Mark E. Zematis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nomination of Natalie R. Bakan, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Patrick R. O'Mara, to be Commander.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1604. A bill to establish the Transition to Independence Medicaid Buy-In Option demonstration program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1605. A bill to amend the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 to authorize concurrent compacts for purposes of regional economic integration and cross-border collaborations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1606. A bill to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative strategies and methods to increase out-of-school access to digital learning resources for eligible students in order to increase student and educator engagement and disseminate evidence-based strategies to relevant

stakeholders and the public; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1607. A bill to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1608. A bill to protect the safety of the national airspace system from the hazardous operation of consumer drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1609. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1610. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement officers, promote accountability for State and local law enforcement agencies, reenfranchise citizens, eliminate sentencing disparities, and promote reentry and employment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1611. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1612. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1613. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding the likeness of a woman on the ten dollar bill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1614. A bill to provide for the inclusion of court-appointed guardianship improvement and oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. KING, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1615. A bill to reform and modernize domestic refugee resettlement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1616. A bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic souring opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1617. A bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1618. A bill to reallocate Federal Government-held spectrum for commercial use, to promote wireless innovation and enhance wireless communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

S. 1619. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1620. A bill to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1621. A bill to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and Internet access service through the Lifeline program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1622. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to devices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1623. A bill to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1624. A bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1625. A bill to require a report on the location of C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1626. A bill to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, improve safety, streamline rail project delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1627. A bill to ensure the Secretary of State complies fully with reporting requirements in section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1628. A bill to preserve the current amount of basic allowance for housing for certain married members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1629. A bill to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 1630. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 to deter labor slowdowns at ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1631. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1632. A bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1633. A bill to require that the face of Federal Reserve Notes bear the likeness of Jeannette Rankin before the likeness of any other woman appears on a Federal Reserve Note, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1634. A bill to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORKER:

S. 1635. An original bill to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1636. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 1637. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1638. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress information on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1639. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assure educational stability for children in foster care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 204. A resolution recognizing June 20, 2015 as ''World Refugee Day''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 205. A resolution congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 206. A resolution congratulating the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 349

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 349, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts.

S. 389

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 389, a bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to terminate Operation Choke Point.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 600

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 600, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency retrofit pilot program.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 845

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 845, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to implement security measures in the electronic tax return filing process to prevent tax refund fraud from being perpetrated with electronic identity theft.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, and for other purposes.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1347

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1347, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by

such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1362, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

S. 1434

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1434, a bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish an energy storage portfolio standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

S. 1516

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1516, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit to provide greater incentives for industrial energy efficiency.

S. 1528

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1528, a bill to improve energy savings by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 1543

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1543, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 1552

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1552, a bill to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

S. 1588

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1588, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1772

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1772 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1608. A bill to protect the safety of the national airspace system from the hazardous operation of consumer drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Consumer Drone Safety Act.

In recent years, privately-operated unmanned aircraft have grown in popularity and capability. In many ways, this is brand new technology.

It is worrisome that these new drones, which are capable of flying thousands of feet in the air and at speeds in excess of 30 miles per hour, are available commercially to completely untrained consumers.

This combination of advanced new technology and broad availability has resulted in a rising number of reports of dangerous operations and narrowly avoided mid-air collisions between drones and passenger planes.

Our airports, pilots and travelers deserve meaningful safety protections, as do the people on the ground, in our stadiums and on our highways.

If we don't act, it's only a matter of time before we have a tragedy on our hands.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act would put in place common-sense safety precautions to minimize the risk of disaster.

As with any new technology, drones have attracted significant interest and have promising commercial uses, including package delivery, search and rescue, pipeline inspection, and agriculture.

I agree that the possibilities for this technology are promising, if properly managed. That is why I support research to make sure that the technology is safe and can be used in ways that respect people's privacy.

But there is no question that the technology comes with great risks, and its potential will never be developed if there is a big aircraft disaster.

What if, for example, a drone accidentally flew into a jet engine and brought down a commercial airliner? What if an airliner, having been hit by a drone on approach to a major airport like JFK or LAX, crashes in an urban area?

Safety must come first.

In the last year, unlawful drone use has proliferated and it's clear that there is a high risk to public safety.

In July of 2014, following an exposé by Craig Whitlock of the Washington Post, I wrote to the Federal Aviation Administration asking for data about drone flights and accidents.

What I received from the FAA was—simply put—startling, and it really crystallized for me the magnitude of the problem we face.

In nine months last year, from March through November, there were approximately 25 incidents where a drone nearly collided in midair with a manned aircraft, sometimes requiring evasive action.

In this time period, there were more than 190 incident reports. Since July 1, at least one incident per day was reported to the FAA. For example: On May 29, 2014, two aircraft on approach to LAX reported a ''trash can sized'' unmanned aircraft at 6,500 feet above ground level.

On June 29, 2014, an airplane on descent to Dulles Airport reported a near midair collision with a drone that flew within 50 feet of the plane at 2,800 feet above ground level.

On September 8, 2014, three separate airplanes reported ''a very close call'' with a drone on descent to LaGuardia airport at 1,900 feet above ground level.

On October 12, 2014, an aircraft near Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma reported taking evasive action at 4,800 feet above ground level to avoid a drone that came between 10 to 20 feet of the plane.

On February 8, 2015, a Southwest passenger jet on its way to land at LAX and reported that a small red drone flew ''right over the top'' of the plane at 4,000 feet above ground level.

These close calls are absolutely unacceptable. It is not just airplanes and airports that are at risk. For example, the general manager of the Golden Gate Bridge reports that drones routinely fly over traffic on the bridge. One drone recently crashed onto the bridge roadway.

Drones equipped with cameras have also flown by the bridge in areas where photography is not permitted for security reasons, which is alarming.

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection—CAL FIRE—is also growing increasingly concerned about the unsafe use of drones. It reports that during last year's fire season, there were numerous incidents involving drones.

For example, in September, one of its helicopters, which was responding to the Pasqualie fire, had to brake in midair to avoid colliding with a recreational drone just 10 feet ahead of it.

In May, several drones were filming an active firefight in order to post videos online. If local police hadn't been able to identify the operators and convince them to stop, CAL FIRE believes it might have had to shut down its aerial firefighting operations for the Poinsettia and Cocos fires to avoid the risk of collision.

As far back as 2012, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, has issued

warnings about obstacles to the safe operation of drones, which include the fact that many drones cannot ''detect, sense and avoid'' other aircraft or objects in the airspace.

Drones are also plagued by a phenomenon known as ''lost link''—in which the remote connection between the pilot on the ground and the aircraft is simply lost, resulting in a loss of command and control of the aircraft.

The GAO's report also noted that many drones ''currently use unprotected radio spectrum and, like any other wireless technology, remain vulnerable to unintentional or intentional interference.''

GAO continued: ''This remains a key security and safety vulnerability because, in contrast to a manned aircraft in which the pilot has direct physical control of the aircraft, interruption of radio transmissions can sever the UAS's only means of control.''

Even the operators of consumer drones often know that their operations can be dangerous. Let me just read to you from one commenter on Amazon's page for a popular consumer drone:

> It just kept climbing as it disappeared into the clouds. I lost visual, and was sure I'd never see my Phantom again. . . . From calculations based on DJI's web site that it climbs [6 meters per second, which means it attained an altitude . . . somewhere between 5,000 and 7,000 feet. I didn't realize until I got video back.

The commentator continued: ''This is 'not' good, though, since until I saw the video, I didn't realize I was in controlled airspace. Do 'not' do this.''

This comment, to me, is really emblematic of what is happening. Consumers with no training, certification, or instruction are buying highly-capable drones with few technological safeguards.

There are precautions we can take to reduce the risk of a catastrophic accident.

For example, after a consumer drone crashed on the White House lawn in January 2015, the manufacturer voluntarily released a firmware update to prevent flights near Washington, D.C.

The update was easy for consumers and commonsense. However, the FAA has no authority to require all manufacturers to follow suit, or to specify other areas that deserve similar protection.

Another easy precaution is education of drone operators. For example, the FAA has partnered with the Academy of Model Aeronautics, the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International, and the Small UAV Coalition to develop an educational campaign called ''Know Before You Fly.''

This campaign includes sensible advice about staying under 400 feet in elevation, keeping the drone within range of eyesight, flying sober, and staying away from pedestrians, vehicles, and airports.

However, the FAA can't require manufacturers to print this type of information and include it in the box for consumers when they buy a new drone.

FAA needs the authority to require these basic safety precautions.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act calls for sensible new safety regulations in how drones are manufactured and used.

These new safety regulations apply only to consumer drones: civil unmanned aircraft that are manufactured for commercial distribution and that are equipped with an automatic stabilization system or are capable of providing a video signal allowing operations beyond the visual line of sight of the operator.

Notably, this definition does not override Section 336 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, which means that model aircraft flown for recreational purposes would continue to be subject to the safety guidelines of a community-based organization rather than to operational regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The bill has operational requirements

The Consumer Drone Safety Act directs the FAA to clearly lay out what is acceptable for consumer drones that are operated outside the programming of a community-based organization, detailing when, where, and under what conditions drones can be operated. This includes how high, how close to airports or stadiums, and under what weather conditions a drone may be flown.

The bill has manufacturer requirements.

Any drone advanced enough to fly autonomously should also be equipped with advanced safety features, including geo-fencing.

But FAA does not currently have authority to require even the most basic safety precautions like providing educational materials.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act authorizes FAA to set meaningful safety requirements for manufacturers. These may include geo-fencing to govern the altitude and location of flights, a transponder or other method for pilots and air traffic control to detect and identify the drones, collision-avoidance software, and precautions for the loss of a communications link, anti-tampering safeguards, and educational materials.

The bill also requires manufactures to update existing consumer drones to meet these new requirements when feasible.

The bill would allow FAA to exempt particular types of consumer drones from any requirement that is technologically infeasible or cost-prohibitive if other precautions enable safe operations.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act is straightforward, balanced, and necessary. For the first time, it would allow the FAA to proactively respond to the increasing use and capabilities of consumer drones by requiring sensible precautions to protect the safety of our nation's airports and hospital helipads, stadiums and fairgrounds, bridges, electrical infrastructure, highways, and city sidewalks.

Congress must not wait for a tragedy before taking action. I encourage my colleagues to join me in this legislation to ensure that consumer drones are built and operated safely.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1609. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, as the labor market of the 21st century continues to transform, it will be critical to ensure that American workers are equipped with the skills and expertise needed to meet the variety of demands in the global marketplace It is critical that we continue to reform and update our education system to ensure that America's students are prepared for cutting-edge careers. Today, many students enter high school and postsecondary education with little knowledge of the careers available to them outside of traditional pathways. Research has found that few middle school students have a lack of understanding of how what they are learning in school relates to careers. With college costs continuing to rise, it is critical that students have exposure to the wide range of available work and career choices early in their academic careers so that, by the time they enter high school, they are more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them.

Career and technical education, CTE, programs play a pivotal role in preparing students for America's job market, and are proven to help students explore their own strengths and preferences, and match up with potential future careers. However, a lack of Federal investment in middle school CTE programming often means students have to wait until high school for this exposure.

Middle school is a critical time when students explore their own strengths, likes, and dislikes, and begin to form long-term career goals. Studies have found that middle school students who participate in career and technical education development programs that promote career exploration skills are able to make more informed career decisions by increasing knowledge of career options and career pathways that match their interests. Additionally, these programs play a positive role in engaging students in the classroom and on their academic success.

I am proud to introduce the Middle School Technical Education Program Act, which establishes a pilot program for middle schools to partner with postsecondary institutions and local businesses to develop and implement

career and technical exploration programs. This legislation will provide support for middle schools to create career and technical education programs that will provide students with introductory courses, hands-on learning, or afterschool programs. Career guidance and academic counseling is vital to ensuring that our students understand the educational requirements for high-growth, in-demand career fields. Many times students receive this information too late in their academic careers.

We need to work to improve middle school education to prepare students for cutting-edge careers and expose students to the variety of career pathways. This legislation also requires that programs helps students draft a high school graduation plan that demonstrates what courses would prepare them for a given career field. If we provide youth with applied career exploration opportunities, they will be more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them. I am hopeful this bill will help highlight current shortcomings in middle schools, and instigate further discussion on the importance of educating youth early on the multitude of educational and career pathways.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1610. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement officers, promote accountability for State and local law enforcement agencies, reenfranchise citizens, eliminate sentencing disparities, and promote reentry and employment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I have introduced legislation along with Senator CARDIN called the Building And Lifting Trust In order to Multiply Opportunities and Racial Equity, or the BALTIMORE Act.

The people of Sandtown-Winchester, the people of Baltimore, and all Americans need to know they have a government on their side. Right now there is a trust gap between the people and the police department.

Baltimore is my hometown. I have lived there all my life. But what happened in Baltimore earlier this year could have happened anywhere, in anyone's hometown. I don't want to see this happen anywhere else. Where there is broken trust, we must rebuild it. And where there is lost hope, we must restore it.

That is why I joined Senator CARDIN in introducing the BALTIMORE Act. This bill is a package of reforms intended to reestablish a sense of trust between communities and the police departments that protect them.

First, the bill would ban discriminatory profiling by State and local law enforcement based on race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin. The bill makes sure that if police departments are receiving Federal funding, they are also adopting practices to cease the use of discriminatory profiling. It holds police departments accountable by requiring them to share officer training information, including how officers are trained in the use of force, racial and ethnic bias, de-escalating conflicts, and constructive engagement with the public. It also authorizes a grant program to assist local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras.

We need to look at how our sentencing laws contribute to racial disparity in our justice system. That is why this bill would reclassify specific, low-level, non-violent drug possession felonies as misdemeanors. The bill also eliminates the distinction between crack and powder cocaine.

Finally, the bill authorizes $200 million annually for the Department of Labor's Reentry Employment Opportunities Program through the Workforce Investment Opportunity Act. This is important funding to give people a hand up—not a hand out. It also encourages the White House to ''ban the box'' in the Federal contracting process. This would allow employers to eliminate questions about criminal convictions on initial job applications.

Baltimore has begun to heal. We will come together as a community and a city to rebuild. But I do not want to see another great American hometown follow in Baltimore's footsteps. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1625. A bill to require a report on the location of C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1625

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

SECTION 1. REPORT ON THE LOCATION OF C–130 MODULAR AIRBORNE FIREFIGHTING SYSTEM UNITS.

Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the locations of C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS) units. The report shall include the following:

(1) A list of the C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units of the Air Force.

(2) The utilization rates of the units listed under paragraph (1).

(3) A future force allocation determination with respect to such units in order to achieve the most efficient use of such units

(4) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of modifications to the C–130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System program to enhance firefighting capabilities.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1628. A bill to preserve the current amount of basic allowance for housing for certain married members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1628

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

SECTION 1. PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING FOR CERTAIN MARRIED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the amount of basic allowance for housing payable under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, to a member of the uniformed services who is married to another member of the uniformed services shall not be reduced unless—

(1) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station requiring a change of residence; or

(2) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 204—RECOGNIZING JUNE 20, 2015 AS ''WORLD REFUGEE DAY''

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 204

Whereas World Refugee Day is a global day to honor the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children who are forced to flee their homes under the threats of conflict, violence, and persecution;

Whereas according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (referred to in this preamble as ''UNHCR'')—

(1) there are nearly 60,000,000 displaced people worldwide, the highest levels ever recorded, including almost 20,000,000 refugees, 38,000,000 internally displaced people, and 1,800,000 people seeking asylum;

(2) children account for 51 percent of the refugee population in the world;

(3) nearly 4,000,000 refugees have fled Syria since the start of the Syrian conflict and more than 7,600,000 people are internally displaced;

(4) approximately 1,325,000 people are displaced within Ukraine with approximately 800,000 Ukrainians seeking protection in other countries as a result of a worsening humanitarian situation in nongovernment controlled areas;

(5) since April 2015, sporadic outbursts of violence in Burundi have prompted more than 100,000 Burundians to flee to the neighboring countries of Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

(6) violent insurgent attacks in Nigeria have forced 167,000 people to flee to the neighboring countries of Cameroon, Chad,

and Niger, and have internally displaced nearly 1,500,000 people;

(7) more than 88,000 women, men, and children, including many persecuted Rohingya refugees from Burma, have departed on smugglers' boats from the Bay of Bengal since 2014, more than 1,000 of whom have died at sea;

(8) as of June 2015, more than 100,000 refugees and migrants have crossed the Mediterranean Sea from North Africa and at least 1,800 women, men, and children have died during such crossings or are missing;

(9) more than 180,000 Iraqi refugees and nearly 3,000,000 internally displaced Iraqis;

(10) nearly 6,000,000 internally displaced Colombians;

(11) nearly 700,000 South Sudanese refugees in neighboring countries; and

(12) more than 465,000 refugees from the Central African Republic;

Whereas refugees who are women and girls are often at a greater risk of sexual violence and exploitation, forced or early marriage, human trafficking, and other forms of gender-based violence;

Whereas the United States provides critical resources and support to the UNHCR and other international and nongovernmental organizations working with refugees around the world; and

Whereas since 1975, the United States has welcomed more than 3,000,000 refugees who are resettled in communities across the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of the millions of refugees and displaced persons who flee war, persecution, and torture in search of peace, hope, and freedom;

(2) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to continue its international leadership role in response to those who have been displaced, including the most vulnerable populations who endure sexual violence, human trafficking, forced conscription, genocide, and exploitation; and

(B) to find political solutions to existing conflicts and prevent new conflicts from beginning;

(3) commends those who have risked their lives working individually and for the countless nongovernmental organizations and international agencies such as UNHCR that have provided life-saving assistance and helped protect those displaced by conflict around the world; and

(4) reiterates the strong bipartisan commitment of the United States to protect and assist millions of refugees and other forcibly uprooted persons worldwide.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution to mark World Refugee Day, June 20, and to address the growing global crisis of people forcibly displaced by persecution or conflict.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, for the first time since World War II, over 60 million people have been forced from their homes and displaced in their own countries or forced to flee abroad. Last year alone, 14 million people were uprooted by violence and persecution, most escaping conflicts in Syria, Iraq, South Sudan, Ukraine, Burma, and Afghanistan. There are more and more protracted crises, and the result is an exponential increase in humanitarian needs.

The worldwide displacement from wars, conflict, and persecution in 2014 was the highest level recorded and accelerating fast, escalating to 60 million last year from 51.2 million in 2013, and a dramatic increase from the 37.5 million of a decade ago. We are on course to over double the number of refugees worldwide.

The increase since 2013 was the highest ever seen in a single year.

Syria is still the world's largest producer of internally displaced persons at 7.6 million and refugees at nearly 4 million.

The 60 million that I previously mentioned can be broken down to 20 million refugees, over 38 million internally displaced persons, and 1.8 million asylum seekers.

The magnitude of the Syrian disaster is perhaps the most shocking. After 4 years of conflict, the situation is increasingly desperate for both the refugees and the host countries such as Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and northern Iraq. Since 2011, 4 million people have fled Syria. The futures of over 3 million Syrian children have been stolen because they have no access to education. Over 2 million Syrian women are in the neighboring countries trying to survive. Dangerous coping mechanisms are on the rise. More and more families are forced to send their children to work or marry off their young daughters. In the tiny country of Lebanon alone, there are over 300,000 Syrian refugee children who have no access to school.

It is hard to comprehend the demographic, economic, and social impact of millions of refugees in Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey. The number of refugees in Lebanon will be equivalent to 88 million new refugees arriving in the United States. Turkey has already spent $6 billion in direct assistance for refugees in its care. At the same time, many countries in the West have been extraordinarily reluctant to admit the most vulnerable Syrians as refugees. While contributing generously to humanitarian funding, the United States has only accepted about 900 Syrian refugees. Because Syrians are finding it increasingly difficult to find safety, they are being forced to move further afield. Since January, over 100,000 people, mostly from Syria, have crossed the Mediterranean in boats in search of protection in Europe—an extremely dangerous journey.

We know that the Syrian humanitarian disaster, which has destabilized an entire region, is not the accidental byproduct of conflict. It is instead one result of a strategy pursued by the Assad regime. The United Nations Commission of Inquiry in Syria has documented that the Assad regime intentionally engages in the indiscriminate bombardment of homes, hospitals, schools, and water and electrical facilities in order to terrorize the civilian population. ISIL and al-Nusra have also shelled areas with high concentrations of civilians.

In Syria's neighbor next door, Iraq, the number of people requiring humanitarian assistance has grown to 8.2 million people. Three million people have been forced from their homes. Half of the displaced are children.

To the south, in Yemen, there is a grave and escalating humanitarian crisis. The country was particularly vulnerable even before this conflict. Now civilians throughout the country are facing alarming levels of suffering and violence. Over 1 million have been forced from their homes and are now living in empty schools and other public buildings or along highways.

We are also witnessing religious and ethnic persecution become part of the violent conflict that has pushed millions of people out of the regions of Sub-Saharan Africa. The unfolding human tragedy in South Sudan, which is perhaps the most frustrating to me, never should have happened. The violence engulfing that small country is entirely manmade and wholly the responsibility of the President and opposition leader and their affiliate militias and armed groups.

Each leader refuses to prioritize the well-being of his own people and instead continues to seek military advantage, violating multiple ceasefire agreements and refusing to meet numerous deadlines for reaching a peace deal. It is hard to overstate the gravity of conditions in South Sudan. I fear there is no end in sight to the suffering of the people there.

The 18-month conflict in South Sudan has already killed an estimated 50,000 people and has displaced over 2 million more, including one-half million who fled to neighboring countries and over 120,000 sheltering in United Nations peacekeeping bases across the country. A nationwide famine was averted in 2014, thanks largely to the assistance from international community.

But the World Food Programme recently warned that 4.6 million people, nearly half the population, will need food aid by the end of this month. Conditions in the country of Sudan are hardly better for those affected by the continuing conflict in Darfur. Attacks on U.N. peacekeepers are on the rise in Darfur. Military offenses by the Khartoum have caused well over 50,000 people to flee their homes this year. The Khartoum has also expelled international nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, and is trying its best to drive out the U.N. peacekeeping mission in Darfur. This number does not include the hundreds of thousands of people who have fled the violence in the South Kordofan and Blue Nile states. But there has been little information about conditions in government-held areas in both of these states, as Sudan has not allowed human rights investigators access.

In northeastern Nigeria, 1.5 million people have fled their homes due to attacks by the terrorist group Boko Haram. Boko Haram is estimated to have killed over 12,000 people, kidnapped thousands, including 276 girls

from the Chibok School whose whereabouts remain unknown.

Over 74,000 Nigerians are refugees in Cameroon, another 100,000 refugees are in the area. The global refugee trends are indeed alarming. The international assistance being provided is not keeping pace with the scale of the problem. For example, almost halfway through 2015, the United Nation's humanitarian appeal for Syria is only 20 percent funded. Yet, in the spirit of World Refugee Day, we must redouble our efforts to prevent conflicts that force families to flee their homes, villages, and cities. We must also then create the conditions to get these refugees safely back home.

First, we need to ask ourselves hard questions about how we can increase the effectiveness of the assistance we provide. Most refugees live in urban areas, not in traditional refugee camps. Refugees who live in cities face unique vulnerabilities, which must change how international assistance is now being given. Moreover, protracted crises are the new normal. Seventy-five percent of the world refugees are caught in long-term crisis situations, with many refugees displaced for an average of 17 years. We need to use our humanitarian and development dollars more skillfully so we are providing durable solutions to chronic vulnerabilities.

Second, the international community must get serious about protecting the most vulnerable refugees: women and children. Women are facing horrible threats in conflicts across the globe, where rape and sexual assault are being used as weapons of war, and as vulnerable refugees they continue to be targets of gender-based violence. Moreover, children now make up half of all refugees worldwide. We must do more to protect them from sexual exploitation and abuse, recruitment as child soldiers, and early marriages. The United Nations Population Fund, Mercy Corps, the International Rescue Committee, and Catholic Relief Services know how to provide targeted support and protection to women and children refugees, but we in the international community must fund them adequately to do the job.

Third, we must strengthen the capacity of U.N. peacekeeping. As David Miliband, former British Foreign Secretary, now head of the International Rescue Committee noted:

> At a time of cuts in defense budgets, new and asymmetric threats, and record numbers of people fleeing conflict, the case of strengthened and more fairly shared UN peacekeeping is overwhelming. Peacekeepers, properly resourced and led, have never been more needed and the consequences of inaction never more evident.

Finally, we must do more to hold accountable the leaders who are responsible for mass humanitarian atrocities. The U.N. Commissioner for Refugees recently commented that he continues to be shocked by the indifference of those who carry the political responsibility for millions of people being uprooted from their homes. They accept forced displacement, with an impact on individuals, on countries, communities, and entire regions, as normal collateral damage of the wars they lead.

They act with the conviction that humanitarian workers will come and pick up the pieces. It is clear the international humanitarian community can no longer stanch the human misery brought on by this callous indifference and criminal leadership. The international community must hold those responsible accountable, those who break all the rules in pursuit of their war aims.

To that end, it was a grave mistake that between October 2011 and July 2012, Russia and China vetoed three Security Council resolutions which were designed to hold the Syrian Government to account for its mass atrocities. It was also unfortunate that Sudanese President Umar al-Bashir was allowed to depart South Africa earlier this week without being detained again, escaping an arrest warrant from the International Criminal Court, where he would be on trial for crimes against humanity in Darfur.

In closing, we must recognize that as these conflicts proliferate, no corner of the world will be left unaffected. On World Refugee Day, we recognize that every person fleeing his or her home deserves compassion and help and to live in safety and dignity. We must recommit to work smarter and harder to assist the world's most vulnerable people.

Next year on this day, I want to stand before the Senate again and speak of the progress we have made and the lives we have saved by our collective efforts. History will judge us accordingly if we fail.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the United States has long been a safe and welcoming home for those fleeing persecution around the world. The refugees and asylum seekers who join our communities help to create new businesses, build more vibrant neighborhoods, and enrich us all. They are also a reminder of our history as a nation of immigrants and our American values of generosity and compassion. Saturday marks World Refugee Day, and to honor it we must renew our commitment to the ideal of America as a beacon of hope for so many who face human rights abuses abroad.

Millions of refugees remain displaced and warehoused in refugee camps in Eastern Africa, Southeast Asia, and other parts of the world. Ongoing political struggles and military conflicts in the Middle East and North Africa are dislocating large populations. Too many are without their families or safe places to find refuge. Some, though far too few, have been able to flee and rebuild their lives.

Peter Keny, one of the ''Lost Boys'' of South Sudan, is one of those inspiring refugees who escaped a civil war in his home country and has rebuilt his life in my home State of Vermont. He is just one of thousands of refugees Vermonters have welcomed over the years. Peter was 19 when he came to Burlington in 2001, and in the years since he has learned English, completed high school, and is earning a college degree. In describing his voyage to the United States and ultimately to Vermont, Peter told ''The Burlington Free Press'' that arriving here ''was like a dream come true.'' I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article, ''A Found Man Returns to South Sudan.''

I am proud of Vermont's long history of supporting refugees by opening its communities, schools, and homes to those in need. It is not always easy, but it is a powerful example of our belief in the most basic ideals of human dignity and hope, and our commitment to responding to the suffering of others. We are fortunate to have remarkable organizations like the Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program leading the effort with its decades of experience and award-winning volunteer program, and the tremendous legal advocacy provided by the Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates. The hard work of these and other organizations and the daily welcoming gestures of Vermonters all over the State have made Vermont a role model for the rest of the country.

On this year's World Refugee Day, it is also important to acknowledge that there is more that we as a country can and must do. I remain deeply concerned about the administration's expanded family detention policy. The women and children it is placing in prolonged detention have fled extreme violence and persecution in Central America. They come seeking refuge from three of the most dangerous countries in the world, countries where women and girls face shocking rates of domestic and sexual violence and murder. Here in the United States, we recently celebrated the 20th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, a law we hold out as an example of our commitment to take these crimes seriously and to protect all victims. The ongoing detention of asylum-seeking mothers and children who have made credible claims that they have been victims of these very same crimes is unacceptable. I again urge the administration to end the misguided policy of family detention.

We must also do more to address the humanitarian crisis in Syria. Almost 4 million Syrians are officially recognized as refugees by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The vast majority of these are women and children, including hundreds of thousands of children under the age of 5. The United States traditionally accepts at least 50 percent of resettlement cases from UNHCR. However, we

have accepted only approximately 700 refugees since the beginning of the Syrian conflict, an unacceptably low number.

Congress also plays an important role. Soon I will reintroduce the Refugee Protection Act to improve protections for refugees and asylum seekers and provide additional support and improvement to the national resettlement program and groups such as the Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program. This bill, which I have long championed with Representative ZOE LOFGREN, reaffirms the commitments made in ratifying the 1951 Refugee Convention, and will help to restore the United States to its rightful role as a safe and welcoming home for those suffering from persecution around the world.

As we pause to take stock on World Refugee Day, let each of us reflect on what this great country means to those escaping persecution. Let us now and always live by and burnish the light of Lady Liberty's torch, our eternal beacon of hope to those struggling to breathe free.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, June 7, 2015]

A FOUND MAN RETURNS TO SOUTH SUDAN

(By Zach Despart)

Peter Keny sat on the side of the road in late December as the sun disappeared behind the acacia trees. He had traveled more than 7,000 miles from Burlington, only to be stranded just north of the South Sudanese capital of Juba.

The taxi he hired an hour earlier had broken down, and he was still 50 miles south of his destination, his native village of Kalthok. The driver walked back to Juba five hours earlier and had yet to return.

Keny took another delay in stride, as he had waited to return home since fleeing his country's civil war 25 years earlier. That decade-long journey, forged in tragedy and perseverance, took Keny on a dangerous trek through the Sudanese bush to a series of refugee camps and, finally, to a new start in America.

For most of his life, Keny has straddled two worlds. Each day he reconciles his life of opportunity in the United States with a longing for his war-torn homeland. For years, Keny balanced work to put himself through school and to save for a trip to Kalthok, the village of his brief childhood and keeper of the only memories of his parents.

Exhausted from two flights and a 12-hour bus ride from Uganda, Keny tried to imagine what the reunion would be like. As he peered through darkness toward Kalthok, he wondered if anyone would remember him.

A CHILD OF WAR

Keny was born in Kalthok in 1982, the youngest of four sons. He lived with his mother and father, who like many in the village were sorghum farmers. The Kenys belonged to the Dinka tribe, the largest ethnic group in southern Sudan.

In November 1989, farmers had finished the annual harvest as the wet season came to a close. One afternoon, 6–year-old Keny and a group of boys played on the banks of the White Nile north of Kalthok, as they often did when little else occupied their time. Around five o'clock, the boys heard gunfire and saw smoke in the village's direction. They rushed toward home but were intercepted by a villager who told them returning was unsafe. The boys, some of whom were Keny's cousins, hid along a riverbank that night. Keny would never again see his parents.

For most of the past 60 years, Sudan has been engulfed in civil war. By 1989, the Second Sudanese Civil War already had raged for six years. When war ended in 2005, 1 million to 2 million people were dead and another 2 million were displaced. Many of those killed or displaced were from the Dinka tribe.

As a child Keny knew about the war, but until that day in 1989, fighting had never come to Kalthok.

''We were all the way to the south of the country, and the government militia did not have a problem with the local people,'' Keny recalled in a recent interview in Burlington. ''There was no tension.''

Unable to return to their village, Keny and his friends faced a harrowing journey. The morning after the attack on Kalthok, the boys crossed the river and joined a larger group of refugees who were walking east, away from the fighting. They walked each day until their legs could carry them no farther. Each time the boys stopped to rest, they feared lion attacks and roaming militias, which abducted children to use as soldiers. Keny was shoeless and without a change of clothing. He thought only of how to survive another day.

''The worry was, 'Are you going to make it to the next town?' '' he recalled. ''You focused on living to the next day, and that's all. There was nothing else you could do.''

The Sudanese government was able to distribute grain to fleeing refugees. Keny and others received two cups each, which they made last as long as they could. Keny had nowhere to put the grain, so he wrapped it carefully in his shirt. When the grain ran out, the boys foraged for wild fruit and berries whenever they stopped to rest.

Keny said he was among an estimated 20,000 ''Lost Boys of Sudan''—children separated from their parents during the war. As many as half died of disease and starvation during the journey to refugee camps.

After traveling several hundred miles over three months, Keny crossed from Sudan into Ethiopia and settled with others at Dimma, a refugee camp established by the Ethiopian government in 1986 to handle an enormous influx of Sudanese refugees.

Keny remained at Dimma for about a year, until spring 1991, when rebels overthrew Ethiopia's government in a coup. The boys fled back across the border and camped near the Sudanese community of Pakok until 1992, when the United Nations moved thousands of refugees to the newly opened Kakuma refugee camp in Kenya. Keny would live there for nine years.

At the Kakuma camp, Keny learned English and went to school daily. He said U.N. staff members encouraged the boys to settle into a routine. But he could not stop thinking about his family. Keny said some of the Lost Boys tried to find their way back to their villages, but he judged the trip back to Kalthok too dangerous. Refugees at Kakuma relied on new arrivals and wounded soldiers seeking care at the U.N. hospital for news about the war.

''The hope was that I would see someone from my village, so I might ask the situation of my family,'' Keny said. ''But no one ever showed up. It was very difficult for me. I never knew whether someone was still there or not.''

Keny received a surprise in 1998, when his oldest brother, Riak, found him at the Kakuma camp. Riak had joined the Sudanese army and had been granted a one-month leave. The brothers had not seen each other in nine years.

''It was one of the best days of my life, after going all that time without seeing my family,'' Keny said.

But the reunion was bittersweet. Riak brought news Keny had long feared: Their parents and brother were killed in the war, and remaining brother had died of disease. Keny was devastated, but relieved finally to know the fate of his family. Riak tried to lift his spirits.

''He was like, 'Look, this is what it is. Someone has to die for someone to live. If we all had to die, and you lived, that's the best we can do,' '' Keny recalled his brother saying.

Riak and Peter spent several weeks together, until the soldier's leave expired and he returned to war. Keny never again saw his brother. Riak died in 2006 after he succumbed to injuries received years earlier.

A NEW LIFE IN AMERICA

In 2001, when he was 19, Keny moved to the U.S. through the federal Office of Refugee Resettlement. He had several cities to choose among, but he picked Burlington because his cousin Abraham Awolich already had settled there. Five others from the Kakuma camp came with him.

For the first time in his life, Keny thought about his future.

''It was like a dream that had come true,'' he said. ''I felt like this is the moment, if I don't have my parents, maybe in the future I'll be able to meet my extended family. Maybe I would be able to do something that my family would remember me.''

In the U.S., Keny became proficient in English, earned a high school degree and dreamed of attending college.

Now 32, Keny lives in a small apartment on Front Street in Burlington with three other Lost Boys who immigrated to the U.S. He works as a janitor for the University of Vermont, where he cleans the athletic complex from 10 p.m. to 6:30 a.m., five days a week. When school is in session, he attends classes during the day, where he is a decade older than his peers. In the next year and a half, he hopes to complete a degree in community development and applied economics.

Keny is able to cram in only a few hours of sleep before walking uphill to class, but he said he must work to afford tuition if he ever hopes to find a better-paying job.

''It's about being willing,'' he said, sitting on the front porch of his home. ''If I don't do it, I will be stuck here. I just tell myself I have to do it. Otherwise I don't have options.''

Ever since moving to the U.S., Keny always hoped return to visit Kalthok. He was able to contact several uncles by telephone in 2002 and remained in touch with relatives regularly. He secured a travel visa in 2006 but was unable to use it, because a trip would have interrupted his studies at community college.

''The biggest fact was that I was struggling with my education,'' Keny said. ''Every time I'd say, 'If I go home while I'm trying to complete this process, I might fall behind.' ''

While studying, Keny kept abreast of news back home.

In 2005, civil war ended with a peace agreement that many Sudanese hoped finally would put an end to violence that had torn apart the country for half a century. In 2011, southern Sudanese voted overwhelmingly to break off from the north to form a new nation, South Sudan. The fragile peace collapsed two years later, when South Sudan plunged into civil war. Keny said Kalthok has so far been spared heavy violence, but the community is inundated with refugees again fleeing to the east.

Finally, in 2014, Keny acquired a new visa and was able to raise enough money for the costly trip, which required a stopover in Europe.

RETURN TO SOUTH SUDAN

Even after dusk in December, the air was still humid. Keny's driver returned around 7 p.m. with tools, but couldn't fix the car. Keny planned to spend the night on the side of the road and at dawn walk back to Juba. He lay down in the brush, careful not to wrinkle the dress shirt and slacks he had put on for the reunion.

Keny was comforted that he at least had company: Some of his cousins, who met him at the bus station in Juba, agreed to wait until another ride could be arranged.

Around midnight, Keny's fortunes turned. A Somali trader came upon him and agreed to drive him to Kalthok. As he braced himself for potholes that shook the vehicle, Keny tried to piece together fragmented memories of his youth.

''Will I remember anyone in the village? Will I remember the places I used to know? Is life still the same as when I left? All those questions were on my mind,'' Keny said.

Although the trip was only 55 miles, the roads were in such poor condition that Keny arrived in Kalthok at 5 a.m. It was Christmas morning. He was exhausted and hoped to find somewhere to sleep, but he found the entire village had stayed up waiting for him in the church.

''They were singing and dancing and praying for us, because they heard we had car trouble,'' Keny said.

At 8 a.m., Kalthok's villagers held a welcome ceremony. Keny said he recognized only a few faces, his maternal and paternal uncles. But all the village elders remembered him.

''They said, 'You look just like you did when you left,' '' he recalled. ''There was a lot of emotional reaction. They talked about my family, my mom and my dad.''

Keny stood at the front of the sanctuary to greet the hundreds of villagers who came to see him. After daybreak they took him around Kalthok, but Keny couldn't pick out any landmarks.

He asked his cousins to take him to a lake with a waterfall he remembered from childhood. From there he looked back toward the village, and memories came back to him. He was able to point out his uncles' houses.

''They said, 'Yes, you now know. You recognize this place,' '' Keny said.

Instead of having Keny stay in one of his uncles' homes, villagers arranged for him to sleep in the church. Each evening for the three weeks he was in Kalthok, villagers set up tents and slept outside the church to be closer to their returned son. Keny said many were surprised he came back after settling into a prosperous life in the U.S.

''They thought I would never go back, because I don't have a living parent anymore,'' Keny said. ''But they still believe I belong to the village.''

Keny had another reason to return to Kalthok, beside visiting relatives. He wanted to ensure success of the local clinic the Sudan Development Foundation, a Burlington nonprofit, helped fund. The clinic is vital to Kalthok, Keny said. In South Sudan, some villages are more than 100 miles from a hospital. South Sudan's infrastructure is so poor this can mean several days of traveling on foot.

Keny returned to Vermont in mid-January. He said leaving his uncles and cousins was difficult, but his visa expired after 30 days.

STRADDLING TWO WORLDS

The son of Kalthok said he is unsure if he will ever move back to South Sudan. Keny wants to help Kalthok and keep the clinic operational. He worries war will come again to the village.

''I see myself living in two worlds, here and South Sudan,'' he said. ''I want to help my people in any form they need. If I ever get married, maybe I would bring my wife over.''

Keny talks to his uncles regularly. A consequence of war, inflation has made staple goods too expensive for many villagers. A drought has raised the prospect of crop failure.

''This month they are supposed to cultivate, but there is no rain,'' he said, referring to May.

Keny wants to help his countrymen and -women in Vermont. More than 150 Sudanese have resettled in Burlington since the late 1990s, and many have started families here. Keny said the small community rents out local halls and churches to meet and celebrate holidays such as South Sudan's Independence Day.

Keny hopes to help lease or purchase a permanent home to aid local Sudanese in preserving their culture. He said parents are concerned children will forget tribal languages when they speak English outside the home.

Keny reflects on what his life would have been like if he never had the opportunity to immigrate to the United States. If he stayed in South Sudan, Keny believes he likely would have been killed in the war or conscripted into the army. He said he feels blessed to have been given the chance to start a new life here, because so many Sudanese never had that option.

''It gave me the chance to look at the world differently,'' he said. ''I have people who support me, and even though I do not yet have a college degree, I feel I've learned enough to help myself and help my people.''

Keny often thinks of his brothers and parents. In their memory, he wants to make the most of opportunities he now has.

''You have this feeling that for the rest of your life, you're going to be living knowing that you don't have someone you'd be taking care of,'' he said. ''I just want to make sure I live a better life, and live it in a peaceful way.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 205—CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS ON WINNING THE 2015 STANLEY CUP

Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 205

Whereas, on June 15, 2015, the Chicago Blackhawks Hockey Team won the Stanley Cup;

Whereas the 2015 Stanley Cup title is the third Stanley Cup title for the Blackhawks in 6 years;

Whereas Blackhawks fans at the ''Madhouse on Madison'' witnessed Duncan Keith and Patrick Kane score show-stopping goals while goaltender Corey Crawford seemed to stand on his head at times, stopping all 25 shots he faced;

Whereas the Blackhawks won their sixth Stanley Cup, tying the Boston Bruins for fourth on the franchise list of most titles won;

Whereas the Blackhawks joined the National Hockey League (referred to in this preamble as ''NHL'') in 1926 and have a rich history in the NHL;

Whereas the Blackhawks were 1 of the 6 original teams in the NHL;

Whereas the Blackhawks won the Stanley Cup in 1934, 1938, 1961, 2010, and 2013;

Whereas for the first time in 77 years, the Blackhawks fans saw their heroes win the Stanley Cup on home ice;

Whereas the Blackhawks began the playoffs with a double-overtime victory against the Nashville Predators;

Whereas a goal scored by Brent Seabrook in triple-overtime of Game 4 helped the Blackhawks defeat the Predators in 6 games;

Whereas a sweep of the Minnesota Wild followed in the second round of the playoffs, setting up a showdown with the Anaheim Ducks in the Western Conference Finals;

Whereas the Blackhawks earned triple and double-overtime victories against the Anaheim Ducks in Games 2 and 4 on their way to winning the series in 7 games and clinching a berth in the Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas the Blackhawks followed a familiar pattern in dropping Games 2 and 3 of the Stanley Cup Finals against the Tampa Bay Lightning, but took a 3-2 series lead into Game 6 on home ice on the night of Monday, June 15, 2015;

Whereas in another close contest, Patrick Kane scored a goal during Game 6 that marked the first time either team led by more than 1 goal in the series;

Whereas it was a great night for fans of the Blackhawks and the culmination of a tremendous team effort;

Whereas Antoine Vermette, acquired at the trade deadline, scored 2 game-winning goals in the Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas Goaltender Scott Darling, when called upon in relief of Corey Crawford, stood tall in net when his team needed him the most against the Predators;

Whereas Duncan Keith was an ''ironman'', earning the Conn Smythe Trophy for Most Valuable Player in the playoffs while logging more than 700 minutes of ice time in 23 games;

Whereas Niklas Hjalmarsson blocked shots left and right and seemed to be in the right place at all times;

Whereas General Manager Stan Bowman, Head Coach Joel Quenneville, President John F. McDonough, and owner Rocky Wirtz have put together and led one of the greatest dynasties in NHL history;

Whereas the Stanley Cup returns to the City of Chicago and gives Blackhawks fans across the State of Illinois a chance to celebrate championship hockey;

Whereas the Nashville Predators, Minnesota Wild, Anaheim Ducks, and Tampa Bay Lightning proved to be worthy and honorable adversaries and also deserve recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup;

(2) commends the fans, players, and management of the Tampa Bay Lightning for an outstanding series; and

(3) respectfully directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the 2015 Chicago Blackhawks hockey organization and Blackhawks owner Rocky Wirtz.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR WINNING THE 2015 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 206

Whereas, on June 16, 2015, the Golden State Warriors won their second National Basketball Association (referred to in this preamble

as the ''NBA'') Championship as a California team by defeating the Cleveland Cavaliers with a score of 105-97 in the sixth game of the NBA Finals;

Whereas during the 2015 NBA playoffs, the Warriors defeated the New Orleans Pelicans, the Memphis Grizzlies, the Houston Rockets, and the Cleveland Cavaliers en route to the NBA Championship;

Whereas during the playoffs, the Golden State Warriors twice overcame 2-1 series deficits and, in both series, responded with 3 straight victories to win the series;

Whereas in the regular season, the Warriors won a league-best 67 games;

Whereas all 15 players on the 2014-2015 Warriors roster should be congratulated, including NBA Finals MVP Andre Iguodala, the NBA regular season MVP Stephen Curry, as well as, Leandro Barbosa, Harrison Barnes, Andrew Bogut, Festus Ezeli, Draymond Green, Justin Holiday, Ognjen Kuzmic, David Lee, Shaun Livingston, James Michael McAdoo, Brandon Rush, Marreesse Speights, and Klay Thompson;

Whereas first-year coach, Steve Kerr, did a tremendous job leading the Warriors to the NBA Title and, through his coaching, built a team that is the best in the NBA; and

Whereas the fans of the Warriors have been ever-loyal in their support of the team, waiting 40 years for their second NBA title, but can now again call their team a champion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship because of their selfless teamwork;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the 2014-2015 season; and

(3) celebrates the unique contributions of the Warriors fan base, who, through its unremitting and vocal support of the Warriors came to be known as ''Dub Nation''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2060. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

SA 2061. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2060 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, supra.

SA 2062. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, supra.

SA 2063. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, supra.

SA 2064. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2063 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, supra.

SA 2065. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

SA 2066. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2065 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) to the bill H.R. 1295, supra.

SA 2067. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, supra.

SA 2068. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, supra.

SA 2069. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2068 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2060. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.''

SA 2061. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2060 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

SA 2062. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment''

SA 2063. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the instructions

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

SA 2064. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2063 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment

Strike ''4 days'' and insert ''5 days''

SA 2065. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Trade Preferences Extension 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—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Findings.
Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.
Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.
Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.
Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.
Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.
Sec. 110. Reports.
Sec. 111. Technical amendments.
Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.
Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.
Sec. 204. Eligibility of certain luggage and travel articles for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Application of provisions relating to trade adjustment assistance.
Sec. 403. Extension of trade adjustment assistance program.
Sec. 404. Performance measurement and reporting.
Sec. 405. Applicability of trade adjustment assistance provisions.
Sec. 406. Sunset provisions.
Sec. 407. Extension and modification of Health Coverage Tax Credit.

TITLE V—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Consequences of failure to cooperate with a request for information in a proceeding.
Sec. 503. Definition of material injury.
Sec. 504. Particular market situation.
Sec. 505. Distortion of prices or costs.
Sec. 506. Reduction in burden on Department of Commerce by reducing the number of voluntary respondents.
Sec. 507. Application to Canada and Mexico.
TITLE VI—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES
Sec. 601. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.
Sec. 602. Duty treatment of protective active footwear.
TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
Sec. 701. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.
TITLE VIII—OFFSETS
Sec. 801. Customs user fees extension.
Sec. 802. Additional customs user fees extension.
Sec. 803. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.
Sec. 804. Payee statement required to claim certain education tax benefits.
Sec. 805. Special rule for educational institutions unable to collect TINs of individuals with respect to higher education tuition and related expenses.
Sec. 806. Penalty for failure to file correct information returns and provide payee statements.
Sec. 807. Child tax credit not refundable for taxpayers electing to exclude foreign earned income from tax.
Sec. 808. Coverage and payment for renal dialysis services for individuals with acute kidney injury.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015''.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost sixfold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''11 succeeding'' and inserting ''21 succeeding''; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2015'' and inserting ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2025'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.''.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol ''D'' in the ''Special'' subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol ''A'' or ''A*'' in the ''Special'' subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''If the President'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.''.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President's intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.''.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

''(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

''(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

''(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

''(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

''(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

''(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

''(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

''(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

''(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

''(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

''(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

''(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.''.

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''for men and women'' after ''rights''.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as ''AGOA utilization strategies'');

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest'' and inserting '', through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have''; and

(B) by striking ''and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States'' and inserting '', complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''20'' and inserting ''30''; and

(B) by inserting after ''from those countries'' the following: '', particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COORDINATION.—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.''.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have a expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) TERMINATION.—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''beneficiary sub-Saharan African country'' means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term ''sub-Saharan African country'' has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking ''July 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2017''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013; and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED ARTICLE.—The term ''covered article'' means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) ENTER; ENTRY.—The terms ''enter'' and ''entry'' include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.''.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''October 1'' for ''July 1'' each place such date appears.

(b) ARTICLE DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4) and (5)'';

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''Footwear'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (5), footwear''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E) of paragraph (1), the President may designate the following as eligible articles under subsection (a):

''(A) Articles classifiable under subheading 4202.11.00, 4202.12.40, 4202.21.60, 4202.21.90, 4202.22.15, 4202.22.45, 4202.31.60, 4202.32.40, 4202.32.80, 4202.92.15, 4202.92.20, 4202.92.45, or 4202.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

''(B) Articles classifiable under statistical reporting number 4202.12.2020, 4202.12.2050, 4202.12.8030, 4202.12.8070, 4202.22.8050, 4202.32.9550, 4202.32.9560, 4202.91.0030, 4202.91.0090, 4202.92.3020, 4202.92.3031, 4202.92.3091, 4202.92.9026, or 4202.92.9060 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as such statistical reporting numbers are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.''.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

''(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking ''succeeding 11 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''; and

(II) by striking ''December 19, 2018'' and inserting ''December 19, 2025''.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''11 succeeding 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking ''11 succeeding 1-year periods'' and inserting ''16 succeeding 1-year periods''.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2020'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''.

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

SEC. 402. APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) REPEAL OF SNAPBACK.—Section 233 of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–40; 125 Stat. 416) is repealed.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this

title, the provisions of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on December 31, 2013, and as amended by this title, shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to petitions for certification filed under chapter 2, 3, or 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after such date of enactment.

(c) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of any such chapter, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

SEC. 403. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF TERMINATION PROVISIONS.—Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''June 30, 2021''.

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''shall not exceed'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall not exceed $450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.''.

(c) REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 246(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''June 30, 2021''.

(d) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—Section 245(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317(a)) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''June 30, 2021''.

(2) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 255(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2012 and 2013'' and all that follows through ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2021''.

(3) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.—Section 298(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401g(a)) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 2012 and 2013'' and all that follows through ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2021''.

SEC. 404. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND REPORTING.

(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—Section 239(j) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2311(j)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''DATA REPORTING'' and inserting ''PERFORMANCE MEASURES'';

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''a quarterly'' and inserting ''an annual''; and

(ii) by striking ''data'' and inserting ''measures'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''core'' and inserting ''primary''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''that promote efficiency and effectiveness'' after ''assistance program'';

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''CORE INDICATORS DESCRIBED'' and inserting ''INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) PRIMARY INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE DESCRIBED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The primary indicators of performance referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall consist of—

''(I) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who are in unsubsidized employment during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program;

''(II) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program and who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth calendar quarter after exit from the program;

''(III) the median earnings of workers described in subclause (I);

''(IV) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, subject to clause (ii), obtain a recognized postsecondary credential or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, during participation in the program or within one year after exit from the program; and

''(V) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, during a year while receiving such benefits, are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable gains in skills toward such a credential or employment.

''(ii) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of clause (i)(IV), a worker who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted for purposes of that clause only if the worker, in addition to obtaining such a diploma or its recognized equivalent, has obtained or retained employment or is in an education or training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential within one year after exit from the program.'';

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''DATA'' and inserting ''MEASURES'';

(B) by striking ''quarterly'' and inserting ''annual''; and

(C) by striking ''data'' and inserting ''measures''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) ACCESSIBILITY OF STATE PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—The Secretary shall, on an annual basis, make available (including by electronic means), in an easily understandable format, the reports of cooperating States or cooperating State agencies required by paragraph (1) and the information contained in those reports.''.

(b) COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF DATA.—Section 249B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''enrolled in'' and inserting ''who received'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''complete'' and inserting ''exited''; and

(II) by striking ''who were enrolled in'' and inserting '', including who received'';

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''complete'' and inserting ''exited'';

(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''complete'' and inserting ''exit''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) The average cost per worker of receiving training approved under section 236.

''(H) The percentage of workers who received training approved under section 236 and obtained unsubsidized employment in a field related to that training.''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking ''quarterly'' each place it appears and inserting ''annual''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) The median earnings of workers described in section 239(j)(2)(A)(i)(III) during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program, expressed as a percentage of the median earnings of such workers before the calendar quarter in which such workers began receiving benefits under this chapter.''; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) the reports required under section 239(j);''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''a quarterly'' and inserting ''an annual''.

(c) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL DEFINED.—Section 247 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(19) The term 'recognized postsecondary credential' means a credential consisting of an industry-recognized certificate or certification, a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship, a license recognized by a State or the Federal Government, or an associate or baccalaureate degree.''.

SEC. 405. APPLICABILITY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—

(1) PETITIONS FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, AND BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CERTIFICATIONS OF WORKERS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(i) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIALS OF CERTIFICATIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) reconsider that determination; and

(II) if the group of workers meets the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(iii) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this clause is a petition for a certification of eligibility for a group of workers filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be eligible, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to receive benefits only under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) COMPUTATION OF MAXIMUM BENEFITS.—Benefits received by a worker described in clause (i) under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be included in any determination of the maximum benefits for which the worker is eligible under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act

of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) PETITIONS FILED BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014.—A worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2013, shall continue to be eligible to apply for and receive benefits under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

(3) QUALIFYING SEPARATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETITIONS FILED WITHIN 90 DAYS OF DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Section 223(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be applied and administered by substituting ''before January 1, 2014'' for ''more than one year before the date of the petition on which such certification was granted'' for purposes of determining whether a worker is eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and on or before the date that is 90 days after such date of enactment.

(b) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(B) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF CERTAIN PETITIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall—

(i) reconsider that determination; and

(ii) if the firm meets the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(C) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this subparagraph is a petition for a certification of eligibility filed by a firm or its representative under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS THAT DID NOT SUBMIT PETITIONS BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2014, AND DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall certify a firm described in subparagraph (B) as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, if the firm or its representative files a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 not later than 90 days after such date of enactment.

(B) FIRM DESCRIBED.—A firm described in this subparagraph is a firm that the Secretary determines would have been certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance if—

(i) the firm or its representative had filed a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on a date during the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the provisions of chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, had been in effect on that date during the period described in clause (i).

SEC. 406. SUNSET PROVISIONS.

(a) APPLICATION OF PRIOR LAW.—Subject to subsection (b), beginning on July 1, 2021, the provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.), as in effect on January 1, 2014, shall be in effect and apply, except that in applying and administering such chapters—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 231(c) of that Act shall be applied and administered as if subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of that paragraph were not in effect;

(2) section 233 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by substituting ''104-week period'' for ''104-week period'' and all that follows through ''130-week period)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by substituting ''65'' for ''52''; and

(II) by substituting ''78-week period'' for ''52-week period'' each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (g) as if it read as follows:

''(g) PAYMENT OF TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO COMPLETE TRAINING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in order to assist an adversely affected worker to complete training approved for the worker under section 236 that leads to the completion of a degree or industry-recognized credential, payments may be made as trade readjustment allowances for not more than 13 weeks within such period of eligibility as the Secretary may prescribe to account for a break in training or for justifiable cause that follows the last week for which the worker is otherwise entitled to a trade readjustment allowance under this chapter if—

''(1) payment of the trade readjustment allowance for not more than 13 weeks is necessary for the worker to complete the training;

''(2) the worker participates in training in each such week; and

''(3) the worker—

''(A) has substantially met the performance benchmarks established as part of the training approved for the worker;

''(B) is expected to continue to make progress toward the completion of the training; and

''(C) will complete the training during that period of eligibility.'';

(3) section 245(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''June 30, 2022'' for ''December 31, 2007'';

(4) section 246(b)(1) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''June 30, 2022'' for ''the date that is 5 years'' and all that follows through ''State'';

(5) section 256(b) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021'' for ''each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and $4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning on October 1, 2007'';

(6) section 298(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting ''the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021'' for ''each of the fiscal years'' and all that follows through ''October 1, 2007''; and

(7) section 285 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a), by substituting ''June 30, 2022'' for ''December 31, 2007'' each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (b) as if it read as follows:

''(b) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 3 after June 30, 2022.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 3 pursuant to a petition filed under section 251 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

''(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

''(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.

''(2) FARMERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 6 after June 30, 2022.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 6 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

''(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

''(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.''.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply on and after July 1, 2021, with respect to—

(1) workers certified as eligible for trade adjustment assistance benefits under chapter 2 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 221 of that Act before July 1, 2021;

(2) firms certified as eligible for technical assistance or grants under chapter 3 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 251 of that Act before July 1, 2021; and

(3) agricultural commodity producers certified as eligible for technical or financial assistance under chapter 6 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 292 of that Act before July 1, 2021.

SEC. 407. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF HEALTH COVERAGE TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 35(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''before January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''before January 1, 2020''.

(b) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR COVERAGE UNDER A QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN.—Subsection (g) of section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (13), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraphs:

''(11) ELECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any taxpayer for any eligible coverage month unless such taxpayer elects the application of this section for such month.

''(B) TIMING AND APPLICABILITY OF ELECTION.—Except as the Secretary may provide—

''(i) an election to have this section apply for any eligible coverage month in a taxable year shall be made not later than the due date (including extensions) for the return of tax for the taxable year, and

''(ii) any election for this section to apply for an eligible coverage month shall apply for all subsequent eligible coverage months in the taxable year and, once made, shall be irrevocable with respect to such months.

''(12) COORDINATION WITH PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible coverage month to which the election under paragraph (11) applies shall not be treated as a coverage month (as defined in section 36B(c)(2)) for purposes of section 36B with respect to the taxpayer.

''(B) COORDINATION WITH ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—In the case of a taxpayer who makes the election under paragraph (11) with respect to any eligible coverage month in a taxable year or on behalf of whom any advance payment is made under section 7527 with respect to any month in such taxable year—

''(i) the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year shall be increased by the excess, if any, of—

''(I) the sum of any advance payments made on behalf of the taxpayer under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and section 7527 for months during such taxable year, over

''(II) the sum of the credits allowed under this section (determined without regard to paragraph (1)) and section 36B (determined without regard to subsection (f)(1) thereof) for such taxable year, and

''(ii) section 36B(f)(2) shall not apply with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year, except that if such taxpayer received any advance payments under section 7527 for any month in such taxable year and is later allowed a credit under section 36B for such taxable year, then section 36B(f)(2)(B) shall be applied by substituting the amount determined under clause (i) for the amount determined under section 36B(f)(2)(A).''.

(c) EXTENSION OF ADVANCE PAYMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 7527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''August 1, 2003'' and inserting ''the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 7527(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''occurring'' and all that follows and inserting ''occurring—

''(A) after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015, and

''(B) prior to the first month for which an advance payment is made on behalf of such individual under subsection (a).''.

(d) INDIVIDUAL INSURANCE TREATED AS QUALIFIED HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO ENROLLMENT DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''insurance if the eligible individual'' and all that follows through ''For purposes of'' and inserting ''insurance. For purposes of''.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of such Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by striking ''insurance.'' and inserting ''insurance (other than coverage enrolled in through an Exchange established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (m) of section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting '', 35(g)(11)'' after ''30D(e)(4)''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) PLANS AVAILABLE ON INDIVIDUAL MARKET FOR USE OF TAX CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (d)(2) shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—Notwithstanding section 35(g)(11)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this title), an election to apply section 35 of such Code to an eligible coverage month (as defined in section 35(b) of such Code) (and not to claim the credit under section 36B of such Code with respect to such month) in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) may be made at any time on or after such date of enactment and before the expiration of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 6511(a) with respect to such taxable year; and

(B) may be made on an amended return.

(g) AGENCY OUTREACH.—As soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Health and Human Services, and Labor (or such Secretaries' delegates) and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (or the Director's delegate) shall carry out programs of public outreach, including on the Internet, to inform potential eligible individuals (as defined in section 35(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the extension of the credit under section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the availability of the election to claim such credit retroactively for coverage months beginning after December 31, 2013.

TITLE V—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''American Trade Enforcement Effectiveness Act''.

SEC. 502. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN A PROCEEDING.

Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking ''ADVERSE INFERENCES.—If'' and inserting the following: ''ADVERSE INFERENCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If'';

(C) by striking ''under this title, may use'' and inserting the following: ''under this title—

''(A) may use''; and

(D) by striking ''facts otherwise available. Such adverse inference may include'' and inserting the following: ''facts otherwise available; and

''(B) is not required to determine, or make any adjustments to, a countervailable subsidy rate or weighted average dumping margin based on any assumptions about information the interested party would have provided if the interested party had complied with the request for information.

''(2) POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR ADVERSE INFERENCES.—An adverse inference under paragraph (1)(A) may include'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—When the'' and inserting the following: ''CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—The administrative authority and the Commission shall not be required to corroborate any dumping margin or countervailing duty applied in a separate segment of the same proceeding.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) SUBSIDY RATES AND DUMPING MARGINS IN ADVERSE INFERENCE DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority uses an inference that is adverse to the interests of a party under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority may—

''(A) in the case of a countervailing duty proceeding—

''(i) use a countervailable subsidy rate applied for the same or similar program in a countervailing duty proceeding involving the same country, or

''(ii) if there is no same or similar program, use a countervailable subsidy rate for a subsidy program from a proceeding that the administering authority considers reasonable to use, and

''(B) in the case of an antidumping duty proceeding, use any dumping margin from any segment of the proceeding under the applicable antidumping order.

''(2) DISCRETION TO APPLY HIGHEST RATE.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the administering authority may apply any of the countervailable subsidy rates or dumping margins specified under that paragraph, including the highest such rate or margin, based on the evaluation by the administering authority of the situation that resulted in the administering authority using an adverse inference in selecting among the facts otherwise available.

''(3) NO OBLIGATION TO MAKE CERTAIN ESTIMATES OR ADDRESS CERTAIN CLAIMS.—If the administering authority uses an adverse inference under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority is not required, for purposes of subsection (c) or for any other purpose—

''(A) to estimate what the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin would have been if the interested party found to have failed to cooperate under subsection (b)(1) had cooperated, or

''(B) to demonstrate that the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin used by the administering authority reflects an alleged commercial reality of the interested party.''.

SEC. 503. DEFINITION OF MATERIAL INJURY.

(a) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES.—Section 771(7) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(J) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY.—The Commission may not determine that there is no material injury or threat of material injury to an industry in the United States merely because that industry is profitable or because the performance of that industry has recently improved.''.

(b) EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IN DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY.—Subclause (I) of section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

''(I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity,''.

(c) CAPTIVE PRODUCTION.—Section 771(7)(C)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma and inserting '', and'';

(2) in subclause (II), by striking '', and'' and inserting a comma; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 504. PARTICULAR MARKET SITUATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF ORDINARY COURSE OF TRADE.—Section 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(15)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) Situations in which the administering authority determines that the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison with the export price or constructed export price.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF NORMAL VALUE.—Section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking ''in such other country.''.

(c) DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTED VALUE.—Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''business'' and inserting ''trade''; and

(2) by striking the flush text at the end and inserting the following:

''For purposes of paragraph (1), if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology. For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost of materials shall be determined without regard to any internal tax in the exporting country imposed on such materials or their disposition that is remitted or refunded upon exportation of the subject merchandise produced from such materials.''.

SEC. 505. DISTORTION OF PRICES OR COSTS.

(a) INVESTIGATION OF BELOW-COST SALES.—Section 773(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE OR SUSPECT.—

''(i) REVIEW.—In a review conducted under section 751 involving a specific exporter, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that are less than the cost of production of the product if the administering authority disregarded some or all of the exporter's sales pursuant to paragraph (1) in the investigation or, if a review has been completed, in the most recently completed review.

''(ii) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—In an investigation initiated under section 732 or a review conducted under section 751, the administering authority shall request information necessary to calculate the constructed value and cost of production under subsections (e) and (f) to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the cost of production of the product.''.

(b) PRICES AND COSTS IN NONMARKET ECONOMIES.—Section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) DISCRETION TO DISREGARD CERTAIN PRICE OR COST VALUES.—In valuing the factors of production under paragraph (1) for the subject merchandise, the administering authority may disregard price or cost values without further investigation if the administering authority has determined that broadly available export subsidies existed or particular instances of subsidization occurred with respect to those price or cost values or if those price or cost values were subject to an antidumping order.''.

SEC. 506. REDUCTION IN BURDEN ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY RESPONDENTS.

Section 782(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677m(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking ''INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—In'' and inserting the following: ''INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In'';

(4) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

''(B) the number of exporters or producers subject to the investigation or review is not so large that any additional individual examination of such exporters or producers would be unduly burdensome to the administering authority and inhibit the timely completion of the investigation or review.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DETERMINATION OF UNDULY BURDENSOME.—In determining if an individual examination under paragraph (1)(B) would be unduly burdensome, the administering authority may consider the following:

''(A) The complexity of the issues or information presented in the proceeding, including questionnaires and any responses thereto.

''(B) Any prior experience of the administering authority in the same or similar proceeding.

''(C) The total number of investigations under subtitle A or B and reviews under section 751 being conducted by the administering authority as of the date of the determination.

''(D) Such other factors relating to the timely completion of each such investigation and review as the administering authority considers appropriate.''.

SEC. 507. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 601. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking ''For the purposes of subheadings'' and all that follows through ''6211.20.15'' and inserting ''For purposes of this chapter'';

(B) by striking ''garments classifiable in those subheadings'' and inserting ''a garment''; and

(C) by striking ''D 3600-81'' and inserting ''D 3779–81''; and

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

''(c) For purposes of this chapter, the term 'recreational performance outerwear' means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with five or more of the following features:

''(1) Insulation for cold weather protection.

''(2) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

''(3) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

''(4) Venting, not including grommet(s).

''(5) Articulated elbows or knees.

''(6) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

''(7) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

''(8) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

''(9) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

''(10) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

''(11) Odor control technology.

The term 'recreational performance outerwear' does not include occupational outerwear.

''(d) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

''(1) The term 'treated with plastics' refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

''(2) The term 'sealed seams' means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

''(3) The term 'critically sealed seams' means—

''(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

''(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

''(4) The term 'insulation for cold weather protection' means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

''(5) The term 'venting' refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

''(6) The term 'articulated elbows or knees' refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

''(7) The term 'reinforcement' refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

''(8) The term 'weatherproof closure' means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

''(9) The term 'multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar' means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments

around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

''(10) The terms 'adjustable powder skirt' and 'inner protective skirt' refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

''(11) The term 'arm gusset' means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

''(12) The term 'radial arm movement' refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

''(13) The term 'odor control technology' means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

''(14) The term 'occupational outerwear' means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

''(e) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as 'recreational performance outerwear'.

''(f) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.''.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	''.

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.12.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	''.

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

''	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				

6201.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6201.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	".

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6201.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	
	6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	".

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
		Other:			
	6201.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
		Other:			
	6201.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%

	6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6201.93.30	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
		Other:				
	6201.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	".

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	

	6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	".

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.12.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6202.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight or silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	".

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6202.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%	
	6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	".

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
		Other:			
	6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
		Other:			
	6202.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%

	Other:				
6202.93.40	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
	Other:				
6202.93.45	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	".

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
	6202.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
	6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	".

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO,IL, JO,KR, MA,MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
	6203.41.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	".

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6203.42.20	Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	

	6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	".

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6203.43.15	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.25	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
		Other:				
	6203.43.35	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
	6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	".

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6203.49	Of other textile materials:				
	6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
		Of artificial fibers:				

6203.49.10	Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
	Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
6203.49.15	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	".

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6204.61.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	".

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.20	Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.62.30	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	

6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	".

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6204.63.12	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.30	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	".

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6204.69	Of other textile materials:			
	6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
		Other:			
		Of artificial fibers:			
	6204.69.10	Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:			

6204.69.20	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	Of silk or silk waste:				
6204.69.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	".

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
		Other:				
	6210.40.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	".

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
		Other:				
	6210.50.30	Having an outer surface impreg- nated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	".

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.32	Of cotton:				
	6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	

6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	".

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.33	Of man-made fibers:			
	6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.4% (OM)	76%
	6211.33.10	Other	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.4% (OM)	76% ".

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
		Other:			
	6211.39.10	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM)	58.5%
	6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
	6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35% ".

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.42	Of cotton:			
	6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%
	6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90% ".

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.43	Of man-made fibers:			
	6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%

6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	".

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

"	6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
	6211.49.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 180th day.

SEC. 602. DUTY TREATMENT OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) For the purposes of subheadings 6402.91.42 and 6402.99.32, the term 'protective active footwear' means footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1) that is designed for outdoor activities, such as hiking shoes, trekking shoes, running shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over $24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.".

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

"	6402.91.42	Protective active footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	".

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

"	6402.99.32	Protective active footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	".

(c) STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VIII—OFFSETS

SEC. 801. CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is

amended by striking ''September 30, 2024'' and inserting ''July 7, 2025''.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2021'' and inserting ''June 30, 2025''.

SEC. 802. ADDITIONAL CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''September 30, 2024'' and inserting ''September 30, 2025''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 29, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025.''.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) FURTHER ADDITIONAL PERIOD.—For the period beginning on July 15, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

''(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting '0.3464' for '0.21'; and

''(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting '0.3464' for '0.21'.''.

SEC. 803. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than $1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 8 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 804. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.''.

(2) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following:

''(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.''.

(b) DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

''(B) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.''.

(c) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 805. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual's TIN.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 806. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250''; and

(2) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(b) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(1) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$30'' and inserting ''$50'';

(B) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250''; and

(C) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

(2) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$60'' and inserting ''$100'';

(B) by striking ''$100'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$250''; and

(C) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(c) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN $5,000,000.—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$175,000''; and

(B) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking ''$200,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''; and

(B) by striking ''$500,000'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''$250'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$500''; and

(2) by striking ''$1,500,000'' in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250''; and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''$30'' and inserting ''$50'';

(ii) by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250''; and

(iii) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''.

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''$60'' and inserting ''$100'';

(ii) by striking ''$100'' (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting ''$250''; and

(iii) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN $5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000''; and

(ii) by striking ''$1,500,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$175,000''; and

(ii) by striking ''$250,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''$200,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''; and

(ii) by striking ''$500,000'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''$250'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$500''; and

(B) by striking ''$1,500,000'' in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 807. CHILD TAX CREDIT NOT REFUNDABLE FOR TAXPAYERS ELECTING TO EXCLUDE FOREIGN EARNED INCOME FROM TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS EXCLUDING FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer elects to exclude any amount from gross income under section 911 for such taxable year.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 808. COVERAGE AND PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.

(a) COVERAGE.—Section 1861(s)(2)(F) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)(F)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including such renal dialysis services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under section 1881(b)(14) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in section 1834(r)(2))''.

(b) PAYMENT.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(r) PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.—

''(1) PAYMENT RATE.—In the case of renal dialysis services (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1881(b)(14)) furnished under this part by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under such section during a year (beginning with 2017) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in paragraph (2)), the amount of payment under this part for such services shall be the base rate for renal dialysis services determined for such year under such section, as adjusted by any applicable geographic adjustment factor applied under subparagraph (D)(iv)(II) of such section and may be adjusted by the Secretary (on a budget neutral basis for payments under this paragraph) by any other adjustment factor under subparagraph (D) of such section.

''(2) INDIVIDUAL WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'individual with acute kidney injury' means an individual who has acute loss of renal function and does not receive renal dialysis services for which payment is made under section 1881(b)(14).''.

SA 2066. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2065 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.''

SA 2067. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.''

SA 2068. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the Instructions

Strike ''2 days'' and insert ''3 days''

SA 2069. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2068 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Water and Power be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Dead End, No Turn Around, Danger Ahead: Challenges to the Future of Highway Funding.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Re-examining EPA's Management of the Renewable Fuel Standard Program.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

AMENDMENT NO. 1474, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the passage of H.R. 1735, the Coons amendment No. 1474, which was agreed to, be modified by replacing the text therein with the text of Coons amendment No. 2058.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve section 1204, relating to the National Guard State Partnership Program)

On page 599, after line 21, add the following:

(g) ENHANCED SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a)(1) of such section, as amended by subsection (b)(1) of this section, is further amended by inserting after ''activities described in paragraph (2)'' the following: '', to support the security cooperation objectives of the United States,''.

(h) PROCEDURES.—Such section, as amended by subsections (b) through (f) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall designate a director for each State and territory to be responsible for the coordination of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.''.

(i) ANNUAL REPORT.—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (h)(1) of this section, is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting ''or other government organizations'' after ''and security forces'';

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: ''and country'';

(3) in clause (v), by striking ''training'' and inserting ''activities''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).''.

ORDER FOR PRINTING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed by the Senate be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The bill, H.R. 1735, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 22, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 156 and 124; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed, and that following disposition of the nominations the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 94, S. 808.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 808) to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 808) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 808

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. References to title 49, United States Code.
Sec. 3. Establishment of Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment.
Sec. 4. Surface Transportation Board membership.
Sec. 5. Nonpublic collaborative discussions.
Sec. 6. Reports.
Sec. 7. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 8. Agent in the District of Columbia.
Sec. 9. Department of Transportation Inspector General authority.
Sec. 10. Amendment to table of sections.
Sec. 11. Procedures for rate cases.
Sec. 12. Investigative authority.
Sec. 13. Arbitration of certain rail rates and practices disputes.
Sec. 14. Effect of proposals for rates from multiple origins and destinations.
Sec. 15. Reports.
Sec. 16. Criteria.
Sec. 17. Construction.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 49, 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 49, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD AS AN INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) REDESIGNATION OF CHAPTER 7 OF TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 49 is amended—

(1) by moving chapter 7 after chapter 11 in subtitle II;

(2) by redesignating chapter 7 as chapter 13;

(3) by redesignating sections 701 through 706 as sections 1301 through 1306, respectively;

(4) by striking sections 725 and 727;

(5) by redesignating sections 721 through 724 as sections 1321 through 1324, respectively; and

(6) by redesignating section 726 as section 1325.

(b) INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 1301, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Surface Transportation Board is an independent establishment of the United States Government.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—Section 1303, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a), (c), (f), and (g);

(B) by redesignating subsections (b), (d), and (e) as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) SUBMISSION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Board submits any budget estimate, budget request, supplemental budget estimate, or other budget information, legislative recommendation, prepared testimony for a congressional hearing, or comment on legislation to the President or to the Office of Management and Budget, the Board shall concurrently submit a copy of such document to—

''(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

''(2) NO APPROVAL REQUIRED.—No officer or agency of the United States has any authority to require the Board to submit budget estimates or requests, legislative recommendations, prepared testimony for congressional hearings, or comments on legislation to any officer or agency of the United States for approval, comments, or review before submitting such recommendations, testimony, or comments to Congress.''.

SEC. 4. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEMBERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1301(b), as redesignated by subsection 3(a), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''3 members'' and inserting ''5 members''; and

(B) by striking ''2 members'' and inserting ''3 members''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) At all times—

''(A) at least 3 members of the Board shall be individuals with professional standing and demonstrated knowledge in the fields of transportation, transportation regulation, or economic regulation; and

''(B) at least 2 members shall be individuals with professional or business experience (including agriculture) in the private sector.''.

(b) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISION.—Section 1301(b), as amended by this section, is further amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking ''who becomes a member of the Board pursuant to paragraph (4), or an individual''.

SEC. 5. NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.

Section 1303(a), as redesignated by subsections (a) and (c) of section 3, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) OPEN MEETINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be deemed to be an agency for purposes of section 552b of title 5.

''(2) NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 552b of title 5, a majority of the members may hold a meeting that is not open to public observation to discuss official agency business if—

''(i) no formal or informal vote or other official agency action is taken at the meeting;

''(ii) each individual present at the meeting is a member or an employee of the Board; and

''(iii) the General Counsel of the Board is present at the meeting.

''(B) DISCLOSURE OF NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.—Except as provided under subparagraph (C), not later than 2 business days after the conclusion of a meeting under subparagraph (A), the Board shall make available to the public, in a place easily accessible to the public—

''(i) a list of the individuals present at the meeting; and

''(ii) a summary of the matters discussed at the meeting, except for any matters the Board properly determines may be withheld from the public under section 552b(c) of title 5.

''(C) SUMMARY.—If the Board properly determines matters may be withheld from the public under section 555b(c) of title 5, the Board shall provide a summary with as much general information as possible on those matters withheld from the public.

''(D) ONGOING PROCEEDINGS.—If a discussion under subparagraph (A) directly relates to an ongoing proceeding before the Board, the Board shall make the disclosure under subparagraph (B) on the date of the final Board decision.

''(E) PRESERVATION OF OPEN MEETINGS REQUIREMENTS FOR AGENCY ACTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit the applicability of section 552b of title 5 with respect to a meeting of the members other than that described in this paragraph.

''(F) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed—

''(i) to limit the applicability of section 552b of title 5 with respect to any information which is proposed to be withheld from the public under subparagraph (B)(ii); or

''(ii) to authorize the Board to withhold from any individual any record that is accessible to that individual under section 552a of title 5, United States Code.''.

SEC. 6. REPORTS.

(a) REPORTS.—Section 1304, as amended by section 3, is further amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''§ 1304. Reports'';

(2) by inserting ''(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—'' before ''The Board'';

(3) by striking ''on its activities.'' and inserting ''on its activities, including each instance in which the Board has initiated an investigation on its own initiative under this chapter or subtitle IV.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) RATE CASE REVIEW METRICS.—

''(1) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Board shall post a quarterly report of rail rate review cases pending or completed by the Board during the previous quarter that includes—

''(A) summary information of the case, including the docket number, case name, commodity or commodities involved, and rate review guideline or guidelines used;

''(B) the date on which the rate review proceeding began;

''(C) the date for the completion of discovery;

''(D) the date for the completion of the evidentiary record;

''(E) the date for the submission of closing briefs;

''(F) the date on which the Board issued the final decision; and

''(G) a brief summary of the final decision;

''(2) WEBSITE POSTING.—Each quarterly report shall be posted on the Board's public website.''.

(b) COMPILATION OF COMPLAINTS AT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1304, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COMPLAINTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall establish and maintain a database of complaints received by the Board.

''(2) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Board shall post a quarterly report of formal and informal service complaints received by the Board during the previous quarter that includes—

''(A) the date on which the complaint was received by the Board;

''(B) a list of the type of each complaint;

''(C) the geographic region of each complaint; and

''(D) the resolution of each complaint, if appropriate.

''(3) WRITTEN CONSENT.—The quarterly report may identify a complainant that submitted an informal complaint only upon the written consent of the complainant.

''(4) WEBSITE POSTING.—Each quarterly report shall be posted on the Board's public website.''.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1305, as redesignated by section 3, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following:

''(1) $33,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(2) $35,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

''(3) $35,500,000 for fiscal year 2018;

''(4) $35,500,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

''(5) $36,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.''.

SEC. 8. AGENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) DESIGNATION OF AGENT AND SERVICE OF NOTICE.—Section 1323, as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''in the District of Columbia,''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''in the District of Columbia''.

(b) SERVICE OF PROCESS IN COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Section 1324(a), as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended by striking ''in the District of Columbia'' each place such phrase appears.

SEC. 9. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.

Subchapter II of chapter 13, as redesignated by section 3(a)(2), is amended by inserting after section 1325, as redesignated by section 3(a)(6), the following:

''§ 1326. Authority of the Inspector General

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of Transportation, in accordance with the mission of the Inspector General to prevent and detect fraud and abuse, shall have authority to review only the financial management, property management, and business operations of the Surface Transportation Board, including internal accounting and administrative control systems, to determine the Board's compliance with applicable Federal laws, rules, and regulations.

''(b) DUTIES.—In carrying out this section, the Inspector General shall—

''(1) keep the Chairman of the Board, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed about problems relating to administration of the internal accounting and administrative control systems of the Board;

''(2) issue findings and recommendations for actions to address the problems referred to in paragraph (1); and

''(3) submit periodic reports to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that describe any progress made in implementing actions to address the problems referred to in paragraph (1).

''(c) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Inspector General may exercise authorities granted to the Inspector General under subsections (a) and (b) of section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for use by the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation such sums as may be necessary to cover expenses associated with activities pursuant to the authority exercised under this section.

''(2) REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENT.—In the absence of an appropriation under this subsection for an expense referred to in paragraph (1), the Inspector General and the Board shall have a reimbursement agreement to cover such expense.''.

SEC. 10. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF SECTIONS.

The table of sections for chapter 13, as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 13—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

''I—ESTABLISHMENT

''Sec.
''1301. Establishment of Board
''1302. Functions.
''1303. Administrative provisions.
''1304. Reports.
''1305. Authorization of appropriations.
''1306. Reporting official action.

''II—ADMINISTRATIVE

''1321. Powers.
''1322. Board action.
''1323. Service of notice in Board proceedings.
''1324. Service of process in court proceedings.
''1325. Railroad-Shipper Transportation Advisory Council.
''1326. Authority of the Inspector General.''.

SEC. 11. PROCEDURES FOR RATE CASES.

(a) SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURE.—Section 10701(d)(3) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) The Board shall maintain 1 or more simplified and expedited methods for determining the reasonableness of challenged rates in those cases in which a full stand-alone cost presentation is too costly, given the value of the case.''.

(b) EXPEDITED HANDLING; RATE REVIEW TIMELINES.—Section 10704(d) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(d) Within 9 months'' and all that follows through ''railroad rates.'' and inserting the following:

''(d)(1) The Board shall maintain procedures to ensure the expeditious handling of challenges to the reasonableness of railroad rates.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2)(A) Except as provided under subparagraph (B), in a stand-alone cost rate challenge, the Board shall comply with the following timeline:

''(i) Discovery shall be completed not later than 150 days after the date on which the challenge is initiated.

''(ii) The development of the evidentiary record shall be completed not later than 155 days after the date on which discovery is completed under clause (i).

''(iii) The closing brief shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date on which the development of the evidentiary record is completed under clause (ii).

''(iv) A final Board decision shall be issued not later than 180 days after the date on which the evidentiary record is completed under clause (ii).

''(B) The Board may extend a timeline under subparagraph (A) after a request from any party or in the interest of due process.''.

(c) PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall initiate a proceeding to assess procedures that are available to parties in litigation before courts to expedite such litigation and the potential application of any such procedures to rate cases.

(d) EXPIRED RAIL SERVICE CONTRACT LIMITATION.—Section 10709 is amended by striking subsection (h).

SEC. 12. INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO INITIATE INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 11701(a) is amended—

(1) by striking ''only on complaint'' and inserting ''on the Board's own initiative or upon receiving a complaint pursuant to subsection (b)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''If the Board finds a violation of this part in a proceeding brought on its own initiative, any remedy from such proceeding may only be applied prospectively.''.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE BOARD'S INITIATIVE.—Section 11701, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) In any investigation commenced on the Board's own initiative, the Board shall—

''(1) not later than 30 days after initiating the investigation, provide written notice to the parties under investigation, which shall state the basis for such investigation;

''(2) only investigate issues that are of national or regional significance;

''(3) permit the parties under investigation to file a written statement describing any or all facts and circumstances concerning a matter which may be the subject of such investigation;

''(4) make available to the parties under investigation and Board members—

''(A) any recommendations made as a result of the investigation; and

''(B) a summary of the findings that support such recommendations;

''(5) to the extent practicable, separate the investigative and decisionmaking functions of staff;

''(6) dismiss any investigation that is not concluded by the Board with administrative finality within 1 year after the date on which it was commenced; and

''(7) not later than 90 days after receiving the recommendations and summary of findings under paragraph (4)—

''(A) dismiss the investigation if no further action is warranted; or

''(B) initiate a proceeding to determine if a provision under this part has been violated.

''(e)(1) Any parties to an investigation against whom a violation is found as a result of an investigation begun on the Board's own initiative may, not later than 60 days after the date of the order of the Board finding such a violation, institute an action in the United States court of appeals for the appropriate judicial circuit for de novo review of such order in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5.

''(2) The court—

''(A) shall have jurisdiction to enter a judgment affirming, modifying, or setting aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Board; and

''(B) may remand the proceeding to the Board for such further action as the court may direct.''.

(c) RULEMAKINGS FOR INVESTIGATIONS OF THE BOARD'S INITIATIVE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board shall issue rules, after notice and comment rulemaking, for investigations commenced on its own initiative that—

(1) comply with the requirements of section 11701(d) of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (b);

(2) satisfy due process requirements; and

(3) take into account ex parte constraints.

SEC. 13. ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN RAIL RATES AND PRACTICES DISPUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 117 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 11708. Voluntary arbitration of certain rail rates and practices disputes

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Board shall promulgate regulations to establish a voluntary and binding arbitration process to resolve rail rate and practice complaints subject to the jurisdiction of the Board.

''(b) COVERED DISPUTES.—The voluntary and binding arbitration process established pursuant to subsection (a)—

''(1) shall apply to disputes involving—

''(A) rates, demurrage, accessorial charges, misrouting, or mishandling of rail cars; or

''(B) a carrier's published rules and practices as applied to particular rail transportation;

''(2) shall not apply to disputes—

''(A) to obtain the grant, denial, stay, or revocation of any license, authorization, or exemption;

''(B) to prescribe for the future any conduct, rules, or results of general, industry-wide applicability;

''(C) to enforce a labor protective condition; or

''(D) that are solely between 2 or more rail carriers; and

''(3) shall not prevent parties from independently seeking or utilizing private arbitration services to resolve any disputes the parties may have.

''(c) ARBITRATION PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board—

''(A) may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process established pursuant to subsection (a) available only to the relevant parties;

''(B) may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process available only—

''(i) after receiving the written consent to arbitrate from all relevant parties; and

''(ii)(I) after the filing of a written complaint; or

''(II) through other procedures adopted by the Board in a rulemaking proceeding;

''(C) with respect to rate disputes, may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process available only to the relevant parties if the rail carrier has market dominance (as determined under section 10707); and

''(D) may initiate the voluntary and binding arbitration process not later than 40 days after the date on which a written complaint is filed or through other procedures adopted by the Board in a rulemaking proceeding.

''(2) LIMITATION.—Initiation of the voluntary and binding arbitration process shall preclude the Board from separately reviewing a complaint or dispute related to the same rail rate or practice in a covered dispute involving the same parties.

''(3) RATES.—In resolving a covered dispute involving the reasonableness of a rail carrier's rates, the arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, shall consider the Board's methodologies for setting maximum lawful rates, giving due consideration to the need for differential pricing to permit a rail carrier to collect adequate revenues (as determined under section 10704(a)(2)).

''(d) ARBITRATION DECISIONS.—Any decision reached in an arbitration process under this section—

''(1) shall be consistent with sound principles of rail regulation economics;

''(2) shall be in writing;

''(3) shall contain findings of fact and conclusions;

''(4) shall be binding upon the parties; and

''(5) shall not have any precedential effect in any other or subsequent arbitration dispute.

''(e) TIMELINES.—

''(1) SELECTION.—An arbitrator or panel of arbitrators shall be selected not later than 14 days after the date of the Board's decision to initiate arbitration.

''(2) EVIDENTIARY PROCESS.—The evidentiary process of the voluntary and binding arbitration process shall be completed not later than 90 days after the date on which the arbitration process is initiated unless—

''(A) a party requests an extension; and

''(B) the arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, grants such extension request.

''(3) DECISION.—The arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, shall issue a decision not later than 30 days after the date on which the evidentiary record is closed.

''(4) EXTENSIONS.—The Board may extend any of the timelines under this subsection upon the agreement of all parties in the dispute.

''(f) ARBITRATORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise agreed by all of the parties, an arbitration under this section shall be conducted by an arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, which shall be selected from a roster, maintained by the Board, of persons with rail transportation, economic regulation, professional or business experience, including agriculture, in the private sector.

''(2) INDEPENDENCE.—In an arbitration under this section, the arbitrators shall perform their duties with diligence, good faith, and in a manner consistent with the requirements of impartiality and independence.

''(3) SELECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the parties cannot mutually agree on an arbitrator, or the lead arbitrator of a panel of arbitrators, the parties shall select the arbitrator or lead arbitrator from the roster by alternately striking names from the roster until only 1 name remains meeting the criteria set forth in paragraph (1).

''(B) PANEL OF ARBITRATORS.—If the parties agree to select a panel of arbitrators, instead of a single arbitrator, the panel shall be selected under this subsection as follows:

''(i) The parties to a dispute may mutually select 1 arbitrator from the roster to serve as the lead arbitrator of the panel of arbitrators.

''(ii) If the parties cannot mutually agree on a lead arbitrator, the parties shall select a lead arbitrator using the process described in subparagraph (A).

''(iii) In addition to the lead arbitrator selected under this subparagraph, each party to a dispute shall select 1 additional arbitrator from the roster, regardless of whether the other party struck out the arbitrator's name under subparagraph (A).

''(4) COST.—The parties shall share the costs incurred by the Board and arbitrators equally, with each party responsible for paying its own legal and other associated arbitration costs.

''(g) RELIEF.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitations set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3), an arbitral decision under this section may award the payment of damages or rate prescriptive relief.

''(2) PRACTICE DISPUTES.—The damage award for practice disputes may not exceed $2,000,000.

''(3) RATE DISPUTES.—

''(A) MONETARY LIMIT.—The damage award for rate disputes, including any rate prescription, may not exceed $25,000,000.

''(B) TIME LIMIT.—Any rate prescription shall be limited to not longer than 5 years from the date of the arbitral decision.

''(h) BOARD REVIEW.—If a party appeals a decision under this section to the Board, the Board may review the decision under this section to determine if—

''(1) the decision is consistent with sound principles of rail regulation economics;

''(2) a clear abuse of arbitral authority or discretion occurred;

''(3) the decision directly contravenes statutory authority; or

''(4) the award limitation under subsection (g) was violated.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 117 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''11708. Voluntary arbitration of certain rail rates and practice disputes.''.

SEC. 14. EFFECT OF PROPOSALS FOR RATES FROM MULTIPLE ORIGINS AND DESTINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall commence a study of rail transportation contract proposals containing multiple origin-to-destination movements.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after commencing the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report containing the results of the study to—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 15. REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON RATE CASE METHODOLOGY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in section 14(b) that—

(1) indicates whether current large rate case methodologies are sufficient, not unduly complex, and cost effective;

(2) indicates whether alternative methodologies exist, or could be developed, to streamline, expedite, and address the complexity of large rate cases; and

(3) only includes alternative methodologies, which exist or could be developed, that are consistent with sound economic principles.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Beginning not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall submit quarterly reports to the congressional committees referred to in section 14(b) that describes the Surface Transportation Board's progress toward addressing the issues raised in each unfinished regulatory proceeding, regardless of whether the proceeding is subject to a statutory or regulatory deadline.

SEC. 16. CRITERIA.

Section 10704(a)(2) is amended by inserting ''for the infrastructure and investment needed to meet the present and future demand for rail services and'' after ''management,''.

SEC. 17. CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to affect any suit commenced by or against the Surface Transportation Board, or any proceeding or challenge pending before the Surface Transportation Board, before the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS ON WINNING THE 2015 STANLEY CUP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 205, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 205) congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR WINNING THE 2015 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 206, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 206) congratulating the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

FILING DEADLINE—H.R. 2146 AND H.R. 1295

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to both H.R. 2146 and H.R. 1295 be at 4 p.m., Monday, June 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 22, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 22, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:02 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 22, 2015, at 3 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORIAM OF ANN DUVALL

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ann Duvall, who passed away on June 15, 2014 at her home in Sausalito, California at the age of 66. Her family and friends are taking time this week to honor her extraordinary life. Fittingly, the celebration will be held at the Pt. Reyes National Seashore. As a lifelong outdoors enthusiast, Mrs. Duvall would have loved nothing more than to spend time with her loved ones in a place so close to heart.

Mrs. Duvall was known for her technological leadership and role in advancing free speech, but more than that she will be remembered for her kindness, her passion, and her love for life. Born and raised in New York, she moved to California after college, where she received a master's degree from Stanford University, began her career, and met her husband of 37 years, Bill.

Together, the Duvalls helped found and run Surfwatch Software, the first program that allowed users to block explicit online content back in the nascent days of the internet. Surfwatch was later used—successfully—as a linchpin in arguments to repeal the anti-indecency provisions of the Communications Decency Act, seen as a victory for free speech advocates.

While her professional accomplishments are impressive, I'd be remiss not to mention her unyielding enthusiasm, thirst for adventure, and compassion for others. Mrs. Duvall excelled at nearly every sport she came across, from tennis to swimming to cycling. A Francophile and avid backpacker, she and her husband hiked the entire GR10 trail in France, walking from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mediterranean Sea. But her gusto was not reserved just for herself. Following a bout with breast cancer, Mrs. Duvall worked as an advocate for other breast cancer patients. She had a way with people that left anyone she came across feeling welcomed and appreciated.

Our community is a slightly darker place today without Ann Duvall lightening our lives. On the first anniversary of her passing, Ann's memory prevails in our thoughts and our hearts. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and express our deepest condolences to her husband, family, and friends.

HONORING MR. ANDREW BUEHLER

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Andrew Buehler for his acceptance to attend the People to People World Leadership Forum in Washington, D.C. Founded by President Eisenhower, this program has provided opportunities for over 500,000 potential leaders from around the world. Students accepted to this program are selected for their academic excellence, leadership potential and distinguished citizenship.

Andrew's hard work and dedication to his academics made him an exemplar candidate for the program. During his time at the forum, Andrew will participate in a curriculum focused on leadership and educational development with students from a variety of cultures and backgrounds. Andrew's selection as a 2015 World Leadership Forum participant is a testament to his achievements, and something that he and his family should be proud of.

I ask you to join me in congratulating Mr. Andrew Buehler for receiving this distinctive honor.

MOTION TO CONCUR IN THE SENATE AMENDMENT WITH AN AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1295—THE TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just thank Representative RANGEL, a real leader and long-time supporter of AGOA, and Representative KAREN BASS for their leadership on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1295, to Concur in the Senate Amendment with an Amendment to the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.

This bipartisan bill provides for a long-term extension of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), renews the Generalized System of Preferences, and extends the HOPE and HELP programs for products from Haiti until 2025.

And as a senior member of the Appropriations Committee and the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, I know just how important these types of programs are to the U.S.-African relationship and to countries like Haiti.

As my colleagues have stated, AGOA has been a cornerstone of the U.S.-African relationship and has resulted in the creation of thousands of jobs—in Africa and the United States. With continued support for AGOA, we also have the potential to increase small-and-medium businesses between U.S. and African jobs.

Let me also just mention just how important the extension of the HOPE and HELP programs included in this bill are to Haiti. These programs have had a tremendous effect on Haiti's economy. Haiti's textile sector has made great progress in recent years, increasing production by 5.84% and increasing jobs by 15% in 2014 alone.

And as the author of the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act, which was passed into law last year, I know we need to do everything we can to continue to support programs that would aid its economic recovery—particularly after the devastating earthquake in 2010.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

HONORING SHERIFF JOHN H. RUTHERFORD FOR MORE THAN 40 YEARS OF SERVICE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Jacksonville Sheriff John H. Rutherford, who is retiring after 12 years as our city's sheriff and after serving more than 40 years in law enforcement. He has been a voice of vision and action in our Jacksonville community. Although law enforcement always has its challenges, John's leadership style embraced the opportunities to make a difference and better the quality of life for the citizens of Jacksonville.

Sheriff Rutherford always wore his badge with pride. He received expert training as a law enforcement professional, and he made sure each one of his police officers received the best training available. That being said, I can tell you that John would be the first to acknowledge that though training is vital to the officers, it's not everything. It is his belief that a police officer also must learn to respect others who have different perspectives, beliefs, and histories, and to learn from them. John, a devout Christian, never shied away from that foundation in his beliefs and principles.

The list of programs that benefitted Jacksonville under Sheriff Rutherford's tenure is both long and varied. He believed strongly that we must put resources into programs for our youth as investments in our future and that crime prevention is the most cost-effective method of law enforcement. John utilized $3.7 million in seized drug money for prevention and intervention projects that made a significant difference in many lives. He engaged in the community and encouraged his officers to set good examples, urging them to volunteer as mentors, coaches, charity board members, and participants.

John Rutherford is a man of vision who encouraged others to take courageous steps and make difficult decisions. He instituted crime fighting initiatives, such as Operation Safe Streets, that helped achieve the lowest crime numbers since records were first kept 35 years ago. In an effort to increase citizen engagement, John also established Advisory Councils, an initiative greatly appreciated in our Jacksonville community. Furthermore,

Sheriff Rutherford regularly participated in Crime Prevention Walks throughout the city to meet with and listen to citizens one-on-one in their own neighborhoods. He hosted live Internet Call-In shows, established the Six Pillars of Character Award, and regularly recognized employees for their good works. In all of these ways, John led the 3,000 men and women at our Jacksonville Sheriff's Office to become a vital and interwoven part in the fabric of our community.

Sheriff John Rutherford led our Jacksonville Sheriff's Office for 12 years. He was an effective leader and his quiet, firm voice was always listened to during times of alarm. I am proud to call him friend and thank him for his service.

NASHVILLE COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL HORNETTES

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the third state victory of the Nashville Community High School Hornettes as the Class 2A softball state champions.

On June 6, 2015, the Hornettes won the Class 2A State Championship in a 1–0 victory over Brimfield. I would like to congratulate freshman Mackenzie McFeron for scoring the game's only run, after reaching base on a bunt single.

I would like to congratulate Coach Dempsey Witte for leading the team to three state trophies in the past four years. I would also like to congratulate senior, Maci Ingram, who pitched for the team in all three state appearances. My congratulations go out to the entire coaching staff and team comprised of: Maci Ingram, Jordi Harre, Emily Thompson, Daley Buchanan, Karly Stanowski, Brooke Bartling, Paige Kasten, Dierdra Holzhauer, Brooke Burcham, Mackenzie McFeron, Jordan Stiegman, Alli Liske, Bethany Hinkle, Charlie Heck, Dakota Hunter, Patrick Weathers, Joey Lane, trainer John Becker, and head coach Dempsey Witte.

I look forward to the continued success of the Nashville Community High School Hornettes. I extend my best wishes for another outstanding season next year.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and Ranking member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2596, the ''Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016,'' for several reasons.

I opposed the rule because Section 2 of the rule permits the House leadership to continue to be postponed through the legislative day of Thursday, July 30, 2015, further consideration of the motion to reconsider the vote by the House rejecting the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314, the ''Trade Adjustment Act of 2015.''

I do not believe it is appropriate to commingle in one rule subjects as complex, critical, and disparate as international trade policy, on the one hand, and authorization of Intelligence community programs and activities, on the other.

They should be considered separately, debated separately, and voted on separately.

Second, I also opposed the rule because the appropriations authorized by H.R. 2596 are predicated on a continuation of the draconian funding levels set by sequestration rather than more realistic and responsible limits to be negotiated and agreed to by the House and Senate.

I agree with President Obama that prior to consideration of appropriations or annual authorization bills, the House and Senate should first reach agreement on a fair and balanced budget framework that does not harm our economy or require draconian cuts to middle-class priorities.

When applied to national security information gathering, sequestration is harmful because it adversely affects the ability of the intelligence community to: provide strategic warning to decision-makers across all levels of government; improve collection technologies to exploit existing and future opportunities and increase resilience; provide cutting-edge technical analysis of counterintelligence, cyber, advanced weapons, and proliferation threats; to spur IC integration; and increase intelligence capacity by investing in critical information technologies.

Third, I oppose the bill because it uses funds intended for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) in a manner that is inappropriate.

By ignoring the pre-negotiated terms regarding war spending, H.R. 2596 seeks to take monies budgeted for war and defense and apply them to domestic defense while neglecting other vital non-defense priorities of the American people.

Specifically, the bill uses OCO funding to circumvent budget caps in defense and intelligence spending and ignores the long-term connection between national security and economic security and fails to account for vital national security functions carried out at non-defense agencies.

Finally Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 2596 on the merits because it contains a highly objectionable ban on the use of funds to transfer any Guantanamo detainee into the United States or construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from Guantanamo.

Also highly objectionable is the provision in the bill providing that nothing in the statute authorizing the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board should be construed to allow that Board to gain access to information the executive branch deems to be related to covert action.

Mr. Chair, in this digital information age the federal government has at its disposal a wealth of resources that enable it to record, track, and monitor the daily activities of ordinary law abiding citizens.

The balance between liberty and security must be respected to preserve our way of life and the values that countless generations have fought to preserve.

This includes taking precautionary measures to ensure that their lives are safe from eminent danger and terrorist threats both domestically and abroad.

I have long supported effective legislation that seeks to do this such as the bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act, which imposes necessary limits on the bulk collection of telecommunication metadata on U.S. citizens by American intelligence agencies, including the National Security Agency.

Because I have long advocated greater diversity and inclusion in government contracting and procurement, I am pleased that H.R. 2596 includes section 334, which requires the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report to Congress regarding participation in contracting opportunities by women, minorities, veterans, and small businesses awarded by elements of the intelligence community for goods, equipment, tools, and services.

There are several other provisions in the bill that I support, including provisions: allowing the Department of Energy's national laboratories to compete for homeland security grants; ensuring better understanding of FBI resource allocation against domestic and foreign threats, and the role of the FBI and DNI in countering violent extremism, particularly among young people; promoting greater oversight of the Intelligence Community's relationships with certain foreign partners; and giving intelligence support to the Ukraine.

But, on balance, Mr. Chair, H.R. 2596 contains more objectionable than salutary provisions, and for that reason I cannot support the bill or the rule governing the terms of floor debate.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my frustration with the latest attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act. I strongly support expanding access to quality, affordable health care for all Americans. Now, the Affordable Care Act isn't perfect, but where problems arise in the law, we should work together to find solutions and fix them. But crippling the law by cutting billions of dollars or robbing the Prevention and Public Health Fund is not a real solution. I've consistently opposed bills that would undermine or repeal the Affordable Care Act, and that's why I cannot support either H.R. 160 or H.R. 1190.

I do not support the creation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board and believe that the medical device tax needs to be changed. I am committed to working with my colleagues to responsibly fund the vital programs under the ACA without stifling innovation or slowing research and development.

Medical device manufacturers in Connecticut develop essential and lifesaving products that are critical to treating every patient whether in a physician's office, a hospital, a nursing home, or in the field by emergency responders. They provide well-paying jobs throughout my district making products that are sold throughout our country and exported around the world. I will continue to call for the medical device tax to be responsibly replaced.

PRESIDENT'S VOLUNTEER SERVICE AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Smriti and Siddhant Ahuja for earning the President's Volunteer Service Award for the third consecutive year.

This prestigious award recognizes those who have taken action to positively serve the world around them. It is a great honor to earn this recognition once, but to receive the award three years in a row is outstanding. Smriti and Siddhant are currently juniors at Seven Lakes High School. Since age 4, these twins have spent countless hours volunteering and have worked hard to inspire others through community service. We are extremely proud of Smriti and Siddhant, and thank their parents for constantly encouraging a life of helping others.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Smriti and Siddhant Ahuja for earning the President's Volunteer Service Award. We are excited to see where your service takes you.

RECOGNIZING JEFFREY L. BAARSTAD

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Jeffrey L. Baarstad, an influential and respected educator who has been committed to the success of our community, and has bestowed an immeasurable and remarkable quality of education upon students in Ventura County.

For over a decade, Superintendent Baarstad has served the Conejo Valley Unified School District with an unwavering commitment to the education of over 20,000 students within 27 schools throughout the district. The Conejo Valley Unified School District is an essential resource for many residents of Ventura County and is one of the top ranked school districts in California thanks to the dedication of outstanding educators like Superintendent Baarstad.

The Conejo Valley Unified School District serves as a beacon, which continues to lead the way towards a higher standard of quality education and academic success for countless children across our community. The work that the Conejo Valley Unified School District has accomplished, with Dr. Baarstad at its helm, has been recognized for its distinction by many national and state organizations. In 2010, Dr. Baarstad became the Superintendent of Conejo Valley Unified School District, and only three years later was recognized as Superintendent of the Year by the Association of California School Administrators for his outstanding work.

Extraordinary educators like Superintendent Baarstad exemplify Ventura County's commitment to education. Although Superintendent Baarstad will be retiring from Conejo Valley Unified School District, he is leaving a significant mark on public education throughout the region, and an immense impact on our community. I am certain his work will continue to inspire educators in their own commitment to providing an excellent education to students in Ventura County.

For these reasons, I graciously thank Superintendent Baarstad for his unwavering dedication as an educator for the past 35 years. It has been my sincere pleasure to work with Dr. Baarstad, whose influence will extend to many future generations.

IN RECOGNITION OF ISAIAH CROWELL

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Isaiah Crowell, an outstanding football player and leader for the Cleveland Browns football team of the National Football League. Crowell will be hosting the Inaugural Isaiah Crowell Football Camp on Saturday, June 20, 2015 at the A.J. McClung Memorial Stadium in Columbus, Georgia.

Isaiah Crowell was born and raised in Columbus, Georgia, where he attended Carver High School. In high school, Isaiah excelled in football, track, and basketball. Upon graduation, Isaiah was a highly recruited athlete by the University of Alabama and the University of Georgia. In 2011, during a nationally televised conference, Isaiah chose to attend the University of Georgia.

During his freshman season at UGA, Isaiah lead the football team with 850 rushing yards and five touchdowns, which led to him being named the SEC Freshman of the Year by the Associated Press in 2011. For his sophomore season, he transferred to Alabama State University where he was named the Southwestern Athletic Conference Newcomer of the Year, after rushing for 842 yards and 15 touchdowns. After two seasons, Isaiah finished fifth in Alabama State University's history in points scored (160) and sixth in rushing yards (1,963).

In the 2014 National Football League draft, Isaiah signed with the Cleveland Browns as an undrafted free agent. As a rookie, he made an immediate impact scoring two touchdowns in the season opener against the Pittsburgh Steelers. He finished his rookie season with eight touchdowns and over 600 yards. Isaiah will enter the 2015 football season as the starting running back for the Cleveland Browns.

But more than being a remarkable athlete, Isaiah has been incredibly active in the communities of Columbus, Georgia and Cleveland, Ohio and is dedicated to giving back to both communities.

This weekend, Isaiah will be hosting a football camp that is part of the USA Football FUNdamentals program in partnership with NFL Play60. This program introduces children to football by teaching basic skills in a fun and energetic environment. Certified clinicians use a series of drills to show passing, catching, and running skills in a non-contact setting. The purpose of this camp is to ensure that children are learning and having fun while being active.

Isaiah was selected to bring this program to Columbus, Georgia, through the NFL Foundation's player grant program. The Columbus community is proud that Isaiah plans on making this area a priority for his charitable efforts throughout his NFL career and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I have long said that in our area of Middle and Southwest Georgia, we have some of the best, the brightest, the most creative, and the most talented young people anywhere in the world. And Isaiah Crowell proves that beyond the shadow of a doubt! This young man is a true representation of what it means to triumph in the face of adversity. Throughout his personal struggles, Isaiah has shown what it means to preserve and chase his dreams. I support Isaiah in his NFL career and I am immensely proud of the spirit of philanthropy that Isaiah is bringing to his local community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in recognizing and commending Isaiah Crowell for his remarkable accomplishments as an athlete and for his generous heart and humble spirit as a philanthropist.

RECOGNIZING MR. GRANT JONES OF KUKURUZA GOURMET POPCORN

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. Grant Jones, of KuKuRuZa Gourmet Popcorn of Seattle, on receiving the U.S. Small Business Administration's (SBA) Washington State 2015 Young Entrepreneur of the Year award.

Today's KuKuRuZa began modestly as Popcorn Pavilion in the garage of his father-in-law, Charles Brown. Shortly after, in 2011, Grant was approached by the original owners of KuKuRuZa with an offer to sell their business to Grant, who jumped at the opportunity. In just three short years, Grant, together with the strong support of his wife, Ashley, grew KuKuRuZa into a multimillion dollar international company.

Since 2011, KuKuRuZa has expanded from one downtown Seattle location to 17 stores in Washington state and around the world. During this time, KuKuRuZa's sales have increased substantially; from $360,000 in its first year to $2.7 million by 2014. Much of this success is due to strong demand for KuKuRuZa's products and the company's expansion into international markets, which include 13 stores in Japan, Korea, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. At the store location in Japan, for example, customers are said to stand in line for up to two hours to purchase KuKuRuZa's products.

Despite its rapid growth into an international company, KuKuRuZa continues to put its consumers first and strives to keep its ingredients

organic, fresh, and local to the Pacific Northwest. The company's success has resulted in considerable growth in recent years and generated economic activity and jobs that have benefited Washington state.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Grant Jones in receiving this year's SBA's 2015 Young Entrepreneur Award. I look forward to hearing further great things from Grant and KuKuRuZa in the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF PETER ''ED'' REILLY UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleague Representative JOHN LARSON of Connecticut to honor the long record of service to working men and women by Peter ''Ed'' Reilly, retiring Business Manager and Financial Secretary of the Ironworkers Union Local 15, of Hartford, Connecticut. Ed has been a leader in Local 15 for 19 years, advocating for his members who build the infrastructure of our state—buildings, transportation, water works and mass transit—leaving a lasting legacy which will benefit Connecticut businesses and families for generations. He did so while ensuring his members receive fair wages with health benefits and pension security which are the pillars of middle class prosperity.

During Ed's tenure, he created and maintained a strong apprenticeship program providing apprenticeships to young residents of Connecticut—many from low income families who otherwise would not have had any chance to escape their circumstances. He literally has transformed the lives of thousands with his apprenticeship efforts.

Ed has also served as a leader in Connecticut's labor community, presiding over the greater Hartford Building Trade Council, Eastern Connecticut Building Trade Council, and Connecticut Building Trade Council. He was a frequent presence at the State Capitol, calling on his deep understanding and respect for the political process. Ed drew his strong political knowledge in part from his father Peter Reilly Sr., who also led Local 15 and later had a distinguished career as Commissioner of the State of Connecticut Department of Labor. The Reilly family can be proud of a compelling and unique political and governing legacy in the State of Connecticut.

Lastly, we want to note that all of these accomplishments came with a high personal cost. Ed's workday started at the crack of dawn and ended late at night, with little or no break, even on the weekends. Ed and his family—his wife Noreen and his children Peter and Raeanne—have earned a long and fruitful retirement. We both ask the full House to join us in extending our sincerest congratulations and best wishes to Ed and his family as they begin this new chapter of their lives.

HONORING DR. PAUL HOMMERT

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great honor to recognize Dr. Paul Hommert, Director of Sandia National Laboratories and President of Sandia Corporation as he prepares for retirement.

In 1976, Paul began his career as a member of the technical staff for Sandia in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Paul stood out among his colleagues, and gradually was given increased responsibility with a broad range of programs and management assignments. He led programs supporting energy research, and from the mid- to late-1990s, Paul served as the Director of Engineering Services.

Paul went on to become the Director of Research and Applied Science at the Atomic Weapons Establishment in the United Kingdom, where he led the science and engineering division responsible for the country's nuclear deterrent. From 2003 to 2006, Paul served as the lead for the Applied Physics Division at Los Alamos National Laboratory, charged with nuclear weapon design and assessment, weapon performance code development, and weapon science support.

In 2009, Paul returned to Albuquerque to serve as the Executive Vice President and Deputy Laboratories Director for Sandia's Nuclear Weapons Program, eventually becoming the Director of Sandia National Laboratories and President of Sandia Corporation.

Paul has propelled Sandia to new heights, bolstering its reputation as the nation's premier science and engineering laboratory for national security and technology innovation. In recognition of Paul's efforts and accomplishments, the Federal Laboratory Consortium named Paul Laboratory Director of the Year in 2013 for his steadfast commitment to Sandia's technology-transfer activities.

Paul has received numerous accolades and achieved many accomplishments throughout his career. Most notably, he inspired and prepared a new generation of scientists and engineers who are making important contributions to our national security.

It is with great honor and privilege that I take this moment to thank Paul for his service on behalf of the United States of America. I wish him continued happiness and an enjoyable, well-deserved retirement. His successes and contributions will always be appreciated.

IN RECOGNITION OF CLAIRE KNOPF

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Claire Knopf as she is honored by the Monmouth County Historical Association at its 40th annual Garden Party on June 28, 2015. Claire's exemplary leadership and contributions to the Monmouth County Historical Association and the greater Monmouth County area are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

A resident of Monmouth County, New Jersey since 1986, Claire has been an active and charitable member of the community. She has been an outstanding leader of the Monmouth County Historical Association for many years, serving as a trustee, first vice president and 20th president of the Board of Trustees. In addition to her work with the Monmouth County Historical Association, Claire has volunteered on the Rumson Country Day School Executive Council, the Leon Hess Cancer Center at Monmouth Medical Center Women's Council, the Spring House, the Two River Film Festival and the Junior League of Monmouth County, among others. Her involvement with numerous local charities and organizations reflect her passion to help others and improve our communities. Her leadership and hard work have greatly benefited the Monmouth County area and her efforts are admirable.

Claire received her Bachelor of Arts degree in English Literature from Boston University. She and her husband Woody reside in Rumson and are the proud parents of three beautiful children.

For over 115 years, the Monmouth County Historical Association has provided Monmouth County residents and visitors with a vast background of our local history and heritage. Its efforts to preserve and promote our local history through programs, exhibits, and resources are valuable to our community and help to ensure that this important knowledge is available for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in thanking Claire Knopf and the Monmouth County Historical Association for their immeasurable contributions to our community.

RECOGNIZING CASTRO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT JIM NEGRI ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Jim Negri, Castro Valley Unified School District (CVUSD) Superintendent, on the occasion of his retirement at the end of this month.

Born in Oakland and a resident of Castro Valley since 1985, Jim has devoted his career to educating students in California and, in particular, the East Bay. He earned his bachelor of arts degree in economics and teaching credential from the University of California, Berkeley, and his master of arts degree and administrative credential from Saint Mary's College.

Jim has played a major role in educating East Bay students for many years. He held a variety of positions in the Pleasanton Unified School District and the San Ramon Valley Unified School District as well as worked as a superintendent for the Acalanes Union High School District. Since 2009, Jim has been the CVUSD Superintendent.

Jim also has been active in the field of education administration. He served in many roles in the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), such as co-chair of the State Curriculum, Instruction, and Evaluation Committee and President of ACSA Region VI (Alameda and Contra Costa counties).

For his excellent work in education, Jim has received numerous awards. These include ACSA's Outstanding Central Office Administrator (2002) and St. Mary's College School of Education Alumnus of the Year (2001).

Jim's commitment to education is truly extraordinary. I want to thank him for his years of dedicated service and to wish him well in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 370 on H. Con. Res. 55, I mistakenly recorded my vote as No when I should have voted Yes.

FORT BEND CHRISTIAN ACADEMY SOFTBALL TEAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Bend Christian Academy softball team for their amazing 4–A district winning streak this past season.

After more than 100 games, the Lady Eagles maintained a remarkable winning streak and ended the year tied for first place. They were led on and off the field by an outstanding young player, Claire McKissick, who was selected for the 4A all-state first team as a sophomore. Additionally, the women had a trio of young players selected for the all-state second team including Tessa Cantrell, Emily Ferguson, and Kati Ray Brown. The Lady Eagles further packed the all-district team selections with the achievements of senior Morgan Kornegay, sophomore Kendall Bohny, and senior Madelyn Hill. These prestigious awards are achieved through both athletic and academic vigor and are highly competitive throughout the state of Texas. We are extremely proud of all the women of the Fort Bend Christian Academy softball team and look forward to their future accomplishments.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the entire Lady Eagle softball team on an incredible season.

RECOGNIZING MR. KYLE WEDEKIND

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize one of my constituents, Mr. Kyle Wedekind of Winter Garden, Florida, for his acceptance to the People to People World Leadership Forum in Washington, D.C. Mr. Wedekind was selected for his academic excellence, leadership potential and exemplary citizenship.

The mission of People to People Leadership Ambassador Programs is to bridge cultural and political borders through education and exchange. To this end, People to People offers domestic and international educational programs that promote cooperation, cross-cultural understanding and leadership. It is my hope that Mr. Wedekind benefitted greatly from his participation in the World Leadership Forum, and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

THE RAINS IN THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, heavy rains poured down hammering the ground and streets of Georgia the Republic of Georgia.

The River Vere, a small stream that cuts through the center of the Georgian capital of Tbilisi, was transformed into a raging torrent.

It caused flooding of an unprecedented scale.

So far, 13 people have been killed. The flooding allowed animals to escape from the local zoo. Lions, bears, tigers, and jaguars remain on the loose.

Homes, cars and roadways are destroyed. There are over 1 million residents in the capital, and it will take a long time before things get back to normal.

I've been to Georgia—twice. Texans and Georgians are likeminded people; they know the spirit and importance of Independence.

Still occupied by the Russians, Georgia sent troops to fight alongside ours in Afghanistan.

They have been a strong and steadfast U.S. ally in an important and often turbulent part of the world.

Americans must help our friends and allies; the Georgians, as they begin to rebuild their capital city after this historic flooding.

From across the globe we keep the Georgians in our thoughts and prayers.

We know our Georgian friends are resilient and will face this natural disaster with courage. We should stand by them in this effort.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 2015, due to the weather, I was unavoidably detained while traveling to Washington, D.C. and missed recorded votes number 364 and 365. Had I been present, on rollcall vote number 364, H. Res. 233—"Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Iran should immediately release the three United States citizens that it holds, as well as provide all known information on any United States citizens that have disappeared within its borders," I would have voted "yea"; and on rollcall vote number 365, H.R. 2559—"To designate the 'PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway' in the State of Texas," I would have voted "yea."

IN RECOGNITION OF CATHEDRAL INTERNATIONAL "STOP THE FUNERAL WEEKEND"

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cathedral International's upcoming "Stop the Funeral Weekend" hosted by Bishop Donald Hilliard, Jr. from June 18–21, 2015. The "Stop the Funeral Weekend" aims to highlight the issue of violence in our communities and I would like to join with Bishop Hilliard in bringing attention to this important issue.

Throughout his 32 years as Senior Pastor of Cathedral International, Bishop Hilliard has advocated for the end of violent behavior and injustice through improved community relations and engagement. He has seen the consequences of violence and the persistence of its existence in our communities. The "Stop the Funeral Weekend" will bring together community leaders, families and individuals to encourage open dialogue and the sharing of concerns, objectives and ideas. It will highlight Bishop Hilliard's mission to promote safe environments for our youth to live and grow. I commend Bishop Hilliard's leadership and his ongoing efforts to address the challenges facing our communities today.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing the importance of addressing the issue of violence in our communities and thanking Bishop Hilliard and Cathedral International for its efforts to bring awareness to this critical issue and creating a better environment for our youth.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LAREDO BEAUTY COLLEGE, INC.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a noteworthy occasion: the fiftieth anniversary of Laredo Beauty College, Inc. For five decades, this school has served the community by providing thousands of aspiring stylists with the training they need to succeed, as well as providing affordably priced salon services to the general public.

Upon its opening in 1965, Laredo Beauty College was the first cosmetology school in the Laredo area. The vision behind this significant contribution to the community was Peggy Dietrick, commonly known as Ms. Peggy. At the time of its founding, the school only offered courses in cosmetology. It has since expanded to include manicuring and cosmetology instructor courses as well.

Today, Laredo Beauty College has 102 students and 17 staff members. The school is exceptional in the dedication it inspires in both students and staff, with many of the staff having worked for the school for over twenty

years. One of the current owners, Judy Rodriguez, was a former student, and has been involved with the school for 43 years. Peggy Dietrick and her niece, Deborah Dietrick, make up the remainder of the school's ownership.

In 1975, the National Accrediting Commission of Career Arts and Sciences recognized Laredo Beauty College for its achievements by conferring upon it national accreditation status. The school is currently a member of both the American Association of Cosmetology Schools and the Cosmetology Educators of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the Laredo Beauty College for having been such an essential part of their community for the past fifty years.

ON THE PASSING OF MICHAEL KING

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of one of the legends of the entertainment industry, a man responsible for some of the greatest television touchstones of the past three decades: Michael Gordon King. Michael's passing last month at age 67 is a great tragedy, but we know he leaves a towering legacy of success and an indelible mark on American culture.

Michael and his late brother Robert inherited their business and their savvy from their father, Charles King, who founded a modest television syndication company named King World Productions in 1964. As Michael would recall, their father would go over every deal at the dinner table with his family, delving into the details of his transactions when Michael was as young as 14. Michael would take the title of president of King World shortly after graduating from Fairleigh Dickinson University, at the salary of $150 a week.

When Charles King died in 1972, King World had one product: the distribution rights to ''The Little Rascals.'' Over the next 30 years, Michael and Robert would build King World into an entertainment empire.

In 1983, King World paid $50,000 to acquire the rights to ''Wheel of Fortune.'' With the hard-charging brothers traveling the country to secure top media markets to air the show, ''Wheel of Fortune'' became the highest-rated syndicated program in history. The company was awarded the distribution rights to the revival of ''Jeopardy!''—the enduring television favorite that made Alex Trebek a national icon.

In 1986, the Kings' launched a national talk show with a former Baltimore news anchor and local-Chicago talk show host: Oprah Winfrey. The Oprah Winfrey Show would become one of the most widely watched and consequential television programs ever.

Under the leadership of Michael and Robert, King World reached astounding heights. According to the New York Times, ''On a typical day in the late 1980s, 90 million people watched at least one of the company's three biggest shows—Wheel of Fortune, Jeopardy!, and The Oprah Winfrey Show.''

Eventually, the Kings sold their company to CBS. Michael would serve as a consultant to CBS, and find a new passion for sports—opening a world-class boxing gym and a boxing promotions company dubbed King Sports Worldwide.

Michael measured himself against the biggest legends in entertainment history. As we reflect on his life and his legacy, we know that Michael King earned his place among the greats.

Michael's passion for entertainment, his showmanship and eye for talent, his dedication, drive and creativity shaped some of the most important cultural touchstones of recent memory.

I knew Michael as a father devoted to his family and concerned about the community. I hope it is a comfort to Michael's wife, Jena, his children, Alexandra, Theodore, Audrey and Jesse, and the entire King family that so many people mourn their loss. Many millions around the world have been entertained and moved by Michael's work, and are grateful for his legacy.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE RETIREMENT OF MASTER CHIEF BOB SEBASTE

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Master Chief Bob Sebaste on the occasion of his retirement after 29 years of service in the United States Navy and Coast Guard. Master Chief Sebaste's illustrious military career began as a Staff Instructor in Balston Spa, New York. During his distinguished career, Master Chief Sebaste served assignments throughout the United States as Public Affairs Officer in the US Navy, Leadership Instructor at Coast Guard Air Station in Miami, as well as Maintenance Control Officer for USCG Base, Boston. Notably, for three years, from 1990–1993, he served as an instructor at the Naval Nuclear Power School in Orlando, Florida.

Throughout his career, Master Chief Sebaste continued to strive for self-improvement and successfully rose through the ranks. He distinguished himself as a well-respected leader in the US Navy and US Coast Guard. After attending Electronics Technician School, Master Chief Sebaste was commissioned as a Reactor Operator for submarine USS Tecumseh in Charleston, SC. He went on to serve in a variety of positions including Staff Instructor at Reactor Plant Training, Public Affairs Officer in the Operational Test Support Unit and Chief Electronics Technician for the US Coast Guard Cutter MOHAWK Division.

Behind every great serviceman and woman is a support network encouraging them to strive for greatness. I offer my gratitude to Master Chief Sebaste's wife, Betty, a school teacher at Sandpiper Elementary School in Sunrise, Florida, and their three children Rachel, Walter and Christopher. Following in his father's footsteps, Christopher Sebaste is currently a Staff Sergeant in the United States Air Force, stationed in Okinawa, Japan.

Mr. Speaker, we owe Master Chief Sebaste our infinite gratitude for his boundless devotion and years of service to our nation. It is because of individuals like Master Chief Sebaste that our nation remains safe and secure. I am honored and truly privileged to recognize Master Chief Bob Sebaste for his dedication to the US Navy and Coast Guard over the past 29 years, and offer him my best wishes for continued good health and success in the years to come.

LOGOS PREPARATORY ACADEMY BASEBALL TEAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Logos Prep baseball team for their advancement to the 3A championship game after winning District 6–3A.

The Lions entered into the championship game with a remarkable 11–1 record and proudly represented the entire Fort Bend community. They were led on and off the field by four outstanding all-state players, including junior Andrew Richards, sophomore Sammy Kuntz, senior Makay Raven, and junior Marshall Allen. Additionally, the Lions had multiple players voted onto the all-district and academic all-state list. These prestigious awards are achieved through both athletic and academic vigor and are highly competitive throughout the state of Texas. We are extremely proud of all the men of the Logos Prep baseball team and look forward to their future accomplishments.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the entire team in representing the Logos Prep Academy in the Texas State Tournament.

RABBINIC LETTER ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit a Rabbinic Letter on the Climate Crisis.

Today, Pope Francis released the Papal Encyclical, calling on all of us to address the global crisis of climate change. But the Encyclical was not the only religious document this week calling for bold action. The Rabbinic Letter demonstrates that leaders in the Jewish faith share the commitment to meeting perhaps the greatest challenge of our time.

The Rabbinic Letter was initiated by seven leading rabbis from a broad spectrum of American Jewish life: Rabbi Elliot Dorff, rector of the American Jewish University; Rabbi Arthur Green, rector of the Hebrew College rabbinical school; Rabbi Peter Knobel, former president, Central Conference of American Rabbis; Rabbi Mordechai Liebling, director of the Social Justice Organizing Program at the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College; Rabbi Susan Talve, spiritual leader of Central Reform Congregation, St. Louis; Rabbi Arthur Waskow, director of The Shalom Center; and Rabbi Deborah Waxman, president of the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College. They were joined by Rabbi Irving (Yitz) Greenberg, a leader of the Orthodox community.

This letter makes clear the scope of the problem we face in combatting human-induced climate change. It also identifies clear and indisputable principles of the Jewish faith that prove that action on this issue isn't just smart from an economic and public health perspective—it's morally and religiously justified.

I thank the 360 Rabbis who have already signed this letter, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to follow the guidance of these religious leaders on this critical issue.

TO THE JEWISH PEOPLE, TO ALL COMMUNITIES OF SPIRIT, AND TO THE WORLD: A RABBINIC LETTER ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS

We come as Jews and rabbis with great respect for what scientists teach us—for as we understand their teaching, it is about the unfolding mystery of God's Presence in the unfolding universe, and especially in the history and future of our planet. Although we accept scientific accounts of earth's history, we continue to see it as God's creation, and we celebrate the presence of the divine hand in every earthly creature.

Yet in our generation, this wonder and this beauty have been desecrated—not in one land alone but 'round all the Earth. So in this crisis, even as we join all Earth in celebrating the Breath of Life that interweaves us all—

You sea-monsters and all deeps, Hallelu-Yah.
Fire, hail, snow, and steam, Hallelu-Yah.
Stormy wind to do God's word, Hallelu-Yah.
Mountains high and tiny hills, Hallelu-Yah
(Psalm 148)

We know all Earth needs not only the joyful human voice but also the healing human hand.

We are especially moved when the deepest, most ancient insights of Torah about healing the relationships of Earth and human earthlings, adamah and adam, are echoed in the findings of modern science.

The texts of Torah that perhaps most directly address our present crisis are Leviticus 25–26 and Deuteronomy 15. They call for one year of every seven to be Shabbat Shabbaton—a Sabbatical Year—and Shmittah—a Year of restful Release for the Earth and its workers from being made to work, and of Release for debtors from their debts.

In Leviticus 26, the Torah warns us that if we refuse to let the Earth rest, it will ''rest'' anyway, despite us and upon us—through drought and famine and exile that turn an entire people into refugees.

This ancient warning heard by one indigenous people in one slender land has now become a crisis of our planet as a whole and of the entire human species. Human behavior that overworks the Earth—especially the overburning of fossil fuels—crests in a systemic planetary response that endangers human communities and many other lifeforms as well.

Already we see unprecedented floods, droughts, ice-melts, snowstorms, heat waves, typhoons, sea-level rises, and the expansion of disease-bearing insects from ''tropical'' zones into what used to be ''temperate'' regions. Leviticus 26 embodied. Scientific projections of the future make clear that even worse will happen if we continue with carbon-burning business as usual.

As Jews, we ask the question whether the sources of traditional Jewish wisdom can offer guidance to our political efforts to prevent disaster and heal our relationship with the Earth. Our first and most basic wisdom is expressed in the Sh'ma and is underlined in the teaching that through Shekhinah the Divine presence dwells within as well as beyond the world. The Unity of all means not only that all life is interwoven, but also that an aspect of God's Self partakes in the interwovenness.

We acknowledge that for centuries, the attention of our people—driven into exile not only from our original land but made refugees from most lands thereafter so that they were bereft of physical or political connection and without any specific land—has turned away from this sense of interconnection of adam and adamah, toward the repair of social injustice. Because of this history, we were so much pre-occupied with our own survival that we could not turn attention to the deeper crisis of which our tradition had always been aware.

But justice and earthiness cannot be disentangled. This is taught by our ancient texts—teaching that every seventh year be a Year of Release, Shmittah, Shabbat Shabbaton, in which there would be not only one year's release of Earth from overwork, but also one year's sharing by all in society of the Earth's freely growing abundance, and one year's release of debtors from their debts.

Indeed, we are especially aware that this very year is, according to the ancient count, the Shmita Year.

The unity of justice and Earth-healing is also taught by our experience today: The worsening inequality of wealth, income, and political power has two direct impacts on the climate crisis. On the one hand, great Carbon Corporations not only make their enormous profits from wounding the Earth, but then use these profits to purchase elections and to fund fake science to prevent the public from acting to heal the wounds. On the other hand, the poor in America and around the globe are the first and the worst to suffer from the typhoons, floods, droughts, and diseases brought on by climate chaos.

So we call for a new sense of eco-social justice—a tikkun olam that includes tikkun tevel, the healing of our planet. We urge those who have been focusing on social justice to address the climate crisis, and those who have been focusing on the climate crisis to address social justice.

Though as rabbis we are drawing on the specific practices by which our Torah makes eco-social justice possible, we recognize that in all cultures and all spiritual traditions there are teachings about the need for setting time and space aside for celebration, restfulness, reflection.

Yet in modern history, we realize that for about 200 years, the most powerful institutions and cultures of the human species have refused to let the Earth or human earthlings have time or space for rest. By overburning carbon dioxide and methane into our planet's air, we have disturbed the sacred balance in which we breathe in what the trees breathe out, and the trees breathe in what we breathe out. The upshot: global scorching, climate crisis.

The crisis is worsened by the spread of extreme extraction of fossil fuels that not only heats the planet as a whole but damages the regions directly affected.

Fracking shale rock for oil and ''unnatural gas'' poisons regional water supplies and induces the shipment of volatile explosive ''bomb trains'' around the country.

Coal burning not only imposes asthma on coal-plant neighborhoods—often the poorest and Blackest—but destroys the lovely mountains of West Virginia.

Extracting and pipe-lining Tar Sands threatens Native First nation communities in Canada and the USA, and endangers farmers and cowboys through whose lands the KXL Pipeline is intended to traverse.

Drilling for oil deep into the Gulf and the Valdez oil spill in Prince William Sound off the Pacific have already brought death to workers and to sea life and financial disasters upon nearby communities. Proposed oil drilling in the Arctic and Atlantic threaten worse.

All of this is overworking Earth—precisely what our Torah teaches we must not do. So now we must let our planet rest from overwork. For Biblical Israel, this was a central question in our relationship to the Holy One. And for us and for our children and their children, this is once again the central question of our lives and of our God. HOW?—is the question we must answer.

So here we turn from inherited wisdom to action in our present and our future. One way of addressing our own responsibility would be for households, congregations, denominations, federations, political action—to Move Our Money from spending that helps these modern pharaohs burn our planet to spending that helps to heal it. For example, these actions might be both practical and effective:

Purchasing wind-born rather than coal-fired electricity to light our homes and synagogues and community centers;

Organizing our great Federations to offer grants and loans to every Jewish organization in their regions to solarize their buildings;

Shifting our bank accounts from banks that invest in deadly carbon-burning to community banks and credit unions that invest in local neighborhoods, especially those of poor, Black, and Hispanic communities;

Moving our endowment funds from supporting deadly Carbon to supporting stable, profitable, life-giving enterprises;

Insisting that our tax money go no longer to subsidizing enormously profitable Big Oil but instead to subsidizing the swift deployment of renewable energy—as quickly in this emergency as our government moved in the emergency of the early 1940s to shift from manufacturing cars to making tanks.

Convincing our legislators to institute a system of carbon fees and public dividends that rewards our society for moving beyond the Carbon economy.

These examples are simply that, and in the days and years to come, we may think of other approaches to accomplish these ecological ends.

America is one of the most intense contributors to the climate crisis, and must therefore take special responsibility to act. Though we in America are already vulnerable to climate chaos, other countries are even more so—and Jewish caring must take that truth seriously. Israeli scientists, for example, report that if the world keeps doing carbon business as usual, the Negev desert will come to swallow up half the state of Israel, and sea-level rises will put much of Tel Aviv under water.

Israel itself is too small to calm the wide world's worsening heat. Israel's innovative ingenuity for solar and wind power could help much of the world, but it will take American and other funding to help poor nations use the new-tech renewable energy created by Israeli and American innovators.

We believe that there is both danger and hope in American society today, a danger and a hope that the American Jewish community, in concert with our sisters and brothers in other communities of Spirit, must address. The danger is that America is the largest contributor to the scorching of our planet. The hope is that over and over in our history, when our country faced the need for profound change, it has been our communities of moral commitment, religious covenant, and spiritual search that have arisen to meet the need. So it was fifty years ago during the Civil Rights movement, and so it must be today.

As we live through this Shmittah Year, we are especially aware that Torah calls for

Hak'heyl—assembling the whole community of the People Israel during the Sukkot after the Shmittah year, to hear and recommit ourselves to the Torah's central teachings.

So we encourage Jews in all our communities to gather on the Sunday of Sukkot this year, October 4, 2015, to explore together our responsibilities toward the Earth and all humankind, in this generation.

Our ancient earthy wisdom taught that social justice, sustainable abundance, a healthy Earth, and spiritual fulfillment are inseparable. Today we must hear that teaching in a world-wide context, drawing upon our unaccustomed ability to help shape public policy in a great nation. We call upon the Jewish people to meet God's challenge once again.

TPA AND TPP

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our friends on the other side of the aisle are not opposed to job creation, Congressional oversight and global economic prosperity. But I predict they will unfortunately chose unions and outside groups over giving assistance to their own workers when a trade package comes before this body. So, because of that, for the first time in half a century, they will let this policy that is so important to their party expire.

While I predict that TPA will pass, it will be a shame if the whole package isn't enacted due to the failure of this President to work with members of his own party.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL JOSEPH McNEIL

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, vision and resolve: the fertile grounds for greatness. These are the qualities that Major General Joseph McNeil exemplified when in 1960 he and three of his classmates protested segregation with a sit-in at a Woolworth store in Greensboro, North Carolina.

The 'Greensboro Four', as they came to be known, were denied service at a Woolworth lunch counter because of the color of their skin. With the spirit of peaceful protest, they committed themselves to a sit-in, which, little did they know, would reverberate across the nation.

With wisdom beyond his years, Joseph knew that strength was not in the individual but in the many. The Greensboro Four united the North Carolina A&T State University student body by establishing the "Student Executive Committee for Justice" and, in the face of all controversy, he won the battle. Woolworth agreed to allow service to blacks and whites alike.

Many years later, when asked in an interview what he had felt at that trying time, Joseph responded: "Intense sense of pride, a bit of trepidation". Not three weeks before he was to depart for training at a Texas Air Force Base was so unwilling to stand idly by in the face of injustice that he was arrested at a demonstration alongside Reverend Jesse Jackson.

The Air Force saw in Joseph what everyone else did too. From first Lieutenant to Captain; from Major to Lieutenant Colonel; from Colonel to Major General, McNeil excelled in every aspect. Today he dons the Air Force Distinguished Service Medal as a symbol of his achievements, just one the many awards Mr. McNeil earned. He received honorary degrees from North Carolina A&T State University, North Carolina at Wilmington, Molloy College, and St. Johns University in my own district. He is a man truly worthy of every honor bestowed upon him.

Today, we honor Major General Joseph McNeil for his success as a civilian, a community leader, a husband, a father, and as a distinguished member of the United States Air Force. May many more be made of the cloth from which he was cut.

RECOGNIZING RAMADAN

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of Ramadan, which begins tonight at sundown for Muslims in Connecticut and around the world.

I offer my support for those marking the holiday. For Muslims worldwide, this month of fasting is a time for prayer, reflection, and charitable work.

With the constant cycle of violence plaguing our country and the world, let us all take this time to recommit ourselves to work together for equality and peace on earth.

Ramadan Mubarak to all observing the holiday.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS SHOOTING AT THE EMANUEL A.M.E. CHURCH IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak out against the senseless loss of innocent lives resulting from another senseless act of violence.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the people of Charleston, South Carolina, the members of the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, pastored by the Rev. Clementa Pinckney, who was one of nine persons slain by a gunman motivated by hate.

Last night Rev. Pinckney, who was also a member of the South Carolina State Senate, and eight others were shot in a horrific massacre at one of the nation's historic black churches.

Mr. Speaker, it shocks the conscience that this shooting took place during a prayer meeting in a house of sanctuary.

These types of events should never happen, and should never happen in a House of the Lord.

There is no place in a civilized society for senseless acts of violence.

I commend Attorney General Lynch for her moving quickly and decisively to launch an investigation into this hate crime and bring the perpetrator to the bar of justice where he will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

Mr. Speaker, as a country we have made major strides in equality and social justice but this tragedy reminds us that we still have work to do before Dr. King's dream of an America where all live and work together in brotherhood is realized.

There is no place for bigotry and hatred in our great country and individuals who wish to practice hate must be rooted out and ostracized.

Mr. Speaker, this senseless act of violence provides us with yet another opportunity to teach our children that violence is never the answer and that we all must be compassionate, inclusive, and understanding to all regardless of age, economic status, race, religion, nationality or educational background

We as a nation must live lives motivated by love, not hate.

We must teach our children to be tolerant, to show kindness, and to embrace and celebrate our differences.

Changing a culture of violence will not happen overnight but that is no excuse for failing to try.

We must try. For the sake of the victims of Emanuel A.M.E., we must not give up.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims in South Carolina, and victims of gun violence everywhere.

RECOGNIZING JANE ROZANSKI

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Jane Rozanski, a remarkable visionary and dedicated leader to the aging population of Ventura County, California.

As the Chief Executive Officer of the Camarillo Health Care District, Jane has demonstrated an outstanding commitment to providing health care and improving the access of medical services to seniors in our community. For over two decades, Jane oversaw the development of the district, which has grown to serve over 35,000 residents annually.

Under the steadfast leadership of Jane Rozanski, along with her highly skilled team, the Camarillo Health Care District embodies the commitment to provide quality and affordable medical care. The Camarillo Health Care District has been recognized throughout California as a model of innovation and efficiency, has received statewide recognition as the Executive Team of the Year by the Association of California Healthcare Districts, and has been recognized nationally as an innovative and competent partner in federal projects.

Jane has worked tirelessly to improve access to healthcare services throughout the community. In addition to her impressive work in the Camarillo Health Care District, she has upheld the responsibility of a commissioner on the California Commission on Aging for nearly three years and has brought her valuable expertise on how to best serve California's elderly citizens.

Community advocates like Jane exemplify Ventura County's impressive leadership. Though Jane will be stepping down from her position as CEO of the Camarillo Health Care District, her immense impact on the community will continue to inspire the future of public health services.

For her lifelong work, Jane is so deserving of our immeasurable gratitude. I graciously thank Jane for her unwavering commitment and dedication for the past 22 years as the CEO of the Camarillo Health Care District. It has been my sincere pleasure to work with Jane over the years.

There is no doubt that Jane's legacy will extend to future generations for her extraordinary commitment to excellence. As she starts this new chapter in her life, I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

MIRABEAU B. LAMAR OUTSTANDING EDUCATOR AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Rodney Bell of Needville High School and Junior High for receiving the Mirabeau B. Lamar Outstanding Educator Award. The Mirabeau B. Lamar Award is given to individuals who overcame personal adversity and have gone on to strengthen their community.

Dr. Bell, the choir director at Needville High School and Junior High, has shown outstanding perseverance and an unrelenting dedication to the education of our future leaders. For all of his efforts, the Morton Masonic Lodge No. 72 in Richmond has recognized him by giving him this prestigious award.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Dr. Rodney Bell for receiving the Mirabeau B. Lamar Outstanding Educator Award. Thank you for your positive impact on the Needville community.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. JACQUELINE H. GRANT

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to a great friend and outstanding public servant, Dr. Jacqueline H. Grant. Dr. Grant will be leaving her position as the District Health Director for the Southwest Georgia Health District, where she managed public health programs in fourteen counties for ten years. A reception will be held in her honor on Thursday, June 18, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. at the Dougherty County Health Department.

Dr. Grant is a native of Atlanta, Georgia, but traveled far and wide to attain different educational experiences before returning to her home state. She earned a Bachelor of Science degree from East Carolina University. She then received her medical degree from Morehouse School of Medicine, a Master's in Public Health from the University of Alabama in Birmingham, and a Master's in Public Administration from Harvard University. She completed her medical residency in obstetrics and gynecology at Emory University.

Dr. Grant previously served as Medical Director of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at the University of Missouri in Columbia. She also served on the faculty at Emory University and Morehouse School of Medicine prior to working full-time in the private sector from 1994–1997.

In 2005, Dr. Grant began serving as the top public health official in Southwest Georgia when she was named as District Health Director. Under her leadership, Southwest Georgia has seen incredible advancements in public health. The District has established an interactive worksite wellness program as well as the non-profit organization Friends of Southwest Georgia Public Health. Additionally, Dr. Grant has presided over district restructuring to improve efficiency and has provided valuable guidance during disease outbreaks and natural disasters.

In 2009, Dr. Grant was instrumental in obtaining a March of Dimes grant to launch CenteringPregnancy, a support group for pregnant women that promotes positive outcomes throughout the gestational period and beyond. It is the first Public Health-administered CenteringPregnancy program in the state of Georgia as well as the first such program in the southern part of the state. The program was a great success and a second site aimed primarily at Hispanic women soon opened, while the first site continued to address the needs of primarily African-American women.

A well-known and respected public health professional, Dr. Grant has received national recognition in Best Doctors of America in 2003, and was the recipient of the Tee Rae Dismukes Award in 2012 and the District Public Health Award for Excellence in Prenatal and Reproductive Health in 2015.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get; you make your life by what you give." Not only has Dr. Grant established a legacy in public health leadership, but she has also done a tremendous job of giving back to Southwest Georgia, and I am very grateful for her tireless advocacy to make the community stronger and more healthy. A woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise in her field are unparalleled, but her heart for helping others is what makes these qualities truly worthy.

Dr. Grant has accomplished much in her life but none of it would be possible without the love and support of her husband Steve, and two children, Steve, Jr. and Michael.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and my wife, Vivian, in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Dr. Jacqueline H. Grant as she embarks upon a new journey in her life.

THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) recently announced a sweeping recall that encourages consumers to replace airbags installed in millions of vehicles on the roads of our nation.

The companies that manufacture the parts that go into the vehicles American families use in their daily lives have a responsibility to ensure their products meet the highest possible standards. Americans deserve the confidence of knowing safety features will perform their mission effectively.

Government, for its part, also has a responsibility. Its job is to ensure there is accountability in the development and implementation of these mechanisms, and to apply the laws of our country fairly and judiciously in carrying out its mandate.

As the recall is implemented, the safety of American drivers and passengers must be our highest priority. We must ensure there is accountability for failures in the system. But we also must ensure that the recall process does not devolve into a scorched-earth campaign that wrecks a vital industry, destroys jobs, and ultimately makes Americans less safe.

The loss of any life in conjunction with a product failure is tragic and unacceptable. As a representative of TK Holdings stated in recent testimony before the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, "it is unacceptable to us and incompatible with our safety mission for even one of our products to fail to perform as intended and to put people at risk."

This is a higher standard than the federal government itself embraced nearly a quarter-century ago, when it mandated that all cars and light trucks sold in the United States be equipped with self-deploying driver-side airbags.

The federal airbag mandate was adopted by Congress in 1991 amid concerns by some experts that the airbags themselves could pose a danger to drivers and passengers in certain situations. Our colleagues, who authored the law, were aware of these concerns, but determined that the benefits far outweighed the risks.

Over time, their assessment has been proven correct. Thousands of lives have been saved by the presence of airbags as a standard feature in our vehicles.

Every life is precious. And the reality is that millions of airbags and other safety products produced by Takata—including those made by the many hard-working Americans employed by the company and its subsidiaries here in the United States—have inflated successfully and worked as intended. Thousands of Americans owe their lives to this success.

Correcting the problems identified with some of the airbags produced by Takata starts with recognizing this, and acknowledging the need for prudence in the manner in which the federal government responds to the problems that have been brought tragically to light.

We also should recognize that, in thinking about safety, we need to look beyond airbags

to the broader question of how to protect drivers on the road and how to encourage them to drive more safely. As NHTSA itself recently recognized, ''[o]nly a small percentage (approximately 2%) of the annual highway fatalities is directly attributable to vehicle factors (some design issues, some owner maintenance issues, some defect issues). Rather, 94 percent of highway fatalities are related to various human factors, including driver actions, such as speeding, distraction, impaired driving, and not wearing a seatbelt.''

No one questions the need for accountability in this case. My concern is with potential unintended effects of going too far in an effort to ensure accountability, as well as potentially getting distracted from the larger issue of how to encourage our constituents to drive more safely and responsibly.

In this instance, pushing Takata too hard financially, for example, will not save a single American life. To the contrary, it will make it harder to ensure safe airbags are installed in every vehicle that needs one and potentially put lives at risk. Moreover, doing so could significantly disrupt the auto sector, which depends on the company for airbags, seat belts, and other safety features that are essential for protecting lives.

Let me put this in perspective.

Takata's Highland Industries, headquartered in Kernersville, North Carolina, in my congressional district, is one of the largest suppliers of fabric for the North American airbag market. My talented, hard-working constituents at Highland Industries take pride in their work, which has played a direct role over the years in saving thousands of American lives. In addition to helping save the lives of individuals in an accident, they produced the fabrics that have safely gotten astronauts into space, including to the moon and back. Indeed, the flag planted on the moon is made of fabric that was produced by these hard-working Americans in my congressional district.

Destroying the jobs of my constituents in the name of safety will not make American drivers and passengers safer. It will ultimately make them less safe.

We all mourn the American citizens who lost their lives tragically in accidents in which an airbag did not perform as intended. Their legacy should be a better and stronger system of airbag safety in the United States, through the development of even more advanced airbags and other safety features. We owe it to their families to put political agendas and posturing aside and work together to achieve that goal.

RETIREMENT OF COL ROMNEY C. ANDERSON, M.D.

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress and the U.S. Military medical community, I congratulate Colonel Romney C. Andersen, M.D. on his longstanding dedication to our nation.

With over 30 years of service, Colonel Andersen exemplifies the values of a model Soldier with his utmost commitment to caring for the combat injured casualty.

Colonel Anderson's distinguished service to our nation began as a cadet at West Point, followed by leadership as an infantry officer and continued training including Ranger school.

Dr. Andersen's time in uniform is celebrated by the advancements he made in the military medical community. It has been my honor to serve under Colonel Andersen at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center; he is an irreplaceable asset to military medicine.

As an exemplary man of many roles, Dr. Romney Andersen has brought unparalleled virtue to himself, his family and his nation.

Congratulations on your retirement and thank you for your service to the United States of America.

May God bless you.

RECOGNIZING VALLEY CITIES ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Valley Cities Behavioral Health Counseling on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

Valley Cities was first established in 1965, formed by members of south King County community who advocated for better mental health resources and with the belief that all people are capable of overcoming personal obstacles and barriers with proper support. The organization's aim is to strengthen communities through the delivery of holistic, integrated behavioral health services that ''promote hope, recovery and improved quality of life.'' Valley Cities became a United Way partner agency in 1967.

Over the last 50 years, Valley Cities has grown to operate six clinics in the cities of Auburn, Federal Way, Kent, Renton, Des Moines, and Bellevue. As a reflection of the diversity of the 9th Congressional District, Valley Cities serves clients from around the world. Their health clinics often provide care for those with low incomes and who are from our most underserved neighborhoods, making Valley Cities an important healthcare partner in our community.

Today, Valley Cities remains dedicated to helping individuals and families through licensed mental health counseling, chemical dependency treatment for adults, family support programs, and specialized veterans services. In recognition of the pace of change in south King County, Valley Cities continues to evolve to meet the needs of the communities it serves.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate Valley Cities Behavioral Health Counseling on its 50th Anniversary. I am proud to have such a dedicated organization serving and healing community members in and around the 9th Congressional District of Washington.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts on the medical device tax.

H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015, would repeal the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical devices enacted as part of the Affordable Care Act. While I voted in opposition of H.R. 160, I recognize the concerns of many in the medical technology industry regarding the implications of an excise tax on medical devices.

Under the Affordable Care Act, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage and access to critical health services. The tax on medical devices was designed as a means to offset the gains made by the industries that benefit from the law's successful expansion of healthcare coverage and is a critical component of paying for the law's implementation. It is problematic that H.R. 160 does not provide for the cost of eliminating the tax. I do not believe that it is prudent to repeal this tax at this time, but we should continue to monitor its long-term impact and perhaps revisit the issue in the future.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DIRECT THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY TO ACCEPT A STATUE DEPICTING PIERRE L'ENFANT FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Pierre L'Enfant from the District of Columbia and to provide for the permanent display of the statue in the United States Capitol.

Pierre L'Enfant was born in France in 1754. He was an engineer and an architect, and he traveled to the United States to serve with the United States in the Revolutionary War. In March 1791, L'Enfant was hired to develop the design for the District of Columbia. L'Enfant's design for the city was so remarkable that it remains and is cherished today in the nation's capital and throughout this country. L'Enfant's design envisioned a federal and residential city with diagonal streets propelling from Congress and the President's home, beautiful boulevards on local streets and neighborhoods, and open spaces for monuments, memorials and historical structures, all of which largely remain intact, protected as a historical treasure.

In 2006, the residents of the District of Columbia chose L'Enfant as one of the top ten Americans that have given distinguished service to the District, and the selection committee created by the D.C. Commission on the Arts and Humanities chose L'Enfant as the second statue from the District of Columbia to be

placed in the United States Capitol. The District's first choice for a statue was Frederick Douglass, and I am pleased that the Douglass statue now sits in Emancipation Hall. Because the United States Capitol does not currently appropriately recognize the contributions of Pierre L'Enfant, and because D.C. residents and stakeholders chose L'Enfant as a distinguished Washingtonian, this bill would require the Joint Committee on the Library to place the Pierre L'Enfant statue in the United States Capitol.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CODIFICATION OF TITLE 55, UNITED STATES CODE, ENVIRONMENT

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to enact certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, ''Environment''. The bill restates the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, and the Clean Air Act, along with related provisions in other Acts, as a new positive law title of the United States Code. The new positive law title replaces the existing provisions, which are repealed by the bill.

The bill was prepared by the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives as part of its ongoing responsibility under 2 U.S.C. § 285b to prepare, and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary one title at a time, a complete compilation, restatement, and revision of the general and permanent laws of the United States.

All changes in existing law made by the bill are purely technical in nature. The bill was prepared in accordance with the statutory standard for codification legislation, which is that the restatement of existing law shall conform to the understood policy, intent, and purpose of Congress in the original enactments, with such amendments and corrections as will remove ambiguities, contradictions, and other imperfections.

The bill is not intended to make any substantive changes in the law. As is typical with the codification process, a number of non-substantive revisions are made, including the reorganization of sections into a more coherent overall structure, but these changes are not intended to have any substantive effect.

The bill, along with a detailed section-by-section explanation of the bill, can be found on the Law Revision Counsel Internet site at http://uscode.house.gov/codification/t55/index.html. Interested parties are invited to submit comments, not later than 30 days after today's date, to Tim Trushel, Senior Counsel, Office of the Law Revision Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING BANDELIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 75th anniversary of Bandelier Elementary School in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The school opened its doors in the southeast heights of Albuquerque which, at the time, seemed like the middle of nowhere. There were no trees, houses or structures surrounding the school.

During World War II, military planes used the red roof of the building to guide them into landing at the Kirtland Army Air Field, as it was known in those early years.

The school became the center of activity as the community grew around it and served children from all walks of life. Many families looked forward to the annual events that included a Halloween Carnival, singing Christmas Carols around a bonfire, Track and Field Day and the Student Safety Patrol Program.

Over the years, the fundamental reading, writing and arithmetic were combined with music, art, track and field, baseball and soccer, which created an environment for well-educated and well-rounded students.

I join all the community members who are celebrating the 75th anniversary of Bandelier Elementary School. I am certain that the academic excellence, community involvement and exceptional learning environment will serve many more students in years to come.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 160, the ''Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015,'' which would repeal the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical devices that was enacted as part of the Affordable Care Act.

I oppose this bill strongly because repeal of the excise would increase the deficit by $24.4 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 160 is nothing but our Republican friends' latest unpaid-for permanent tax cut bill.

If H.R. 160 were to become law, House Republicans will have passed unpaid-for GOP tax cuts that increase the deficit by a total of $611 billion just this year.

Mr. Speaker, given the real challenges facing our nation, it is irresponsible for the Republican majority to continue bringing to the floor bills that have no chance of becoming law and would harm millions of Americans if they were to be enacted.

House Republicans have tried at least 58 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled more than 16 million previously uninsured Americans to know the peace of mind that comes from having access to affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Their record to date is 0–58; it will soon be 0–59 because the President has announced that he will veto this bill if it makes it to his desk.

Mr. Speaker, all sectors of the health care industry are benefiting from the projected 25 million Americans who will gain coverage under reform, all were called upon to contribute.

The medical device tax that H.R. 160 would repeal was simply the medical device industry's contribution to this collective undertaking.

A repeal of the medical device tax would encourage drug companies, health insurers, hospitals, clinical laboratories, and home health agencies to seek the repeal of their own contributions as well.

According to a study conducted by Wells Fargo Securities, increasing the number of insured Americans, will increase medical device sales by 3.6 percent over its first decade.

Moreover, the medical device tax, which went into effect in 2013, has not damaged the medical device industry.

In fact, the medical device industry is prospering grandly.

A recent analysis by Ernst and Young indicates that the medical device industry's revenue increased by $8 billion in 2013, while R&D spending by the industry increased by 6 percent and employment in the industry increased by 23,500.

Also, despite industry's claims to the contrary, the medical device tax has not forced companies to ship jobs overseas and there is no disadvantage for U.S.-based firms.

Mr. Speaker, our friends across the aisle just cannot accept the fact that the Affordable Care Act is a success and is making a positive difference in the lives of more than 16 million persons.

These Americans come from all walks of life.

They are women, who can no longer be denied coverage or be forced to pay exorbitant amounts for coverage simply because of their sex.

They are nine million seniors and people with disabilities, who have saved $1,600 each on expensive and lifesaving prescription medication.

And they are this country's most vulnerable citizens; people who are working hard and struggling to make ends meet while living in near-poverty, and who have been covered by Medicaid expansion in 27 states and the District of Columbia.

These benefits have been felt across the country, and especially in my home state of Texas where:

1. 10,695,000 individuals with pre-existing conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes—including up to 1,632,000 children—will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history.

2. 4,889,000 uninsured Texans have new health insurance options through Medicaid or private health plans in the Marketplace.

3. 5,198,000 individuals on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one free preventive health care service such as a mammogram, birth control, or an immunization in 2011 and 2012.

4. In the first ten months of 2013, 233,100 seniors and people with disabilities saved on average $866 on prescription medications.

5. 357,000 young adults have gained health insurance because they can now stay on their parents' health plans until age 26.

In addition to the tangible healthcare benefits for millions of families, the ACA has had powerful effects on the financial state of our nation.

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we have extended the solvency of the Medicare Trust fund by more than a decade, and helped save taxpayers $116 billion through new Medicare efficiencies.

H.R. 160 will not make our country better, it will not help uninsured Americans obtain coverage; it will cost the medical device industry jobs and will increase the deficit.

It is an irresponsible proposal and should, like the previous 58 attempts to undermine Obamacare, be rejected.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 160.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. SETH MOULTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favor of H.R. 160, legislation to repeal the onerous medical device tax, when it comes before the House today. I have always said that I strongly support the repeal of this tax on Massachusetts' growing medical device industry, especially because the tax disproportionally affects small- and medium-sized medical device manufacturers that don't have the compliance resources of larger companies. I also believe we must responsibly pay for the repeal of the tax. In light of our nation's growing national debt, I am hopeful that voting in favor of H.R. 160 sends a message to the Senate and the President that we must repeal this tax and pay for it in a responsible way.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the third anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program established by President Barack Obama and which has transformed the lives of over half a million young people in our country.

The DACA program has given aspiring Americans of immigrant heritage across our country the chance to more fully contribute their talents to our society and aid in our nation's economic recovery.

I think of DREAMers like Jose Garcia, a young student from Los Angeles who was just accepted to Harvard University and is a DACA recipient. Because he was able to apply for DACA, his hard work in school paid off and now he can pursue a college education in the only country he has ever known.

Since the DACA program began in 2012, there are more than 261,000 young women and men in California, who like Jose, have been approved for DACA.

Today, on the third anniversary of DACA, we are here to say that we are ready and waiting for that opportunity to help all of these families who want to come out of the shadows. We're ready for the President's executive actions on expanded DACA and the Deferred Action Program for Parents (DAPA) to move forward.

We're ready—estamos listos. Y le digo a nuestras familias inmigrantes que se preparen, porque ya llega el día. [We're ready. And I want to tell our immigrant families to be prepared, because the day is coming].

Ojalá, en estos proximos meses, podemos darles a todos las buenas noticias que estos programas vitales del Presidente van a seguir adelante. [Hopefully, in the coming months, we will be able to convey the good news that the President's vital programs will be able to move forward].

Mr. Speaker, our families and our communities look forward to progress on the President's executive actions as well as the day when we finally enact comprehensive immigration reform.

FORT BEND CHRISTIAN ACADEMY BASEBALL

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Bend Christian baseball team for a remarkable season.

The Eagles finished the season with a remarkable 11–3 record and proudly represented the entire Fort Bend community. They were led on and off the field by captain and all-state senior, Trent Bohny. Additionally, the Eagles had multiple players selected for the all-district teams with honorable state mentions, including senior Spencer Paschal, senior Derek Smith, and senior Garrett West. These prestigious awards are achieved through both athletic and academic vigor and are highly competitive throughout the state of Texas. We are extremely proud of all the men of the Fort Bend Christian Academy baseball team and look forward to their future accomplishments.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Fort Bend Christian Academy baseball team on a successful season.

HIGHLAND HIGH SCHOOL BULLDOGS CLASS 3A BASEBALL STATE CHAMPS

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the victory of the Highland High School Bulldogs as the Class 3A baseball state champions. This is their second title since 2008.

On June 13, 2015, the Bulldogs won the Class 3A State Championship in a 7–6 victory over Nazareth Academy. I would like to congratulate senior Grant Geppert for scoring the bases-loaded single during the seventh inning to give the Bulldogs the win.

I would like to congratulate the Bulldogs on their numerous, outstanding defensive plays, which kept the Nazarene Academy scoring to a minimum. My congratulations go out to the entire coaching staff and team comprised of: Grant Geppert, Pete Baumgartner, Andrew Winning, Tyler Kimmle, Cody Bentlage, Will Greenwald, Jordan Smith, Matt Augustin, Griffin Welz, Seth Luitjohan, Mike McGill, Austin Brown, Jim Smith, Jarrett Dubach, Tyler Pollard, Sam Greene, Chris Dickman, Nick Schmollinger, Kyle Schmitt, Matt Beyer, Trent Carriger, assistant coaches Sam Weber, Caleb Houchin, Dave Miscik, and head coach Joel Hawkins.

I look forward to the continued success of the Highland High School Bulldogs. I extend my best wishes for another outstanding season next year.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF JUNETEENTH AND THE 22ND CELEBRATION OF THE JUNETEENTH URBAN MUSIC FESTIVAL IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the observance of Juneteenth in the United States. Even though the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by President Abraham Lincoln in September 1862, it was not until June 19, 1865 that Union Soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger announced to the last slaves in Galveston, Texas, that they were free. This year also marks the 22nd annual Juneteenth Urban Music Festival in Memphis, Tennessee. To commemorate this day in our history and the contributions of African-Americans to our nation, the 2015 Juneteenth Urban Music Festival theme is: ''Celebrating 150 Years with Music.''

American music has long embodied influences of African culture, since the dark years of slavery when African instruments such as the banjo were introduced to America. Overtime, African Americans developed their own musical style on southern plantations that is now heard in nearly every genre of music, including gospel, blues, bluegrass, jazz, country and rock and roll. This is the true history of American music.

The year's theme is an especially fitting one as Memphis has a rich musical history filled with contributions by African Americans. Memphis is home to Royal Studios, which was founded in 1957 and is one of the oldest recording studios in the world. Such talents as former owner and Memphian Willie Mitchell, Bobby Blue Bland, Ann Peebles, and Al Green have recorded hits at the studio. Most recently, the studio became the recording home of the 2015 Billboard Hot 100 chart topper, Uptown Funk, which held the number one spot for fourteen weeks. Memphis is also home to Stax Records, which is renowned for producing the sounds of Isaac Hayes, Booker T. & the M.G.'s, Otis Redding, Rufus and Carla Thomas, Mavis Staples, the Staple Singers, Lalah Hathaway, Albert King, the Bar-Kays and many more. Other well-known musicians to come out of Memphis include B.B. King,

W.C. Handy, Ruby Wilson, Aretha Franklin, Kirk and Kenneth Whalum and the Oscar-winning rap group, Three 6 Mafia.

The 2015 Juneteenth Urban Music Festival will honor Memphis' own, the Bar-Kays, with a Legendary Award. With their beginnings at Stax producing backup music for other Stax artists, the Bar-Kays found their own voice and have been credited for creating ''Black Rock,'' which is now known as ''Funk,'' and have recorded 29 albums, of which five went gold and one went platinum, as well as 20 top ten singles. Some include: ''Shake Your Rump To The Funk,'' ''Hit and Run,'' ''Freakshow On The Dance Floor,'' ''Move Your Boogie Body,'' and ''Soul Finger,'' which was used in the 1985 movie, Spies Like Us, the 2007 comedy, Superbad, and the 2012 remake of Sparkle. Last year, the Bar-Kays celebrated 50 years in the music industry and their music continues to be an inspiration to artists worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time to reflect upon the end of slavery in America and to recognize the many influences of African American citizens. It is in this spirit that I ask my colleagues to join me in observing our nation's 150th anniversary of Juneteenth and the 22nd celebrations in Memphis.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.R. 1735, National Defense Authorization Act, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4255–S4332.

Measures Introduced: Thirty-six bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1604–1639, and S. Res. 204–206. **Pages S4297–99**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 697, to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act. (S. Rept. No. 114–67)

S. 1619, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. (S. Rept. No. 114–68)

S. 1635, to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016. **Page S4296**

Measures Passed:

National Defense Authorization Act: By 71 yeas to 25 nays (Vote No. 215), Senate passed H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4258–75**

Adopted:

McCain/Blunt Modified Amendment No. 1974 (to Amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress on the security and protection of Iranian dissidents living in Camp Liberty, Iraq. **Page S4263**

McCain (for Murkowski) Amendment No. 2030 (to Amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress on the coordination of hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities on military land. **Page S4263**

McCain (for Vitter) Modified Amendment No. 1472 (to Amendment No. 1463), to exclude AbilityOne goods from the authority to acquire goods and services manufactured in Afghanistan, central Asian states, and Djibouti. **Pages S4263–64**

McCain (for Daines) Amendment No. 1890 (to Amendment No. 1463), to modify the immediate applicability of basic allowance for housing for married members assigned for duty within normal commuting distance. **Page S4264**

McCain (for Coats) Amendment No. 1705 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide for military exchanges between senior officers and officials of the United States and Taiwan. **Page S4264**

McCain (for Flake) Amendment No. 1720 (to Amendment No. 1463), to authorize transportation to transfer ceremonies for the family and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who die overseas during humanitarian operations. **Page S4264**

McCain (for Gardner) Amendment No. 1708 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require a strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. **Page S4264**

McCain (for Enzi) Amendment No. 1908 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide for a small business procurement ombudsman. **Page S4264**

McCain (for Paul) Amendment No. 1678 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide for the more accurate and complete enumeration of members of the Armed Forces in any tabulation of total population by the Secretary of Commerce. **Page S4264**

McCain (for Hatch/Inhofe) Amendment No. 1811 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide for sustainment enhancement. **Pages S4264–65**

McCain (for Fischer/Booker) Amendment No. 1825 (to Amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. **Page S4265**

Reed (for King/Carper) Amendment No. 2020 (to Amendment No. 1463), to demonstrate the effects of a method to facilitate the disposal of excess Army property and management of underutilized and unutilized property by providing an exemption from

certain requirements for off-site use and off-site removal only of non-mobile properties. Page S4265

Reed (for Menendez) Modified Amendment No. 2050 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus. Page S4265

Reed (for Coons) Modified Amendment No. 1474 (to Amendment No. 1463), to improve section 1204, relating to the National Guard State Partnership Program. Pages S4265–66

Reed (for Murphy) Amendment No. 1901 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on foreign procurements. Page S4266

Reed (for Warren/Merkley) Amendment No. 1902 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces. Page S4266

Reed (for Blumenthal) Amendment No. 1563 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly submit to Congress a report on the implementation of new or updated electronic health records in certain environments. Page S4266

Reed (for Durbin) Amendment No. 1703 (to Amendment No. 1463), to authorize the provision of post-traumatic stress disorder training to military and security forces of the Government of Ukraine. Page S4266

Reed (for Tester) Modified Amendment No. 1944 (to Amendment No. 1463), to reform and improve personnel security, insider threat detection and prevention, and physical security. Pages S4266–68

Reed (for Casey/Ayotte) Amendment No. 1747 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require the Department of Defense to support the security of Afghan women and girls during and after 2015. Pages S4268–69

Reed (for Schatz) Amendment No. 2006 (to Amendment No. 1463), relating to the policies of the Department of Defense on the travel of next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas. Page S4269

Reed (for Leahy) Amendment No. 1931 (to Amendment No. 1463), to improve the annual reports of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau on the ability of the National Guard to meet its missions. Page S4269

McCain (for Ayotte) Amendment No. 2011 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide for cooperation between the United States and Israel on anti-tunnel capabilities. Pages S4269–70

Reed (for Bennet) Amendment No. 1916 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate a construction agent for certain construction projects by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Page S4270

Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act: Senate passed S. 808, to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment. Pages S4329–31

Congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks: Senate agreed to S. Res. 205, congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup. Page S4332

Congratulating the Golden State Warriors: Senate agreed to S. Res. 206, congratulating the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship. Page S4332

Measures Considered:

Department of Defense Appropriations Act: By 50 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 216), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2685, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. Pages S4275–76

Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. Page S4276

House Messages:

Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act House Message—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: Page S4290

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. Page S4290

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Amendment No. 2060 (to the House Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date. Page S4290

McConnell Amendment No. 2061 (to Amendment No. 2060), of a perfecting nature. Page S4290

McConnell motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 2062, to change the enactment date. Page S4290

McConnell Amendment No. 2063 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2062), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4290**

McConnell Amendment No. 2064 (to Amendment No. 2063), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4290**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, June 23, 2015. **Page S4290**

Trade Preferences Extension Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4290–92**

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell/Hatch Amendment No. 2065 (to the House Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4291**

McConnell Amendment No. 2066 (to Amendment No. 2065), to change the enactment date. **Page S4291**

McConnell motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 2067, to change the enactment date. **Page S4291**

McConnell Amendment No. 2068 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2067), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4291**

McConnell Amendment No. 2069 (to Amendment No. 2068), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4291**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell/Hatch Amendment No. 2065 (to the House Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50. **Page S4291**

National Defense Authorization Act Printing—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, as amended, and passed by the Senate, be printed. **Page S4328**

H.R. 2146, and H.R. 1295 Filing Deadline—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and to H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, be at 4 p.m., on Monday, June 22, 2015. **Page S4332**

Neffenger and Elliott Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5 p.m., on Monday, June 22, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, and Daniel R. Elliott III, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed; and that no further motions be in order to the nominations. **Page S4328**

Messages from the House: **Page S4295**

Measures Referred: **Pages S4295–96**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S4296–97**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4299–S4300**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4300–04**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4294–95**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4307–28**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4328**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—216) **Pages S4275, S4276**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:02 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 22, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4332.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill entitled, ''Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2016''; and

An original bill entitled, ''Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016''.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 1,659 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

WATER AND POWER LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine S. 593, to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets, S. 982, to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and to require the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop water planning instruments consistent with State law, S. 1305, to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir, S. 1365, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, S. 1291, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska, S. 1552, to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and S. 1533, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, after receiving testimony from Dionne Thompson, Deputy Commissioner for External and Intergovernmental Affairs, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; Charles V. Stern, Specialist in Natural Resources Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Jerry Meissner, Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority, Circle, Montana; Adam P. Schempp, Environmental Law Institute, and Ryan R. Yates, American Farm Bureau Federation, both of Washington, D.C.; and Anthony Willardson, Western States Water Council, Murray, Utah.

FUTURE OF HIGHWAY FUNDING

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine challenges to the future of highway funding, after receiving testimony from Joseph Kile, Assistant Director for Microeconomic Studies, Congressional Budget Office; and former Representative Ray LaHood, Building America's Future, and Stephen Moore, The Heritage Foundation, both of Washington, D.C.

RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD PROGRAM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management concluded a hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's management of the renewable fuel standard program, after receiving testimony from Janet McCabe, Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence committee.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 2818–2821, 2823–2842, and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 57; and H. Res. 326–332, were introduced. **Pages H4541–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4543–44**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2390, to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–168, Part 1);

H.R. 1646, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how small and medium sized unmanned aerial systems could be used in an attack, how to prevent or mitigate the effects of such an attack, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 114–169, Part 1); and

H.R. 2822, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–170). **Pages H4540–41**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speakers approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H4495, H4507**

Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act: The House agreed to the motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment printed in H. Rept. 114–167 to H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 208 noes, Roll No. 374. **Pages H4507–25**

H. Res. 321, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2146) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 373, after the previous question was ordered. **Pages H4497–H4507**

A point of order was raised against the consideration of H. Res. 321 and it was agreed to proceed with consideration of the resolution by voice vote. **Page H4497**

Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 160, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, by a yea-and-nay vote of 280 yeas to 140 nays, Roll No. 375. Consideration began yesterday, June 17th. **Pages H4525–26**

H. Res. 319, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 160) and (H.R. 1190) was agreed to yesterday, June 17th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow, June 19th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, June 23rd for Morning Hour debate. **Page H4528**

Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015: The House began consideration of H.R. 1190, to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H4528–35**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–157 shall be considered as adopted. **Page H4535**

H. Res. 319, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 160) and (H.R. 1190) was agreed to yesterday, June 17th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4506–07, H4524–25, and H4525. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a markup on the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2016. The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2016, was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

A NATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE REVIEW AND LABELING OF BIOTECHNOLOGY IN FOOD

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "A National Framework for the Review and Labeling of Biotechnology in Food". Testimony was heard from Todd W. Daloz, Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Vermont Attorney General; and public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF PROPERTY RIGHTS IN CUBA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Property Rights in Cuba''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing on H.R. 320, the ''Rapid DNA Act''. Testimony was heard from Amy Hess, Executive Assistant Director of Science and Technology, Federal Bureau of Investigation; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, June 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, and Daniel R. Elliott III, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, and vote on confirmation of the nominations at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Friday, June 19

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in a Pro Forma session at 12 noon.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E932
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E923, E929
Brownley, Julia, Calif., E923, E928
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E932
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E924
Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E921
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E925
Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E922, E928
Foxx, Virginia, N.C., E929
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E925
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E926
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E921
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E922, E928, E931
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E921
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E921
Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E924, E931
Marino, Tom, Pa., E931
Meeks, Gregory W., N.Y., E928
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E930
Moulton, Seth, Mass., E932
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E930
Olson, Pete, Tex., E923, E925, E926, E929, E932
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E924, E925
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E926
Poe, Ted, Tex., E925
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E926
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E928
Shimkus, John, Ill., E922, E932
Smith, Adam, Wash., E923, E930
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E924
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E925
Welch, Peter, Vt., E925
Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E930

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.