United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2015 No. 101

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 23, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BLAKE FARENTHOLD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last Congress, we passed a new farm bill. As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I could not support it, either in committee or on the House floor. I couldn't support it because it cut SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, our Nation's premier antihunger program. I couldn't support a bill that I believed made hunger worse in America.

At the time, members of both parties offered many assurances that the changes to SNAP's relationship with LIHEAP, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, wouldn't hurt SNAP recipients, that the changes were merely ''closing a loophole'' rather than a true benefit cut.

I was skeptical of those assurances at the time—and with good reason. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the change would reduce benefits for about 850,000 low-income households by an average of $90 a month in the 14 States and the District of Columbia that took advantage of a State option to link LIHEAP and SNAP. States chose to use this option to alleviate some of the heartbreaking choices that poor families face. Seniors and the disabled are all too often the ones forced to choose between buying food or heating their homes or paying for their prescriptions.

Throughout the farm bill process, antihunger advocates in the ''heat and eat'' States vigorously opposed the LIHEAP cuts to SNAP, saying their effects would be much greater than the Congressional Budget Office estimates. I'm sorry to say they were right. These cuts are much more than just abstract numbers. We are starting to hear real stories from real people who are seeing their SNAP benefits cut. Hunger is worse in this country because of these cuts.

Take Judy Beals, a disabled senior from Belleville, Wisconsin. Earlier this year, she saw her SNAP benefit cut from $120 a month to $16 a month. Let me repeat that, she now gets $16 a month in food assistance. That is it. That is unconscionable. How could anyone afford to feed themselves for a month on that?

Ms. Beals says she is forced to eat just once a day now that her SNAP benefit has been cut as she tries to figure out how to pay her other bills. To add insult to injury, Ms. Beals found out that her SNAP benefit had been cut at the register at the grocery store with a full cart of groceries.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Beals' story is not unique. The Hunger Task Force in Milwaukee estimates that, in Wisconsin alone, 255,000 families have seen their SNAP benefits reduced since the LIHEAP cuts went into effect.

We are hearing similar stories in New Jersey, another State that did not extend its heat and eat program. The Food Bank of South New Jersey estimates that 160,000 New Jersey residents have lost about $90 a month in SNAP benefits due to the farm bill cut.

Now, to be fair, there are several States, including my home State of Massachusetts, that did the right thing and found a way, mostly with State funds, to make up the money lost by the LIHEAP cut in the farm bill. Republican and Democratic Governors stepped up and recognized that those already struggling to put food on the table would be worse off if they didn't find a way to fix the cut. In those States that did not make up the money, we will continue to hear stories of people who have seen their SNAP benefit cut.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to serve on the House Agriculture Committee. Since the beginning of this Congress, the committee has been conducting a top-to-bottom review of the SNAP program. Now, I have no idea where these hearings are going and, once again, we have heard assurances that there will be no cuts in SNAP, but I have this sinking feeling in my stomach that these hearings are not leading to a place that is good for millions of struggling Americans.

The fact is SNAP is a good program. It works. It is effective, and it is efficient. It is one of the most efficiently run Federal programs that exists, with an unbelievably low error rate.

Instead of cutting SNAP or making other harmful policy changes, we

Printed on recycled paper.

should be strengthening the program. Democratic and Republican witnesses alike have testified before the Agriculture Committee that the SNAP benefit is already too low.

We have heard that the certification and recertification process is time-consuming and onerous, especially for working families. We have heard about people who are eligible to get renewed benefits who fall off the program because of these onerous, new requirements.

We have heard from charities that they cannot solve the problems of hunger on their own. Charities do incredible work, but they cannot meet the demand for food assistance. They need a strong Federal partner.

We need better coordination among all stakeholders—Federal agencies, nonprofits, faith-based organizations, and businesses—to end hunger. That is why I have been advocating for a White House conference on food, nutrition, and hunger. We need a coordinated, holistic plan to end hunger now.

If we make further cuts to SNAP, we will no doubt hear more stories like Ms. Beals where those who are already struggling to put food on the table see their food assistance benefits cut.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that we should not be making hunger worse in this country. We should end hunger now.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JUAN FELIPE HERRERA

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and pay tribute to Juan Felipe Herrera, who was recently appointed to serve as the United States Poet Laureate.

The son of migrant farmworkers, Mr. Herrera is the first Latino American to be appointed to this position and has published more than a dozen short stories, novels, and collections of poetry.

In 2008, he was awarded the National Book Critics Circle Award, and in 2012 he was appointed California's Poet Laureate.

Never one to shy away from experimentation, Mr. Herrera conducted a 2-year poetry project, entitled, ''The Most Incredible and Biggest Poem on Unity in the World,'' where California residents of all ages submit their writings on unity. The project resulted in a 170-page collection of poems on unity and how we as Americans can come together.

A recent retiree from the University of California, Riverside, Mr. Herrera taught creative writing and worked with young people in the Inland Empire by creating an antibullying poetry project that allows kids affected by bullying to channel their feelings through poetry. Poetry, after all, is an incredibly powerful medium.

In his work, ''Let Me Tell You What a Poem Brings,'' Herrera spoke of poetry's impact, saying:

Before you go further,
let me tell you what a poem brings,
first, you must know the secret, there is no poem
to speak of, it is a way to attain a life without boundaries,
yes, it is that easy, a poem, imagine me telling you this,
instead of going day by day against the razors, well,
the judgments, all the tick-tock bronze, a leather jacket
sizing you up, the fashion mall, for example, from
the outside you think you are being entertained,
when you enter, things change, you get caught by surprise,
your mouth goes sour, you get thirsty, your legs grow cold
standing still in the middle of a storm, a poem, of course,
is always open for business too, except, as you can see,
it isn't exactly business that pulls your spirit into
the alarming waters, there you can bathe, you can play,
you can even join in on the gossip—the mist, that is,
the mist becomes central to your existence.

As a former student of Juan Felipe Herrera's, I offer my congratulations and know that he will continue to inspire and move us with his words as our next Poet Laureate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Barry Black, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Sovereign Lord, Your kingdom cannot be shaken.

Thank You for inviting us to ask and receive, to seek and find, and to knock for doors to open. Lord, forgive us when we forfeit our blessings because of our failure to ask. Remind us that we have not because we ask not.

Inspire our lawmakers to harness prayer power continuously. May they follow Your admonition to pray without ceasing. Throughout this day, may they repeatedly ask You for wisdom and guidance. May their fervent prayers make a positive impact on the legislative process.

We pray in Your great name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota 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.

CONGRATULATING JOE RAMSTAD

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Joe Ramstad, a high school senior from Forest Lake, Minnesota.

This impressive 18-year-old from my district was recently named the 2015 Star in Agriscience by the Minnesota Future Farmers of America for his work teaching a local agricultural literacy program.

Agriculture is a vital part of Minnesota's economy, and we are dependent on these young men and women to ensure that agriculture remains a bright and thriving industry in our State.

In the fall, Joe will be heading to the University of Minnesota with plans to work toward an agricultural education degree. Eventually, he hopes to work in an urban setting to educate students on a variety of agricultural opportunities that exist.

I applaud Joe and all Future Farmers of America for their interest and passion in agriculture and Minnesota.

Thank you, and congratulations on your recent honor, Joe.

HUMANE COSMETICS ACT

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a bill that Representatives MCSALLY, CÁRDENAS, JOE HECK, and I have introduced, the Humane Cosmetics Act.

The Humane Cosmetics Act would phase out the use of animal-based testing for cosmetic products. It will eventually prohibit the sale of cosmetics tested on animals in foreign countries, making sure that only safe products tested with cutting-edge technology enter the American market.

It is time for us to end the painful and completely unnecessary process of testing American cosmetics on animals. Safer, more cost-effective, and

completely humane alternatives already exist; and the United States is in no danger of losing its competitive role as a leader in the global cosmetics industry. Now, we need to ensure our place as a moral leader.

Over the last 20 years, cosmetics companies have reduced their use of animals for cosmetics testing in favor of more reliable, cost-effective, and technologically advanced methods that can more accurately predict whether cosmetics are safe for humans.

Let's not stay in the past. Let's keep up with our peers. The Humane Cosmetics Act would match U.S. law to the European Union, Israel, and India and ensure that the American cosmetics industry can remain competitive in a changing global market.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, President Obama described his signature healthcare law as ''a new set of rules that treats everyone fairly and honestly.''

But under President Obama's Independent Payment Advisory Board, also known as IPAB, a panel of 15 unelected bureaucrats would be tasked with cutting Medicare costs in a way that could deny care to seniors who need it the most.

Now, I have been a nurse for over 40 years, but you don't have to be in health care as a professional to understand that there is nothing fair about that. Even Democrat Governor Howard Dean called IPAB ''a healthcare rationing board'' that should be scrapped.

Mr. Speaker, no senior needs a Washington bureaucrat standing between them and their doctor.

Vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1190, and let's repeal IPAB today.

IRAN NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the goal of the ongoing P5+1 negotiations is to guarantee that Iran never develops a nuclear weapon.

As Congress assesses the final deal, I am going to draw upon a recent publication which is entitled, ''Negotiations with Iran: Five Requirements for a Good Deal,'' which details the following five components: one, mechanisms supporting strong verification, including anytime, anywhere inspections of all Iranian nuclear and military facilities; two, Iranian compliance with all U.N. resolutions and full disclosure of its previous work toward nuclear weapons; three, a schedule which lifts sanctions only as Iran meets the agreement's obligations; four, must include measures to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear threshold state; and, lastly, requirements that Iran dismantle its nuclear weapon infrastructure and relinquish its fissionable weapons material stockpile.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 19, 2015 at 2:22 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 808.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 23, 2015 at 11:02 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 91.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 22, 2015 at 5:26 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1735.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

CONSUL GENERAL TOYOEI SHIGEEDA

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

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a very good friend of Hawaii and a very good friend of mine, Consul General Toyoei Shigeeda.

Consul General Shigeeda has been a tireless advocate for Japan and has been the glue that has held together a solid bond between Hawaii and Japan.

I have known Consul General Shigeeda and his wife, Michiko, since they arrived in October of 2012. I have enjoyed many occasions with the consul general and Michiko at the numerous bon dances throughout Oahu.

I recall inviting Consul General Shigeeda to the Aiea Hongwanji bon dance 2 years ago. We had a great time. More importantly, Consul General Shigeeda and I enjoyed spending many Friday and Saturday nights last year going to bon dances. He and Michiko are really great bon dancers.

I also wanted to commend the consul general on his efforts to bridge the Pacific Ocean and bring together the leaders of Japan's Diet with the members of the Hawaii State Legislature. This Japan-Hawaii Friendship Association will continue for many years and will continue to foster the great relationship between Hawaii and Japan.

I also wanted to thank Michiko. She has developed strong bonds with many Japanese organizations and has always been a great advocate for Japan.

I wish them well, Mr. Speaker, for their service in Hawaii, and I wish them the very best in their future endeavors.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1501

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DOMAIN OPENNESS THROUGH CONTINUED OVERSIGHT MATTERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 805) to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility over the Internet domain name system until the Comptroller General of the United States submits to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to such system, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 805

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 ''Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act of 2015'' or the ''DOTCOM Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Until the date that is 30 legislative days after the submission to Congress of the report described in subsection (b), the Assistant Secretary may not permit the NTIA's role in the performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions to terminate, lapse, be cancelled, or otherwise cease to be in effect.

(b) REPORT DESCRIBED.—The report described in this subsection is a report that contains—

(1) the proposal relating to the transition of the NTIA's stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions that was developed in a process convened by ICANN at the request of the NTIA; and

(2) a certification by the Assistant Secretary that—

(A) such proposal—

(i) supports and enhances the multistakeholder model of Internet governance;

(ii) maintains the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet domain name system;

(iii) meets the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority services;

(iv) maintains the openness of the Internet; and

(v) does not replace the role of the NTIA with a government-led or intergovernmental organization solution; and

(B) the required changes to ICANN's bylaws contained in the final report of ICANN's Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and the changes to ICANN's bylaws required by ICANN's IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group have been adopted.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ''Assistant Secretary'' means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(2) ICANN.—The term ''ICANN'' means the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.

(3) LEGISLATIVE DAY.—The term ''legislative day'' does not include Saturdays, Sundays, legal public holidays, or days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress.

(4) NTIA.—The term ''NTIA'' means the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are here to consider H.R. 805, the DOTCOM Act. I first introduced this legislation last Congress, and I am proud to see it brought to the floor today. The DOTCOM Act is a great example of what can get done when we work together and build on the Energy and Commerce Committee's growing record of legislative success.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, from the time the administration announced their intent to transition the IANA functions, I have had serious concerns about the potential risk associated with the move. I have said time and again that this is far too important to rush and that we must carefully consider all the potential consequences and outcomes before any transition occurs.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would require a period of 30 legislative days for us to review any proposal that NTIA receives from the multistakeholder community and ICANN. This allows us to hear from our constituents and consult with outside experts before we decide if ICANN's proposal is satisfactory. If, in this review period allowed only through passage of the DOTCOM Act, we find that ICANN and/or its proposal does not adequately protect the free and open Internet, Congress can then take action to either completely stop the transfer or require more safeguards to be put in place.

Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, the DOTCOM Act requires NTIA to renew their contract to continue these important stewardship functions with ICANN before it expires in September. Everyone agrees that the contract should remain with NTIA while this process moves forward. DOTCOM is the vehicle to make sure this does in fact happen. Extending the contract takes the pressure off of making a rushed transition and perhaps making mistakes. We get one bite at the apple on this, and we need to make sure it is done correctly.

Mr. Speaker, before I relinquish my time, I want to say that I am very proud of the work that has been done on this bill in the Energy and Commerce Committee, particularly by Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN and Ranking Members PALLONE and ESHOO. We wouldn't be here today without their hard work and also the work of staff, particularly Greta Joynes of my office and committee staff David Redl, Kelsey Guyselman, Margaret McCarthy, David Goldman, and Tiffany Guarascio.

Mr. Speaker, clearly, this is an issue that has brought both sides together for the best interests of all Americans. I ask my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 805, and 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 support of H.R. 805, the Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters, or DOTCOM, Act. I am pleased to support this bill, and I want to commend my colleagues for the bipartisan process in the Energy and Commerce Committee that brought us here.

The Internet is a great American success story that has benefited billions of users around the globe. Over the last two decades, the United States Government has taken steps to get out of the way and empower a bottom-up approach to Internet governance. Thanks to the success of this multistakeholder model, the Internet has opened up new markets and economic opportunities and become an unprecedented platform for democratic free expression.

Mr. Speaker, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, the U.S. Government has supported the idea that the Internet should be governed through a decentralized process, free from governmental control. Since the late 1990s, the U.S. Government has moved towards private sector management of the domain name system. To put it another way, we think that the future of the Internet should be determined by businesses, civil society, and technical experts.

Congress has also explicitly embraced this vision. As recently as 2013, the House voted unanimously in support of a bill making it official U.S. policy to ''preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet.''

Mr. Speaker, completing the transition of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority advances that policy goal. The IANA transition reaffirms our two-decade commitment to the global multistakeholder community, but we have a responsibility to make sure that the transition is done right.

The DOTCOM Act continues the longstanding congressional support for the global, open Internet while appropriately conducting oversight of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration. We require NTIA to live up to the commitments the agency has made for the IANA transition and ensure that transparency and accountability mechanisms are in place before the U.S. Government can relinquish its stewardship role. In short, I believe our bill provides the necessary safeguards for the IANA transition to occur without unnecessary delay.

Our vote on the DOTCOM Act today is timely for several reasons. Key

meetings are taking place, as we speak, in Buenos Aires, Argentina, to finalize planning for the IANA transition. And quick action on the DOTCOM Act is needed to provide a better alternative to the language in the House Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill that blocks NTIA's ability to implement the transition. Unlike the appropriations rider, the DOTCOM Act provides a real opportunity for congressional oversight, so I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN, Representative SHIMKUS, and their respective staffs, David Redl and Greta Joynes, for working with Congresswoman ESHOO and other Democrats on this bill. The DOTCOM Act shows what we can accomplish when our work is bipartisan from the start. I would also like to thank David Goldman and Margaret McCarthy of my staff for their hard work on this legislation. I look forward to working with you all and our colleagues in the Senate to see this bill become law.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I urge passage of the DOTCOM Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 805, the DOTCOM Act.

Over the past two decades, U.S. policy through Republican and Democratic administrations has supported the transition of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) to the private sector. The DOTCOM Act which passed the Energy and Commerce Committee by voice vote last week carries on this bipartisan tradition by ensuring that the IANA transition supports and enhances the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance; maintains the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet domain name system; and does not replace the role of the NTIA with a government-led or intergovernmental organization solution.

Importantly, the DOTCOM Act as amended by the Committee, represents a sensible alternative to the funding restriction included in the House-passed Commerce, Justice and Science (CJS) Appropriations bill. I look forward to working with my colleagues to see that the DOTCOM Act becomes the law of the land—rather than enacting a counterproductive limitation of funds which sends the wrong message to the international community.

I thank Chairman WALDEN, Ranking Member PALLONE and Congressman SHIMKUS for their bipartisan cooperation on this bill and I urge my colleagues to support the DOTCOM Act, which is a vote for the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance and a global, open Internet, free from governmental control.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, right now as we speak, the international community is meeting in Argentina to discuss the state of the Internet around the globe. We have an opportunity today to send a loud and clear message to those gathered in Buenos Aires: that the United States will not stand for anything other than strong safeguards to protect our online future.

By advancing the DOTCOM Act, we can ensure that the Internet—the world's greatest platform of ideas, commerce, and social connection—continues to thrive to the benefit of folks in Michigan and every corner of the country.

As we move toward transitioning the United States' oversight role of the Domain Name System to the international community of stakeholders, it is essential we tread carefully and thoughtfully. The bill we are considering today is a bipartisan effort to ensure appropriate congressional oversight of this incredibly important transition, and ensure that the administration and NTIA get it right as there are no do-overs.

Over the course of the past year, the Energy and Commerce Committee has engaged in efforts to ensure that any transition proposal considered by the administration contains the necessary safeguards to protect the Internet. This bill incorporates the criteria initially put forward by NTIA, and requires the agency to certify to Congress that the proposal meets these important metrics. It would also put important accountability measures in place for the Internet community.

This legislation, which the Energy and Commerce Committee approved by voice vote, is the result of many informative hearings, feedback from a variety of stakeholders—both domestically and internationally—and productive and ongoing conversations between members on both sides of the aisle. Once again, our committee's efforts demonstrate that Congress can work together to achieve meaningful results and build a bipartisan record of success. I want to recognize Mr. SHIMKUS for his leadership on this issue from the beginning, as well as Chairman WALDEN and Ranking Member PALLONE for their hard work on this commonsense solution to protect the Internet on which we have come to depend.

The world is watching. A vote for the DOTCOM Act is a vote for effective Congressional oversight. I urge all members to support this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 805, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SHIMKUS. 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 motion will be postponed.

TSCA MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2576) to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2576

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''TSCA Modernization Act of 2015''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Testing of chemical substances and mixtures.
Sec. 4. Regulation of hazardous chemical substances and mixtures.
Sec. 5. Relationship to other Federal laws.
Sec. 6. Disclosure of data.
Sec. 7. Effect on State law.
Sec. 8. Administration of the Act.
Sec. 9. Conforming amendments.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2602) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) as paragraphs (8) through (10) and (12) through (16), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) The term 'intended conditions of use' means the circumstances under which a chemical substance is intended, known, or reasonably foreseeable to be manufactured, processed, distributed in commerce, used, and disposed of.''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (10), as so redesignated, the following:

''(11) The term 'potentially exposed subpopulation' means a group of individuals within the general population who, due to either greater susceptibility or greater potential exposure, are likely to be at greater risk than the general population of adverse health effects from exposure to a chemical substance.''.

SEC. 3. TESTING OF CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES AND MIXTURES.

Section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) testing of a chemical substance is necessary to conduct a risk evaluation under section 6(b); and'';

(2) in the matter following subsection (a)(2), by inserting '', order, or consent agreement'' after ''by rule''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(5), by striking ''paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A), (1)(B), or (1)(C)''.

SEC. 4. REGULATION OF HAZARDOUS CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES AND MIXTURES.

(a) SCOPE OF REGULATION.—Section 6(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''finds that there is a reasonable basis to conclude'' and inserting ''determines under subsection (b)'';

(2) by inserting ''or designates a chemical substance under subsection (i)(2),'' before ''the Administrator shall by rule''; and

(3) by striking ''to protect adequately against such risk using the least burdensome requirements'' and inserting ''so that the chemical substance or mixture no longer presents or will present an unreasonable risk, including an identified unreasonable risk to a potentially exposed subpopulation''.

(b) RISK EVALUATIONS.—Section 6(b) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) RISK EVALUATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall conduct risk evaluations pursuant to this subsection to determine whether or not a chemical substance presents or will present, in the absence of requirements under subsection (a), an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment.

''(2) APPLYING REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall apply requirements with respect to a chemical substance through a rule

under subsection (a) only if the Administrator determines through a risk evaluation under this subsection, without consideration of costs or other non-risk factors, that the chemical substance presents or will present, in the absence of such requirements, an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment.

''(3) CONDUCTING RISK EVALUATION.—

''(A) REQUIRED RISK EVALUATIONS.—The Administrator shall conduct and publish the results of a risk evaluation under this subsection for a chemical substance if—

''(i) the Administrator determines that the chemical substance may present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment because of potential hazard and a potential route of exposure under the intended conditions of use; or

''(ii) a manufacturer of the chemical substance requests such a risk evaluation in a form and manner prescribed by the Administrator.

''(B) TSCA WORK PLAN CHEMICALS.—The Administrator may, without making a determination under subparagraph (A)(i), conduct and publish the results of a risk evaluation under this subsection for a chemical substance that, on the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, is listed in the TSCA Work Plan for Chemical Assessments published by the Administrator.

''(4) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting a risk evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall—

''(A) integrate and assess information on hazards and exposures for all of the intended conditions of use of the chemical substance, including information that is relevant to specific risks of injury to health or the environment and information on potentially exposed subpopulations;

''(B) not consider information on cost and other factors not directly related to health or the environment;

''(C) take into account, where relevant, the likely duration, intensity, frequency, and number of exposures under the intended conditions of use of the chemical substance;

''(D) describe the weight of the scientific evidence for identified hazard and exposure;

''(E) consider whether the weight of the scientific evidence supports the identification of doses of the chemical substance below which no adverse effects can be expected to occur; and

''(F) in the case of a risk evaluation requested by a manufacturer under paragraph (3)(A)(ii), ensure that the costs to the Environmental Protection Agency, including contractor costs, of conducting the risk evaluation are paid for by the manufacturer.

''(5) DEADLINES.—

''(A) RISK EVALUATIONS.—The Administrator shall conduct and publish a risk evaluation under this subsection for a chemical substance as soon as reasonably possible, subject to the availability of resources, but not later than—

''(i) 3 years after the date on which the Administrator—

''(I) makes a determination under paragraph (3)(A)(i); or

''(II) begins the risk evaluation under paragraph (3)(B); or

''(ii) in the case of a risk evaluation requested by a manufacturer under paragraph (3)(A)(ii), 2 years after the later of the date on which—

''(I) the manufacturer requests the risk evaluation; or

''(II) if applicable, the risk evaluation is initiated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

''(B) DEADLINE ADJUSTMENT.—If the Administrator receives more requests for risk evaluations under paragraph (3)(A)(ii) than the Administrator has resources to conduct by the deadline under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) (taking into account the requirement in paragraph (4)(F)), the Administrator shall—

''(i) initiate risk evaluations that exceed the Administrator's allotted resources as soon as resources for such risk evaluations are available; and

''(ii) not collect a fee under section 26 from the manufacturer for a risk evaluation until the Administrator initiates the risk evaluation.

''(C) SUBSECTION (a) RULES.—If, based on a risk evaluation conducted under this subsection, the Administrator determines, without consideration of costs or other non-risk factors, that a chemical substance presents or will present, in the absence of a rule under subsection (a), an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment, the Administrator shall—

''(i) propose a rule under subsection (a) for the chemical substance not later than 1 year after the date on which the risk evaluation regarding such chemical substance is published under subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) publish in the Federal Register a final rule not later than 2 years after the date on which the risk evaluation regarding such chemical substance is published under subparagraph (A).

''(D) EXTENSION.—If the Administrator determines that additional information is necessary to make a risk evaluation determination under this subsection, the Administrator may extend the deadline under subparagraph (A) accordingly, except that the deadline may not be extended to a date that is later than—

''(i) 90 days after receipt of such additional information; or

''(ii) 2 years after the deadline being extended under this subparagraph.

''(6) DETERMINATIONS OF NO UNREASONABLE RISK.—

''(A) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—Not later than 30 days before publishing a final determination under this subsection that a chemical substance does not and will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment, the Administrator shall make a preliminary determination to such effect and provide public notice of, and an opportunity for comment regarding, such preliminary determination.

''(B) POTENTIALLY EXPOSED SUBPOPULATIONS.—The Administrator shall not make a determination under this subsection that a chemical substance will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment if the Administrator determines that the chemical substance, under the intended conditions of use, presents or will present an unreasonable risk of injury to 1 or more potentially exposed subpopulations.

''(C) FINAL ACTION.—A final determination under this subsection that a chemical substance will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment shall be considered a final agency action.

''(7) MINIMUM NUMBER.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Administrator shall initiate 10 or more risk evaluations under paragraphs (3)(A)(i) or (3)(B) in each fiscal year beginning in the fiscal year of the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015.''.

(c) PROMULGATION OF SUBSECTION (a) RULES.—Section 6(c) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(c)) is amended—

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

''(1) REQUIREMENTS FOR RULE.—In promulgating any rule under subsection (a) with respect to a chemical substance or mixture, the Administrator shall—

''(A) consider and publish a statement with respect to—

''(i) the effects of the chemical substance or mixture on health and the magnitude of the exposure of human beings to the chemical substance or mixture;

''(ii) the effects of the chemical substance or mixture on the environment and the magnitude of the exposure of the environment to the chemical substance or mixture;

''(iii) the benefits of the chemical substance or mixture for various uses; and

''(iv) the reasonably ascertainable economic consequences of the rule, including consideration of the likely effect of the rule on the national economy, small business, technological innovation, the environment, and public health;

''(B) impose requirements under the rule that the Administrator determines, consistent with the information published under subparagraph (A), are cost-effective, except where the Administrator determines that additional or different requirements described in subsection (a) are necessary to protect against the identified risk;

''(C) based on the information published under subparagraph (A), in deciding whether to prohibit or restrict in a manner that substantially prevents a specific use of a chemical substance or mixture and in setting an appropriate transition period for such action, determine whether technically and economically feasible alternatives that benefit health or the environment, compared to the use so proposed to be prohibited or restricted, will be reasonably available as a substitute when the proposed prohibition or other restriction takes effect;

''(D) exempt replacement parts designed prior to the date of publication in the Federal Register of the rule unless the Administrator finds such replacement parts contribute significantly to the identified risk, including identified risk to identified potentially exposed subpopulations; and

''(E) in selecting among prohibitions and other restrictions to address an identified risk, apply prohibitions or other restrictions to articles on the basis of a chemical substance or mixture contained in the article only to the extent necessary to protect against the identified risk.'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''PROCEDURES.—'' before ''When prescribing a rule'';

(B) by striking ''provide an opportunity for an informal hearing in accordance with paragraph (3); (D)'';

(C) by striking '', and (E)'' and inserting ''; and (D)''; and

(D) by moving such paragraph 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3); and

(4) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4)'' and inserting ''APPLICATION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2)''; and

(B) by moving such paragraph 2 ems to the right.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 6(d)(2)(B) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605(d)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Any rule promulgated under subsection (a) shall provide for a reasonable transition period.''.

(e) NON-RISK FACTORS; CRITICAL USE EXEMPTIONS; PBT CHEMICALS.—Section 6 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) NON-RISK FACTORS.—The Administrator shall not consider costs or other non-risk factors when deciding whether to initiate a rulemaking under subsection (a).

''(h) CRITICAL USE EXEMPTIONS.—

''(1) CRITERIA FOR EXEMPTION.—The Administrator may grant an exemption from a requirement of a subsection (a) rule for a specific use of a chemical substance or mixture, if—

''(A) the requirement is not cost-effective with respect to the specific use, as determined by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(B); and

''(B) the Administrator finds that—

''(i) the specific use is a critical or essential use; or

''(ii) the requirement, as applied with respect to the specific use, would significantly disrupt the national economy, national security, or critical infrastructure.

''(2) PROCEDURE.—An exemption granted under paragraph (1) shall be—

''(A) supported by clear and convincing evidence;

''(B) preceded by public notice of the proposed exemption and an opportunity for comment; and

''(C) followed by notice of the granted exemption—

''(i) to the public, by the Administrator; and

''(ii) to known commercial purchasers of the chemical substance or mixture with respect to which the exemption applies, by the manufacturers and processors of such chemical substance or mixture.

''(3) PERIOD OF EXEMPTION.—An exemption granted under paragraph (1) shall expire after a period not to exceed 5 years, but may be renewed for one or more additional 5-year periods if the Administrator finds that the requirements of paragraph (1) continue to be met.

''(4) CONDITIONS.—The Administrator shall impose conditions on any use for which an exemption is granted under paragraph (1) to reduce risk from the chemical substance or mixture to the greatest extent feasible.

''(i) CHEMICALS THAT ARE PERSISTENT, BIOACCUMULATIVE, AND TOXIC.—

''(1) IDENTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, the Administrator shall publish a list of those chemical substances that the Administrator has a reasonable basis to conclude are persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic, not including any chemical substance that is a metal, a metal compound, or subject to subsection (e).

''(2) CONFIRMATION OF CONCERN.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, the Administrator shall designate as a PBT chemical of concern each chemical substance on the list published under paragraph (1)—

''(A) that, with respect to persistence and bioaccumulation, scores high for one and either high or moderate for the other, pursuant to the TSCA Work Plan Chemicals Methods Document published by the Administrator in February 2012; and

''(B) exposure to which is likely to the general population or to a potentially exposed subpopulation identified by the Administrator.

''(3) EXPEDITED ACTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(2), subject to the availability of appropriations, not later than 2 years after designating a chemical substance under paragraph (2), the Administrator shall promulgate a rule under subsection (a) with respect to the chemical substance to reduce likely exposure to the extent practicable.

''(4) RELATIONSHIP TO SUBSECTION (b).—If, at any time prior to the date that is 90 days after the date on which the Administrator publishes the list under paragraph (1), the Administrator makes a finding under subsection (b)(3)(A)(i), or a manufacturer requests a risk evaluation under subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii), with respect to a chemical substance, such chemical substance shall not be subject to this subsection.''.

SEC. 5. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.

Section 9(b) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2608(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Administrator shall coordinate'' and inserting ''(1) The Administrator shall coordinate''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) In making a determination under paragraph (1) that it is in the public interest for the Administrator to take an action under this title with respect to a chemical substance or mixture rather than under another law administered in whole or in part by the Administrator, the Administrator shall consider the relevant risks, and compare the estimated costs and efficiencies, of the action to be taken under this title and an action to be taken under such other law to protect against such risk.''.

SEC. 6. DISCLOSURE OF DATA.

Section 14 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2613) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

''(5) may be disclosed to a State, local, or tribal government official upon request of the official for the purpose of administration or enforcement of a law; and

''(6) shall be disclosed upon request—

''(A) to a health or environmental professional employed by a Federal or State agency in response to an environmental release; or

''(B) to a treating physician or other health care professional to assist in the diagnosis or treatment of 1 or more individuals.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter following subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''data which discloses'' and inserting ''data that disclose formulas (including molecular structures) of a chemical substance or mixture,'';

(B) by striking ''mixture or,'' and inserting ''mixture, or,''; and

(C) by striking ''the release of data disclosing'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting ''DESIGNATING AND SUBSTANTIATING CONFIDENTIALITY.—'';

(B) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows: ''(1)(A) In submitting information under this Act after date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, a manufacturer, processor, or distributor in commerce shall designate the information which such person believes is entitled to protection under this section, and submit such designated information separately from other information submitted under this Act. A designation under this subparagraph shall be made in writing and in such manner as the Administrator may prescribe, and shall include—

''(i) justification for each designation of confidentiality;

''(ii) a certification that the information is not otherwise publicly available; and

''(iii) separate copies of all submitted information, with 1 copy containing and 1 copy excluding the information to which the request applies.

''(B) Designations made under subparagraph (A) after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015 shall expire after 10 years, at which time the information shall be made public unless the manufacturer, processor, or distributor in commerce has reasserted the claim for protection, in writing and in such manner as the Administrator may prescribe, including all of the elements required for the initial submission.

''(C) Not later than 60 days prior to making information public under subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall notify, as appropriate and practicable, the manufacturer, processor, or distributor in commerce who designated the information under subparagraph (A) of the date on which such information will be made public unless a request for renewal is granted under subparagraph (B).''; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting '', for a reason other than the expiration of such designation pursuant to paragraph (1)(B),'' before ''proposes to release''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''or (4)'' and inserting ''(4), or (6)''; and

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

''(f) PROHIBITION.—No person who receives information as permitted under subsection (a) may use such information for any purpose not specified in such subsection, nor disclose such information to any person not authorized to receive such information.

''(g) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the applicability of State or Federal rules of evidence or procedure in any judicial proceeding.''.

SEC. 7. EFFECT ON STATE LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2617(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by striking paragraph (2)(B) and inserting the following:

''(B) if the Administrator makes a final determination under section 6(b) that a chemical substance will not present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment under the intended condition of use, no State or political subdivision may, after the date of publication of such determination, establish or continue in effect any requirement that applies to such chemical substance under the intended conditions of use considered by the Administrator in the risk evaluation under section 6(b), and is designed to protect against exposure to such chemical substance under the intended conditions of use, unless the requirement of the State or political subdivision—

''(i) is adopted under the authority of a Federal law; or

''(ii) is adopted to protect air or water quality or is related to waste treatment or waste disposal, except that this clause does not apply to such a requirement if a provision of this title, or an action or determination made by the Administrator under this title, actually conflicts with the requirement; and

''(C) if the Administrator imposes a requirement, through a rule or order under section 5 or 6, that applies to a chemical substance or mixture (other than a requirement described in section 6(a)(6)) and is designed to protect against a risk of injury to health or the environment associated with such chemical substance or mixture, no State or political subdivision may, after the effective date of such requirement, establish or continue in effect any requirement that applies to such chemical substance or mixture (including a requirement that applies to an article because the article contains the chemical substance or mixture) and is designed to protect against exposure to the chemical substance or mixture either under the intended conditions of use considered by the Administrator in the risk evaluation under section 6(b) or from a use identified in a notice received by the Administrator under

section 5(a), or, in the case of a requirement imposed pursuant to section 6(i), is designed to protect against a risk of injury considered by the Administrator in imposing such requirement, unless the requirement of the State or political subdivision—

''(i) is identical to the requirement imposed by the Administrator;

''(ii) is adopted under the authority of a Federal law; or

''(iii) is adopted to protect air or water quality or is related to waste treatment or waste disposal, except that this clause does not apply to such a requirement if a provision of this title, or an action or determination made by the Administrator under this title, actually conflicts with the requirement.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In the case of an identical requirement described in paragraph (2)(C)(i)—

''(A) a State may not assess a penalty for a specific violation for which the Administrator has assessed a penalty under section 16; and

''(B) if a State has assessed a penalty for a specific violation, the Administrator may not assess a penalty for that violation in an amount that would cause the total of the penalties assessed for the violation by the State and the Administrator combined to exceed the maximum amount that may be assessed for that violation by the Administrator under section 16.''.

(b) SAVINGS.—Section 18 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2617) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SAVINGS.—

''(1) PRIOR STATE ACTIONS.—Nothing in this title, nor any risk evaluation, rule, order, standard, or requirement completed or implemented under this title, shall be construed to preempt or otherwise affect the authority of a State or political subdivision of a State to continue to enforce any action taken or requirement that has taken effect—

''(A) before August 1, 2015, under the authority of a State law that prohibits or otherwise restricts the manufacturing, processing, distribution in commerce, use, or disposal of a chemical substance; or

''(B) pursuant to a State law that was in effect on August 31, 2003,

unless an action or determination made by the Administrator under this title actually conflicts with the action taken or requirement that has taken effect pursuant to such a State law.

''(2) TORT AND CONTRACT LAW.—Nothing in this title, nor any risk evaluation, rule, order, standard, or requirement completed or implemented under this title, shall be construed to preempt or otherwise affect either Federal or State tort law or the law governing the interpretation of contracts of any State, including any remedy for civil relief, whether under statutory or common law, including a remedy for civil damages, and any cause of action for personal injury, wrongful death, property damage, or other injury based on negligence, strict liability, products liability, failure to warn, or any other legal theory relating to tort law.

''(3) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is not the intent of Congress that this title, or rules, regulations, or orders issued pursuant to this title, be interpreted as influencing, in either a plaintiff's or defendant's favor, the disposition of any civil action for damages in a State court, or the authority of any court to make a determination in an adjudicatory proceeding under applicable State law with respect to the admissibility of evidence, unless a provision of this title actually conflicts with the State court action.

''(4) APPLICATION.—For purposes of this title, the term 'requirements' does not include civil tort actions for damages under State law.''.

(c) EFFECT OF ACTIONS BY ADMINISTRATOR.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed as changing the preemptive effect of an action taken by the Administrator prior to the date of enactment of this Act or under section 6(e).

SEC. 8. ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT.

Section 26 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2625) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking ''of a reasonable fee'';

(B) by inserting ''of a fee that is sufficient and not more than reasonably necessary'' after ''section 4 or 5'';

(C) by inserting '', or who requests a risk evaluation under section 6(b)(3)(A)(ii),'' before ''to defray the cost'';

(D) by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''the provision of this title for which such fee is collected''; and

(E) by striking ''Such rules shall not provide for any fee in excess of $2,500 or, in the case of a small business concern, any fee in excess of $100.'' and inserting ''Such rules shall provide for lower fees for small business concerns.'';

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following:

''(3) FUND.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund, to be known as the TSCA Service Fee Fund (in this paragraph referred to as the 'Fund'), consisting of such amounts as are deposited in the Fund under this paragraph.

''(B) COLLECTION AND DEPOSIT OF FEES.—The Administrator shall collect the fees described in paragraph (1) and deposit those fees in the Fund.

''(C) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—On request by the Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Fund to the Administrator amounts appropriated to pay or recover the full costs incurred by the Environmental Protection Agency, including contractor costs, in carrying out the provisions of this title for which the fees are collected under paragraph (1).

''(D) USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.—Fees authorized under this section shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts, and shall be available without fiscal year limitation for use only in administering the provisions of this title for which the fees are collected.

''(E) ACCOUNTING AND AUDITING.—

''(i) ACCOUNTING.—The Administrator shall biennially prepare and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that includes an accounting of the fees paid to the Administrator under this paragraph and amounts disbursed from the Fund for the period covered by the report, as reflected by financial statements provided in accordance with sections 3515 and 3521 of title 31, United States Code.

''(ii) AUDITING.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of section 3515(c) of title 31, United States Code, the Fund shall be considered a component of a covered executive agency.

''(II) COMPONENTS OF AUDIT.—The annual audit required in accordance with sections 3515 and 3521 of title 31, United States Code, of the financial statements of activities carried out using amounts from the Fund shall include an analysis of—

''(aa) the fees collected and amounts disbursed under this subsection;

''(bb) the reasonableness of the fees in place as of the date of the audit to meet current and projected costs of administering the provisions of the title for which the fees are collected; and

''(cc) the number of requests for a risk evaluation made by manufacturers under section 6(b)(3)(A)(ii).

''(III) FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.—The Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct the annual audit described in subclause (II) and submit to the Administrator a report that describes the findings and any recommendations of the Inspector General resulting from the audit.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) SCIENTIFIC STANDARDS.—In carrying out sections 4, 5, and 6, to the extent that the Administrator makes a decision based on science, the Administrator shall consider, as applicable—

''(1) the extent to which the scientific and technical procedures, measures, methods, or models employed to generate the information are reasonable for and consistent with the use of the information;

''(2) the extent to which the information is relevant for the Administrator's use in making a decision about a chemical substance or mixture;

''(3) the degree of clarity and completeness with which the data, assumptions, methods, quality assurance, and analyses employed to generate the information are documented;

''(4) the extent to which the variability and uncertainty in the information, or in the procedures, measures, methods, or models, are evaluated and characterized; and

''(5) the extent of independent verification or peer review of the information or of the procedures, measures, methods, or models.

''(i) WEIGHT OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE.—The Administrator shall make decisions under sections 4, 5, and 6 based on the weight of the scientific evidence.

''(j) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Subject to section 14, the Administrator shall make available to the public all notices, determinations, findings, rules, and orders of the Administrator under this title.

''(k) POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND GUIDANCE.—

''(1) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, the Administrator shall develop any policies, procedures, and guidance the Administrator determines are necessary to carry out the amendments to this Act made by the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015.

''(2) REVIEW.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator shall—

''(A) review the adequacy of the policies, procedures, and guidance developed under paragraph (1), including with respect to animal, nonanimal, and epidemiological test methods and procedures for assessing and determining risk under this title; and

''(B) revise such policies, procedures, and guidance as the Administrator determines necessary to reflect new scientific developments or understandings.

''(l) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate a report containing an estimation of—

''(A) the capacity of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct and publish

risk evaluations under subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B) of section 6(b)(3), and the resources necessary to initiate the minimum number of risk evaluations required under section 6(b)(7);

''(B) the capacity of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct and publish risk evaluations under section 6(b)(3)(A)(ii), the likely demand for such risk evaluations, and the anticipated schedule for accommodating that demand;

''(C) the capacity of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate rules under section 6(a) as required based on risk evaluations conducted and published under section 6(b); and

''(D) the actual and anticipated efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency to increase the Agency's capacity to conduct and publish risk evaluations under section 6(b).

''(2) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—The Administrator shall update and resubmit the report described in paragraph (1) not less frequently than once every 5 years.''.

SEC. 9. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) SECTION 4.—Section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''rule'' each place it appears and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''rules'' and inserting ''rules, orders, and consent agreements'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''rule'' each place it appears and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement''; and

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''rule under subsection (a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement under subsection (a)'';

(ii) by striking ''repeals the rule'' each place it appears and inserting ''repeals the rule or order or modifies the consent agreement to terminate the requirement''; and

(iii) by striking ''repeals the application of the rule'' and inserting ''repeals or modifies the application of the rule, order, or consent agreement'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''rule'' and inserting ''rule or order'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''a rule under subsection (a) or for which data is being developed pursuant to such a rule'' and inserting ''a rule, order, or consent agreement under subsection (a) or for which data are being developed pursuant to such a rule, order, or consent agreement'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''such rule or which is being developed pursuant to such rule'' and inserting ''such rule, order, or consent agreement or which is being developed pursuant to such rule, order, or consent agreement''; and

(iii) in the matter following subparagraph (B), by striking ''the rule'' and inserting ''the rule or order'';

(C) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking ''rule promulgated'' and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement''; and

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''rule promulgated'' each place it appears and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement'';

(ii) by striking ''such rule'' each place it appears and inserting ''such rule, order, or consent agreement''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the rule'' and inserting ''the rule, order, or consent agreement'';

(3) in subsection (d), by striking ''rule'' and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement''; and

(4) in subsection (g), by striking ''rule'' and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement''.

(b) SECTION 5.—Section 5 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2604) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) by striking ''rule promulgated'' and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement''; and

(ii) by striking ''such rule'' and inserting ''such rule, order, or consent agreement'';

(B) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) by striking ''rule promulgated'' and inserting ''rule or order''; and

(ii) by striking ''the date of the submission in accordance with such rule'' and inserting ''the required date of submission''; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), by striking ''rule promulgated'' and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement'';

(2) in subsection (d)(2)(C), by striking ''rule'' and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement''; and

(3) in subsection (h)(4), by striking ''paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 6(c)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2) of section 6(c)''.

(c) SECTION 6.—Section 6 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(2)(B)—

(A) by striking '', provide reasonable opportunity, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c), for a hearing on such rule,'' and inserting ''in accordance with paragraph (2) of subsection (c),''; and

(B) by striking ''; and if such a hearing is requested'' and all that follows through ''or revoke it.'' and inserting a period; and

(2) in subsection (e)(4), by striking ''paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (c)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2) of subsection (c)''.

(d) SECTION 7.—Section 7(a)(1) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2606(a)(1)) is amended, in the matter following subparagraph (C), by striking ''a rule under section 4, 5, 6, or title IV or an order under section 5 or title IV'' and inserting ''a rule under section 4, 5, or 6 or title IV, an order under section 4 or 5 or title IV, or a consent agreement under section 4''.

(e) SECTION 8.—Section 8(a)(3)(A)(ii)(I) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2607(a)(3)(A)(ii)(I)) is amended by striking ''or an order in effect under section 5(e)'' and inserting '', an order in effect under section 4 or 5(e), or a consent agreement under section 4''.

(f) SECTION 9.—Section 9(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2608(a)) is amended by striking ''section 6'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 6(a)''.

(g) SECTION 11.—Section 11(b)(2)(E) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2610(b)(2)(E)) is amended by striking ''rule promulgated'' and inserting ''rule promulgated, order issued, or consent agreement entered into''.

(h) SECTION 15.—Section 15(1) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2614(1)) is amended by striking ''(A) any rule'' and all that follows through ''or (D)'' and inserting ''any requirement of this title or any rule promulgated, order issued, or consent agreement entered into under this title, or''.

(i) SECTION 18.—Section 18(a)(2)(A) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2617(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''rule promulgated'' and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement''; and

(2) by striking ''such rule'' each place it appears and inserting ''such rule, order, or consent agreement''.

(j) SECTION 19.—Section 19 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2618) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) by striking ''(A) Not later than 60 days after the date of the promulgation of a rule'' and inserting ''Not later than 60 days after the date on which a rule is promulgated'';

(ii) by inserting ''or the date on which an order is issued under section 4,'' before ''any person'';

(iii) by striking ''such rule'' and inserting ''such rule or order''; and

(iv) by striking ''such a rule'' and inserting ''such a rule or order'';

(B) by striking paragraph (1)(B);

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the rule'' and inserting ''the rule or order''; and

(D) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''the rule'' and inserting ''the rule or order'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''a rule under section 4(a)'' and inserting ''a rule or order under section 4(a)'';

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''such rule'' and inserting ''such rule or order'';

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''such rule'' and inserting ''such rule or order''; and

(v) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) by striking ''to such rule'' and inserting ''to such rule or order''; and

(II) by striking ''the date of the promulgation of such rule'' and inserting ''the date on which such rule is promulgated or such order is issued'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''review a rule'' and inserting ''review a rule, or an order under section 4,'';

(B) by striking ''such rule'' and inserting ''such rule or order'';

(C) by striking ''the rule'' and inserting ''the rule or order'';

(D) by striking ''new rule'' each place it appears and inserting ''new rule or order''; and

(E) by striking ''modified rule'' and inserting ''modified rule or order''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''a rule'' and inserting ''a rule, or an order under section 4''; and

(II) by striking ''such rule'' and inserting ''such rule or order''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''a rule'' and inserting ''a rule or order'';

(II) in clause (i)—

(aa) by inserting ''or an order under section 4,'' before ''the standard for review'';

(bb) by striking ''such rule'' and inserting ''such rule or order'';

(cc) by striking ''the rule'' and inserting ''the rule or order''; and

(dd) by striking the semicolon and inserting ''; and''; and

(III) by striking clause (ii) and redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''any rule'' and inserting ''any rule or order''.

(k) SECTION 20.—Section 20(a)(1) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2619(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''order issued under section 5'' and inserting ''order issued under section 4 or 5''.

(l) SECTION 21.—Section 21 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2620) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''order under section 5(e) or (6)(b)(2)'' and inserting ''order under section 4 or 5(e)''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''order under section 5(e), 6(b)(1)(A), or 6(b)(1)(B)'' and inserting ''order under section 4 or 5(e)''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''order under section 5(e) or 6(b)(2)'' and inserting ''order under section 4 or 5(e)'';

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''order under section 5(e)'' and inserting ''order under section 4 or 5(e)''; and

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking ''or an order under section 6(b)(2)''.

(m) SECTION 24.—Section 24(b)(2)(B) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2623(b)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and'' at the end of clause (i);

(2) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(n) SECTION 27.—Section 27(a) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2626(a)) is amended by striking ''rules promulgated'' and inserting ''rules, orders, or consent agreements''.

(o) SECTION 30.—Section 30(2) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2629(2)) is amended by striking ''rule'' and inserting ''rule, order, or consent agreement''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the TSCA Modernization Act has been a long time in coming. We actually started work on this bill in the last Congress. We held a total of eight hearings and received testimony from a broad range of stakeholders, including the administration; but most importantly, we worked with each other, Member to Member, across the aisle.

The bill before you, Mr. Speaker, reflects lessons learned over the course of the last 3 years in which we worked on TSCA reform. First, the bill is clear and understandable. Despite the highly technical nature of chemical regulation, Members can pick up this bill, read it from beginning to end, and understand what it does and how it works.

Second, the bill does not try to be all things for all people. Major sections of TSCA are not amended at all. For example, we leave the process for new chemical review in TSCA section 5 unchanged because it is working pretty well right now, and changes could make it worse.

The heart of the bill is our approach to regulating chemicals already on the market. Thousands of these chemicals have been in commerce for many years, and they pose no known risks and really don't need to be regulated at all. We leave those alone. But we do allow some existing chemicals to be scientifically evaluated for risk and, if necessary, to have that risk managed through a rule by the EPA.

Chemicals may be chosen for risk evaluation in one of two ways: either EPA may select a chemical for risk evaluation based on what EPA knows may pose an unreasonable risk, or the manufacturer may designate a chemical for EPA to evaluate for risk.

Now, why would a manufacturer invite EPA scrutiny of its product? There are several reasons. First, some interest or even a retailer may be raising concerns about a product, and the manufacturer wants to put those concerns to rest. Or one or two States may be thinking about regulating the chemical. The State-by-State approach can spell disaster for someone trying to capture economies of scale in a national market.

What better way to put these concerns to rest than to have EPA, with the scientific standards that we require, perform an objective risk evaluation? Then the EPA decision on that chemical will apply in all the States, and consumers and the public can have the confidence that the chemical is safe for its intended uses.

Another area in the legislation that required careful discussion and negotiation is preemption. Of course, we want to make sure national markets are just that and not a patchwork of restrictions varying State to State. At the same time, we did not want to deny anyone a legitimate cause of action under State tort or contract law. So that is what we said: as long as the State law does not conflict with the Federal ruling, the State action may continue.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has strict but attainable deadlines for action. If EPA initiates a risk evaluation, it must finish in 3 years. If a manufacturer initiates one and includes information EPA needs to make a decision, EPA should finish that in 2 years. Once the risk evaluation is complete, if EPA decides a rule is needed to manage the risk, EPA must propose the rule within a year.

The risk evaluation itself only asks does the chemical present an unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment. That is a science question based on a combination of hazard and actual exposure. If there is an unreasonable risk, the agency's decision on how to manage it is based on many other factors such as cost effectiveness, whether restricting an article will actually reduce exposure, whether replacements are available, and many other concerns.

H.R. 2576 permits EPA to regulate articles in those areas where regulation of chemical substances and mixtures alone would not be effective to reduce the identified risk, but requires EPA to be careful in addressing replacement parts that serve a commercially intended function or the original product or are needed to maintain the functionality of the original product.

We think this system sets a new standard for quality regulation. Of course, we want to be protected from harm, but we do not want needless, expensive regulations. Consumers want safe choices, not no choice at all.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the brink of setting up a commonsense approach to protecting people from unsafe chemical exposure that will become the standard of the world.

□ 1515

We want our constituents to be safe, and we want markets to work. This bill delivers both.

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

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

Nearly four decades ago, Congress enacted the Toxic Substances Control Act to identify and regulate risks from dangerous chemicals. Unfortunately, the statute has never worked. Improvements to the law are long overdue, and I am happy to be here today with my Energy and Commerce colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this landmark reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what brought us together is the failure of the current statute to keep the American public safe and to provide confidence in the safety of American products. Toxic chemicals can be found in the products we use every day and are steadily building up in our bodies and the environment.

Consumers are worried about chemicals like BPA and triclosan, but they don't know how to avoid them. It seems like every day there is a new study about how chemicals are negatively affecting our health, and something needs to change.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has held many hearings over the last 6 years to understand why TSCA isn't working. Some critical flaws were built into the statute, like the grandfathering of over 60,000 chemicals in 1976 without any safety review. Other flaws came to light only through litigation, like the impossible analytical burden of the statute's ''least burdensome'' clause.

Even though we have recognized these flaws, forward progress has been elusive. When Chairman SHIMKUS and Chairman UPTON approached Ranking Member TONKO and myself about working on a streamlined approach to address the essential components of reform, I was hopeful.

The result is a bipartisan bill that will remove major obstacles to EPA action and give the Agency new authority and new resources. It will offer more protection and more implementation than current law. It is a strong compromise, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2576 will empower EPA to regulate the universe of chemicals that were grandfathered in 1976 by removing the requirement that EPA impose the ''least burdensome'' regulatory option and by establishing a

risk-based standard for risk management, instead of a cost-benefit standard. For the first time, the decision of whether a chemical needs to be regulated will be based purely on the risk it poses.

H.R. 2576 will improve EPA's access to information about potentially dangerous chemicals by allowing EPA to require testing through orders and consent agreements, not just rulemakings, and by authorizing EPA to seek data when needed for a risk evaluation without first demonstrating risk.

H.R. 2576 will provide expedited action for the worst chemicals, those that are persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic. Under this bill, we can expect quick action to get these chemicals out of our environment and out of our bodies.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2576 will explicitly and directly protect vulnerable populations like children, workers, the elderly, and hotspot communities.

The bill will provide more resources for EPA to carry out this important program by removing outdated caps on user fees. It would also ensure that those fees are deposited in a dedicated trust fund for TSCA implementation.

Under the bill, all future confidential business information claims by industry would have to be substantiated, preventing abuse and ensuring greater transparency.

H.R. 2576 would ensure that States maintain their important role as partners in chemical regulation. Under the bill, preemption of State laws would be more limited than current law and other proposals. No State law would be preempted until Federal requirements are in effect.

Many State laws would be protected from preemption, including existing State laws, new State laws adopted to address air and water quality or implement other Federal laws, State tort claims, and State laws regulating uses not evaluated by EPA.

In response to concerns raised by stakeholders and Members, a few additional important clarifications have been made following committee markup, and I thank the chairman for working with us to make those changes.

There is now clear authority for EPA to set a schedule if manufacturer-requested risk evaluations exceed EPA's capacity, ensuring that such requests won't overwhelm the program. The grandfathering provision for existing State laws has also been clarified based on feedback from State attorneys general.

Mr. Speaker, strong committee report language further clarifies the limited role of costs in risks management, the preservation of State monitoring and reporting requirements, and the expansion of EPA's testing authority.

I know that tomorrow, we will get back to disagreeing on the importance of environmental protection and the essential role EPA plays in keeping America safe, but for today, we can all agree on the need for a strong and protective Federal regulatory program for chemicals.

I want to thank Chairman SHIMKUS and Chairman UPTON for their leadership and their willingness to work with Democrats and stakeholders to craft this legislation. I would also like to thank Jackie Cohen of my staff for her hard work on this legislation, as well as Dave McCarthy of the majority staff for his efforts. This is a true testament to what we can achieve when we work together.

I look forward to supporting this bill, and I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this landmark legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), my colleague.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015, which updates the Toxic Substances Control Act, TSCA, of 1976. This legislation will benefit the Eighth District of Indiana and our Nation by improving the regulation of chemicals in commerce.

Indiana's Eighth District has a strong and diverse manufacturing sector, including plastics, fertilizer production, automobiles, and medical devices, which play pivotal roles in the local and State economy.

H.R. 2576 will improve the EPA's outdated regulatory process for these industries and manufacturers, fostering conditions for stronger interstate commerce, and ensure robust protections for public health and the environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and our ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative PALLONE, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, Congress passed the Toxic Substances Control Act, which created a Federal program to manage the risks associated with our Nation's industrial chemicals.

That law, TSCA, has never met that need. As a result, the public has lost confidence in this Federal program. The many failings of the current law have been pointed out in reports, reports issued by the Government Accountability Office and others.

Well-intentioned attempts over the years to address some of the problems administratively or through voluntary agreements amongst the Environmental Protection Agency, the chemical industry, and the environmental and public health communities have failed. The public has too little information about the safety of chemicals that they are exposed to every day in virtually every product that they use.

Even in the face of overwhelming evidence of harm to people's health, EPA is unable to regulate exposure to toxic chemicals. Congress had to step in and explicitly legislate to gain public health and environmental protections from PCBs, for instance, and asbestos.

Because of the regulatory vacuum at the Federal level, some States have legislated to secure protections for their citizens. In some cases, large retailers have initiated their own chemical policies to respond to what are consumers' concerns.

Forty years of ineffective Federal policy is enough. H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act, amends TSCA and corrects the fundamental flaws that exist in our law.

When my colleague Chairman SHIMKUS began the effort to reform TSCA in the last Congress, I knew the committee could produce a bill. I believed we could. I was not convinced, however, that we could pass a law; but H.R. 2576 is a decisive step, I believe, in that direction.

I thank Chairman SHIMKUS, Chairman UPTON, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their continued cooperation and dedicated effort on behalf of this legislation. This truly has been a productive partnership, and the result is a good bill, a bill that I am pleased to support.

H.R. 2576 is the result of much discussion, much work, and compromise by all parties involved. While no one group gets all that they might have hoped for in this legislation, every stakeholder group gets something that they need. Frankly, we all need a functional, fair, and reliable Federal program of chemical regulation.

Industry gains a fair, predictable Federal program for chemical regulation, a program that will inspire public confidence in the safety of their products. In the context of our global economy, that is an important asset for doing business both here and in other countries.

The public health and environmental communities gain a Federal program in which EPA evaluates chemicals and, based on those evaluations, will act to regulate chemicals the Agency determines present a risk to health or a risk to the environment.

Under current law, in order to regulate a chemical, EPA must demonstrate that the benefits of regulating outweigh the costs. Under H.R. 2576, EPA's evaluation and decision on whether to act will be based solely on risk factors, risk factors alone.

Considerations of cost will be addressed when the Agency selects among different regulatory options to reduce chemical exposures. That is a major gain—a major gain—for public health and a major gain for the environment.

H.R. 2576 is a good bill. It offers significant improvements over our current law. I know many Members have concerns about states' rights and State preemption provisions in TSCA. I share those concerns.

There is State preemption in current law, and there is State preemption in H.R. 2576, but State preemption only

occurs when EPA takes final—final—action on a chemical, either finding it safe or regulating its risks.

H.R. 2576 maintains a strong role for the States. With those changes in TSCA, the States will have a more active and credible partner in this effort at the Federal level.

Again, I want to thank Chairman SHIMKUS, Chairman UPTON, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their excellent work on this bill. I appreciate the constructive partnership that we formed in working together on this legislation. We worked through many difficult issues and found that common ground.

I look forward to continuing to work together as this bill moves on to the Senate.

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

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

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman.

I urge my colleagues to end the ineffective chemical policy that we have had for four decades and to support H.R. 2576.

I, too, would like to thank some individuals who are very pertinent to this discussion and final product. I thank David McCarthy from the subcommittee staff on the majority side and Jerry Couri from the subcommittee staff, Jackie Cohen from our subcommittee staff on the Democratic side, and Chris Sarley of Chairman SHIMKUS' personal office staff, and Jean Fruci of my personal staff, the legislative director for my Congressional office.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, could I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation that will update the Toxic Substances Control Act, our Nation's primary statute regulating the use and safety of commercial chemicals for the first time since it was enacted in 1976.

This legislation will directly address many of current TSCA's biggest flaws, including eliminating the ''least burdensome'' requirement and explicitly clarifying the law's safety standard excludes any consideration of costs.

This bill would require EPA to consider the risks to vulnerable subpopulations, like children, pregnant women, workers, and set restrictions if necessary to protect them.

The TSCA Modernization Act will go a long way towards ensuring that all American families—especially for families of chemical facility workers and fence line communities in our congressional district in Houston and Harris County, Texas—are protected from potentially harmful chemicals and bring needed regulatory clarity to this important sector of our Nation's economy.

I would like to thank both Chairman SHIMKUS and Ranking Member TONKO of the Subcommittee on the Environment and the Economy and Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and their staffs for the hard work and willingness to work together to make TSCA reform a reality.

I would also like to personally thank my legislative director, Sergio Espinosa, who has worked on this for three terms, I think, Mr. Speaker.

I want to ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join us and vote in support of this important legislation.

□ 1530

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, we all know that our chemical regulatory system is badly broken and that it has been broken for a very long time. When it comes to chemicals, weak statutory authority and limited resources have prevented the EPA from fulfilling its mission of protecting public health and the environment. Current law is so weak that the EPA famously could not even use it to ban the use of asbestos despite overwhelming evidence that asbestos poses serious risks to human health.

Even when the EPA can successfully regulate a chemical under the Toxic Substances Control Act, which we know as TSCA—which has happened only five times—they must do so using a flawed cost-benefit analysis that prioritizes profits over health and safety. These are just a few of the many serious flaws of the current system.

While the TSCA Modernization Act does not address all of these problems, it does take several important steps forward that will help improve the health and safety of consumers and their families. It finally ensures that health, not cost, is the standard by which the safety of chemicals is evaluated; it maintains critical State chemical safety laws, such as California's landmark Proposition 65; and for the first time, it includes explicit protections for vulnerable populations, such as pregnant mothers, children, and seniors.

I want to commend Chairmen UPTON and SHIMKUS, Ranking Members PALLONE and TONKO, and the committee staffs for all of their hard work and commitment for making this a truly bipartisan bill. It is far from perfect, but it has improved at every step of the process, and I hope that continues. Should the Senate pass its TSCA reform package, I hope this cooperation continues in conference so we can produce an even stronger bill.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long, our chemical laws have prioritized profits over human health and safety. This bill would put an end to this inequity and to many other serious failings of the current system. The TSCA Modernization Act is a good compromise and is a major step forward. That is why I will be voting for it today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act.

Since the 111th Congress, a lot of us have been wrestling very seriously with how to reform the EPA's current regime for reviewing and regulating chemicals. Everyone agrees that the statute has been broken for most of the decades that it has been in effect. Devising a new program, though, that would both enable the EPA to take meaningful action on the chemicals that truly need regulation and that will protect the health of our citizens was an uphill battle in deeply partisan times; yet what we have come up with is a true compromise. We have focused on the aspects of current law that really need to be addressed, and we have developed language that will move the ball forward.

As all of the other speakers have said, our work is not done after the vote later today. The Senate, in working its own will, has come up with a reform bill that takes a distinctly different approach. We have a lot to reconcile. It is important that legislation makes it to the President's desk that will equip the EPA to protect us from toxic chemicals over the long term. Ultimately, we will be judged by how well the new law works, not only over the next few years, but over the coming decade.

I want to add my thanks, Mr. Speaker, to Congressman FRANK PALLONE, Congressman SHIMKUS, Congressman TONKO, Congressman GENE GREEN, all of our staffs, and, in particular, to my legislative director, Eleanor Bastian, who has been working on this bill ever since we really started seriously negotiating.

One last thing—and I think it is important—is that Congresswoman CAPPS mentioned that this bill will not preempt State law and that it will not preempt Proposition 65. This was an important provision, and I want to thank Congressman SHIMKUS and his staff for working on it with us because it is important that we have these kinds of protections that we need.

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

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

In closing, I will just say thank you again to Mr. SHIMKUS, in particular, for reaching out to me and to Mr. TONKO on this legislation and for making it bipartisan.

I almost feel anticlimactic today because I know how much hard work has gone into getting this bill to the floor. I know we are going to work hard after it passes in the House to get it passed in the Senate and to have a law that goes to the President, so I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

This is a good bill, and I am going to give my thanks to my colleagues, too. We want a good vote today because we want to make sure we have a strong House position as we go into negotiations with the Senate, and I think we are going to have that. I also appreciate the leadership for bringing this up on the suspension calendar, which, I think, shows a lot of support right at the outset.

As everyone else has done, I want to take a moment to thank our colleagues. This has been a multiyear, multi-Congress approach. As a former high school teacher in government history, so far, the system is working on this bill, and we are hoping for good things as we move forward with conference and get something to the President's desk. I harken back to PAUL TONKO's comment and FRANK PALLONE's comment that we could pass a bill but that, if we wanted to pass a law, we really needed to open up the process a little bit. That was very helpful to me, and I appreciate that.

I also want to thank Chairman UPTON, obviously, for his leadership and for his friendship.

DIANA DEGETTE, who just spoke, and GENE GREEN have both been with me, slaving away, over the last couple of years. We have learned a lot about each other, and we have learned a lot about the law, and it is a very difficult law to understand. We also started getting help from BOB LATTA, from Ohio, and from BILL JOHNSON, and I want to thank them for their help.

H.R. 2576 has also gained letters of support from a variety of stakeholders, which include—and sometimes this shocks people to know that we have this group of diverse interests—the American Chemistry Council, the American Alliance for Innovation, the American Cleaning Institute, the Consumer Specialty Products Association, the National Association of Chemical Distributors, the National Wildlife Federation, just to name a few.

I also want to thank two people who never promoted any particular policy but who were responsible for exceptional quality in the legislation before us—Tim Brown and Kakuti Lin, who are our House legislative counsel. They make sure that the words in the bill do what we intend them to do. That is a part of this process that really goes unrecognized, the people who are legislative counsel. They spend long hours, and we ask them to do heavy lifting on short notice, so we want to make sure that we thank them here today. In a highly technical field such as chemical risk management, that is not an easy task. I thank them for their skill, dedication, and hard work.

Finally, I would like to recognize the dedicated staffs on both sides of the aisle who helped us craft this legislation—David McCarthy, who has already been mentioned, along with Jerry Couri on the Energy and Commerce staff. Understanding our chemical regulations has helped Members navigate through the complex nature of TSCA reform from our very first informational hearing in the last Congress.

I know, over there, we have got Jackie Cohen, who in the last Congress was a real pain in the rear end to me, but, this year, we have been able to work together, which has been helpful. Jean Fruci also was a calming influence, and we appreciate her steady guidance. They have both provided quality input to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle throughout this process. I appreciate their dedication, oftentimes through nights and weekends, to help us get to where we are today.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2576 to send a strong signal that the time is now to update this outdated law and to keep the momentum and the bipartisan spirit moving forward until the President signs it into law.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the purpose of engaging Chairman SHIMKUS in colloquy. First, I would like to thank Mr. SHIMKUS for working with me during and after markup to make sure that the important role of states in chemical regulation is preserved. In the absence of a strong federal chemical regulatory program, many states have taken action to protect their citizens from toxic chemicals. Strong laws are in place in many states to address chemicals including BPA, flame retardants, and more. Through the Committee process, explicit protections have been added for state laws and state common laws, including important changes taken from the amendment that I offered at markup. My amendment was drafted in response to the letter sent by 12 State Attorneys General, which I would like to introduce now into the RECORD. Again, I appreciate you working with me to address the points they raised. It is my understanding that nothing in this bill would preempt or otherwise affect existing state laws or private rights of action, unless there is an actual conflict between a federal requirement and a state requirement. Is that correct?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, Yes it is. H.R. 2576 contains protection for existing state laws and existing citizen enforcement actions. No existing state requirements will be preempted unless they actually conflict with federal requirements.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, as you know, over twenty-five years ago, the people of California enacted a landmark ballot measure known as Proposition 65. Proposition 65 requires persons who expose individuals to certain chemicals that are known to cause cancer or reproductive harm to display a clear and reasonable warning. Proposition 65 enforcement actions by the state and by private parties have played a crucial role in reducing childhood exposure to harmful chemicals. This state law operates somewhat differently from other state laws related to chemicals, so I want to ask specifically about the protection for Proposition 65 in the bill. It is my understanding that nothing in this bill would preempt or otherwise impact enforcement of Proposition 65 or the ability of the State to continue to authorize citizen enforcement of Proposition 65, unless there is an actual conflict. Is that correct?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. We do not intend to interfere with operation of Proposition 65 unless a requirement under that law actually conflicts with a federal requirement under TSCA.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, and just to be clear, the waiver provision in Section 18(b) of current law, which could protect additional state laws, is not changed by this bill?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a long time coming. The breakthrough bipartisan bill before us today is the culmination of a multiyear, multi-Congress effort to modernize our decades-old chemical safety laws. The Toxic Substances Control Act, which was signed into law by Michigan's own President Jerry Ford, needs to be updated for the 21st century. And this thoughtful bill improves chemical safety while encouraging continued innovation and economic growth and gives the public greater confidence in the safety of American-made chemicals and the products that contain them.

There are six core elements that form the basis of the TSCA Modernization Act. First, this bill helps markets work and provides certainty. Chemicals will get reviewed and will be ruled either safe for intended uses, or in need of a risk management rule. Once a decision is made by EPA, that decision will apply in all the states. Manufacturers won't have to produce 50 different product versions for 50 different states.

Second, the bill respects the role of states and individual rights of action. Tort and contract claims are explicitly protected in the preemption section.

Third, any regulation of a chemical will be guided by common sense. Is the regulation cost effective? If use in an article were restricted, will exposure actually go down? Is there a feasible replacement? Is the transition period fair? Without good answers to these questions regulation will not move forward.

Fourth, the bill will build confidence for consumers and the general public that chemicals on the market anywhere in the U.S. are safe, and not just because EPA says so. EPA must evaluate risk against the most stringent science standards we've ever enacted for chemicals. And the science has to be transparent and hold up to objective peer review.

Fifth, the bill lets government and industry actually collaborate. Chemical manufacturers are given the choice to ask for and get a chemical evaluated. And EPA must meet strict action deadlines. If the science indicates the chemical is safe, then EPA must say so, and that determination will be the law in all 50 states.

Finally, the bill encourages innovation, largely by protecting confidential business information. New technology is not likely to appear if the secret formula can be stolen and

copied the minute a new product appears. This bill would prevent that from happening.

Each of the elements of the bill are not trade-offs, each provision works to the support the others. It would not accomplish much good for EPA to evaluate all these chemicals if the results were not going to apply in all the states. It does not make sense for the government to be writing safety regulations if the result is no real improvement in safety. And a manufacturer is not likely to cooperate with the government in chemical evaluation if to do so means giving up a trade secret.

The TSCA Modernization Act solves each of these concerns, as all these safeguards work together.

Mr. Speaker, this is a big day. The TSCA Modernization Act is good for consumers, good for trade, and good for the environment. I especially commend Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LATTA for their dedication and hard work in putting together a bill that can be signed into law. Let's put jobs and the economy first and vote yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2576, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. 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 motion will be postponed.

BOYS TOWN CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 893) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 893

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Boys Town is a nonprofit organization dedicated to saving children and healing families, nationally headquartered in the village of Boys Town, Nebraska;

(2) Father Flanagan's Boys Home, known as ''Boys Town'', was founded on December 12, 1917, by Servant of God Father Edward Flanagan;

(3) Boys Town was created to serve children of all races and religions;

(4) news of the work of Father Flanagan spread worldwide with the success of the 1938 movie, ''Boys Town'';

(5) after World War II, President Truman asked Father Flanagan to take his message to the world, and Father Flanagan traveled the globe visiting war orphans and advising government leaders on how to care for displaced children;

(6) Boys Town has grown exponentially, and now provides care to children and families across the country in 11 regions, including California, Nevada, Texas, Nebraska, Iowa, Louisiana, North Florida, Central Florida, South Florida, Washington, DC, New York, and New England;

(7) the Boys Town National Hotline provides counseling to more than 150,000 callers each year;

(8) the Boys Town National Research Hospital is a national leader in the field of hearing care and research of Usher Syndrome;

(9) Boys Town programs impact the lives of more than 2,000,000 children and families across America each year; and

(10) December 12th, 2017, will mark the 100th anniversary of Boys Town, Nebraska.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) $5 GOLD COINS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall mint and issue not more than 50,000 $5 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 8.359 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(b) $1 SILVER COINS.—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 $1 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 26.73 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(c) HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 300,000 half dollar clad coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 11.34 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(3) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(d) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(e) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 100 years of Boys Town, one of the largest nonprofit child care agencies in the United States.

(b) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

(1) a designation of the value of the coin;

(2) an inscription of the year ''2017''; and

(3) inscriptions of the words ''Liberty'', ''In God We Trust'', ''United States of America'', and ''E Pluribus Unum''.

(c) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the National Executive Director of Boys Town and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens of Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2017.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins; and

(2) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge as follows:

(1) A surcharge of $35 per coin for the $5 coin.

(2) A surcharge of $10 per coin for the $1 coin.

(3) A surcharge of $5 per coin for the half dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be paid to Boys Town to carry out Boys Town's cause of caring for and assisting children and families in underserved communities across America.

(c) AUDITS.—Boys Town shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received under subsection (b).

(d) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the Federal Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 893, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act, introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), and I seek its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 2017, Boys Town will celebrate 100 years of saving children and healing families. Boys Town was founded in 1917 by a young Irish priest, Father Edward Flanagan, who believed that every child could be a productive citizen if given love, a home, an education, and a trade. He accepted boys of every race, color, and creed—an amazing thing back in 1917.

Boys Town first opened on December 12 of 1917 in a rundown Victorian mansion in downtown Omaha, Nebraska. In 1921, the home later moved to Overlook Farm on the outskirts of Omaha, where it remains located today. A number of years ago, I had the privilege of visiting Boys Town. By the 1930s, hundreds of boys lived at Boys Town, which grew to include dormitories and administrative buildings, and the boys even elected their own government, which included a mayor, a council, and commissioners.

News of Father Flanagan's work spread worldwide, and even Hollywood took notice with the very famous 1938 movie ''Boys Town,'' with Spencer Tracy, who won an Academy Award for his portrayal of Father Flanagan. At the request of President Truman, he even traveled the world, visiting orphans and advising government leaders on how to care for displaced children after the war.

Although Father Flanagan died in 1948, his work at Boys Town, which Flanagan called ''God's work''—and I think most of us would agree with that—continued. Today, although Boys Town is still headquartered in Nebraska, it continues to expand its care across America. It is one of the largest nonprofit child care agencies in the country, providing treatment for behavioral, emotional, and physical problems for children and their families, helping as many as 2 million people annually. Additionally, the Boys Town National Research Hospital is a global leader in the research of Usher syndrome.

Mr. Speaker, I can't think of a better way to commemorate Father Flanagan and Boys Town than by creating this commemorative coin. The spirit of Boys Town truly embodies the best of America. This bill would help recognize and continue to nurture that spirit.

I commend the gentleman from Nebraska for his hard work on this issue, and I ask for the immediate passage of the bill.

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

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: I am writing with respect to H.R. 893, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Ways and Means will forgo action on H.R. 893 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the jurisdictional interests of the Committee on Ways and Means 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. 893 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 893 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,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thank you for your letter of June 19th regarding H.R. 893, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego action on H.R. 893 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that by forgoing such action the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdictional interest in this or similar legislation. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this measure.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 893, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act.

I was pleased to be an original sponsor in the last Congress and a cosponsor in this one. This bill appropriately recognizes the outstanding work done by Boys Town, a nonprofit organization headquartered in the village of Boys Town, Nebraska, that selflessly promotes the interest of children and their families across this Nation.

□ 1545

Boys Town, which takes its name from Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, impacts the lives of more than 2 million families across America each year through its counseling services, outreach, and education. I am also pleased to report that each year, Boys Town directly touches the lives of thousands of New Yorkers through its community support services and homes for troubled youth.

Father Flanagan, the founder of Boys Town, focused on the inherent good in children and built a world class organization that emphasized the rehabilitation of troubled youth, rather than punishment. President Franklin Roosevelt once said that America needs 49 more Father Flanagans.

It is this compassionate approach and commitment to love, training, and guidance, regardless of race or religion, that has made Boys Town such a success story and a lifeline for countless children and their families. In commemoration of their centennial anniversary, the bill before us today will require the U.S. Treasury Department to mint and issue $5 gold, $1 silver, and half-dollar clad commemorative coins.

Surcharges from the sale of the coins will allow Boys Town to raise needed funds that will be dedicated to making a positive impact on the lives of children and families from underserved communities across America. It is also important to note that the passage of this bill comes at absolutely no cost to the taxpayer.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in passing this commonsense bipartisan bill without further delay.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank Mr. HUIZENGA and Mrs. MALONEY for their very thoughtful reflections on the history and importance of Boys Town. I greatly appreciate the sentiments offered.

I am very happy and proud to stand here in support of the centennial commemorative coin. As was mentioned, Boys Town was founded in 1917 by Father Edward Flanagan and has since grown from a small local home for children who found themselves in difficult circumstances in Omaha to one of the largest nonprofit, nonsectarian child and family service organizations in America.

Boys Town offers a remarkable model of academic and spiritual engagement. Students learn more than math and grammar, as important as that is. Their teachers and caregivers provide them with solid formation. Graduates are equipped to succeed not only professionally, but are also given the life skills to stay on the right path.

Boys Town is so impactful that about 90 percent of the children who come there integrate successfully back into

their communities; and historically, many, over time, have joined the military.

What is this extraordinary model of intervention? It starts with a family. Each child is placed into a family with a caring, nurturing mother and a protective, giving father, where there are rules and expectations, discipline, and love.

The success of Nebraska's Boys Town has recently been duplicated across many, many communities in our country. Their network of 11 national sites and national hotlines touches the lives of more than 2 million Americans each year.

On December 2, 2017, Boys Town will celebrate 100 years of saving children and helping to heal families. In honor of this 100-year anniversary, this legislation, again, would authorize the U.S. Mint to produce a series of commemorative coins with a design emblematic of Boys Town's 100-year history.

These coins, of course, will be available to the general public for sale and will more than offset the cost of minting by the Treasury. As was mentioned earlier, there will be no cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, Boys Town is a quiet institution nestled in the heartland, my home. It does great service to America by helping to heal wounds during this socially fractured time.

A quick story, Mr. Speaker: last year, I had the privilege of participating as a commencement speaker at Boys Town. After I finished my address, the young people were called forward to receive their diplomas in a ceremony marked with great dignity and formality and even lightheartedness.

Even though family and friends and those visiting were told to please hold their applause, the excitement couldn't be contained. As each graduate crossed the stage, shouts of joy and encouragement and clapping continued throughout the whole event.

Prior to the graduation, students had gathered for a retreat, giving them the opportunity for reflection and recommitment. During their last time together, the seniors discussed what they had to say. Here are quotes from a few of them.

> I ran in the wrong crowd, hated my family, kept running away from home, and inflicted self-harm. At Boys Town, I am a member of the Junior ROTC and learned to like myself and my family. I look forward to returning home and being a good example to my younger brother.

Another said:

> I lived on the streets from age 10 to 13 and stole to eat. I ended up in prison, and my cousin got shot in the face. I never played sports, let alone attended school, but at Boys Town, I just finished playing baseball this year and signed on with a college to study business.

Another child said this:

> My mom and dad were both in prison, and I had trouble since kindergarten. In junior high, I was locked up myself for 2 years, and when I got out, my mom died. My dad was still in prison. Since I have lived at Boys Town, I chose to get myself on the right track and graduate and made a promise to myself that I would never do anything that would land me in prison. Boys Town saved my life.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately, most children do not experience such trauma in their lives, but some do. These are the kids who bear the scars of fraying social and familial bonds, destructive choices, and legal difficulty.

Through no fault of their own, the great problems of our time fall most heavily on our young people. Economic hardship and broken families destroy the sense of safety and possibility that is a necessary antidote to social alienation.

Every child needs a nurturing environment of compassionate challenge and genuine promise. Education should cultivate that creativity, as well as dignity, allowing all boys and girls to realize their full potential.

Today, we have an opportunity to celebrate the lives of remarkable young men and women and the extraordinary institution that is serving them so well. By authorizing this Boys Town commemorative coin, we are investing in the future of our children in a simple but I think really impactful way.

I want to thank the nearly 300 bipartisan Members of this Congress who have signed on as cosponsors of this bill. I think that is an important statement. I would also like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS as well for their leadership on the committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD), whose father and grandfather served on the board of Boys Town.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I would like to commend my colleague Congressman FORTENBERRY for his work on this issue and his words, which are right on. I would like to thank as well the chairman for his words, which accurately describe the history of Boys Town. Let me also thank the ranking member for her comments that so accurately reflect what Boys Town means to our community and to the entire country.

I grew up around Boys Town. I grew up playing sports at Boys Town. The high school that I went to, Boys Town was in our conference; and we spent many very difficult nights playing basketball against the Boys Town basketball team which, quite frankly, was better than we were on most every occasion.

In my years in the legislature that lasted until last year, I had the opportunity to work with a colleague of mine, Senator Bob Krist from Omaha, who spearheaded significant juvenile justice reform in our State.

The child welfare system in Nebraska was in deep trouble; and Senator Krist, along with Father Boes, who is the acclaimed and incredibly competent leader at Boys Town, we passed significant juvenile justice legislation that helps families throughout the State of Nebraska, that deals with brain development, that deals with wraparound services, family services, as was so aptly described by my colleague Congressman FORTENBERRY.

Mr. Speaker, we are changing lives in Nebraska; and, as has been mentioned, Boys Town is changing lives throughout the country. Their unique approach to juvenile justice issues, the wraparound family-centered services that deal with not only the parents but the siblings to help bring these young people into a productive life, is what Boys Town has been about for the 100 years that it has been in existence.

It is no longer there, but I remember as a child in the 1950s actually seeing the first Boys Town facility in downtown Omaha. When I was growing up, Boys Town was way out of town. It had a farm around it. The farm is still there, but now, it is in the middle of Omaha, as Omaha grows.

Though it is in a different place in the world today than it was in 1917 with Father Flanagan, by bringing business leaders in Omaha together and others to create Boys Town, it serves that grand purpose that Father Flanagan envisioned in 1917.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I thank the ranking member for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank Mr. THORNBERRY for his beautiful statement, as well as Mr. ASHFORD, from the great State of Nebraska.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I, too, want to express my thanks to both Congressman FORTENBERRY and Congressman ASHFORD for their dedication and desire to highlight Boys Town and what an amazing thing that has happened out there and really the impact that it has had.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 893, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BULLION AND COLLECTIBLE COIN PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY AND COST SAVINGS ACT

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (H.R. 1698) to amend design and content requirements for certain gold and silver coins, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1698

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 ''Bullion and Collectible Coin Production Efficiency and Cost Savings Act''.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 5112—

(A) in subsection (q)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (3) and (8); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(B) in subsection (t)(6)(B), by striking ''90 percent silver and 10 percent copper'' and inserting ''not less than 90 percent silver''; and

(C) in subsection (v)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Subject to'' and all that follows through ''the Secretary shall'' and inserting ''The Secretary shall'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''To the greatest extent possible, the Secretary'';

(iii) in paragraph (5), by inserting after ''may issue'' the following: ''collectible versions of''; and

(iv) by striking paragraph (8); and

(2) in section 5132(a)(2)(B)(i), by striking ''90 percent silver and 10 percent copper'' and inserting ''not less than 90 percent silver''.

SEC. 3. AMERICAN EAGLE SILVER BULLION 30TH ANNIVERSARY.

Proof and uncirculated versions of coins issued by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to subsection (e) of section 5112 of title 31, United States Code, during calendar year 2016 shall have a smooth edge incused with a designation that notes the 30th anniversary of the first issue of coins under such subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. 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 the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1698, the Bullion and Collectible Coin Production Efficiency and Cost Savings Act, a bipartisan bill which I introduced in March, along with the gentlewoman from New York, Representative MALONEY.

This simple piece of legislation would make minor changes to four existing coin programs. Each change saves money for the United States Mint, and it makes it easier to produce the coins or make the coins more attractive to investors and collectors.

The changes include: first, making it less expensive to package gold investment coins; second, it allows the Mint to buy standard coinage silver for collectible coins instead of the more expensive custom alloy; third, it removes the requirement for an already completed study on the production of an investor coin made of palladium; and, fourth, it allows collector versions of the widely popular American eagle silver investment coin to bear an inscription noting that next year is the 30th anniversary of the first issuance of those coins.

These small changes will have an impact on saving taxpayer dollars over the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate passage of H.R. 1698.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this cost-saving legislation, which I was proud to cosponsor with my friend from Michigan.

People who see the big things that Congress does, they often forget that we have to pay attention to the little things, too, and these little things are important. This is a very good example of that. This is a small bill which makes the government better, saves some taxpayers' money, and makes our coin programs better for collectors and for investors.

For years, the laws that specify the production of silver coins made by the Mint have required them to be 90 percent silver. Today, the standard silver used in coins is 91 percent silver. So the Mint has had to pay extra for custom coin blanks. This legislation fixes that problem.

It also allows the Mint to make a special collectible version of the American Eagle silver bullion coin, noting the popularity of the program over the past 30 years.

The bill also allows the sale of American Buffalo gold coins in bulk rather than in individual packages, making handling easier for the Mint and for investors and clears the final hurdle for the Mint finally to produce investor coins made of palladium, an idea from a 2010 bill from my former colleague and very good friend, Mr. Watt.

Mr. Speaker, this bill saves money and makes coin programs more attractive to collectors and investors. I ask for its immediate passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1698, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES COTTON FUTURES ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2620) to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2620

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

SECTION 1. EXCLUDING CERTAIN COTTON FUTURES CONTRACTS FROM COVERAGE UNDER UNITED STATES COTTON FUTURES ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c)(1) of the United States Cotton Futures Act (7 U.S.C. 15B(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''except that any cotton futures contract'' and inserting the following: ''except that—

''(A) any cotton futures contract'';

(2) in subparagraph (A) (as designated by paragraph (1)), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(B) any cotton futures contract that permits tender of cotton grown outside of the United States is excluded from the coverage of this paragraph and section to the extent that the cotton grown outside of the United States is tendered for delivery under the cotton futures contract.''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to cotton futures contracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2620. This bill would amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to allow for the creation of a world cotton contract listed on the United States exchange.

Current law, which requires sampling and classing by the USDA of every bale of cotton tendered under contracts listed on a U.S. exchange reflects an antiquated picture of the global cotton market. Some market participants need to hedge price fluctuations in foreign markets, and the current law limits their ability to do so. We need to update our law to reflect the modern nature of this marketplace.

H.R. 2620 accomplishes this by providing an option for cotton produced and delivered in foreign markets to be classed by rating facilities closer to the point of delivery rather than by the United States Department of Agriculture. It makes no changes to the treatment of domestically produced and delivered cotton.

This legislation will allow any willing exchange to meet industry demand to design a world cotton contract. For example, ICE Futures U.S., which has already worked with market participants, has publicly announced their intention and preference to list a world cotton contract side by side with the domestically focused Cotton No. 2 contract they already list.

H.R. 2620 allows for an important new contract for cotton hedging to be developed, which would be beneficial to commercial hedgers. However, it is important specifically to me and to others to note, it would not disrupt the industry's benchmark hedging contract, the No. 2 contract, which is relied upon by U.S. cotton producers in my district and around the country.

Before I close, I would like to thank Chairman CONAWAY both for his continued leadership on the Agriculture Committee and his efforts on this legislation. Additionally, I want to thank Ranking Member DAVID SCOTT for working with me on this issue over the last few months. And I would like to acknowledge LYNN WESTMORELAND's work in this as well. He was instrumental in advancing this issue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2620.

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, too, have enjoyed working with my colleague from Georgia, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, Congressman AUSTIN SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, our bill, H.R. 2620, will modernize the way in which cotton futures contracts are listed and regulated under the 1916 Cotton Futures Act.

More specifically, as many of you know, the main tool used in the marketplace for hedging cotton is the No. 2 contract. Currently, the No. 2 contract only permits cotton grown within the United States. That cotton is delivered to only five United States cities: Galveston, Texas; Houston, Texas; Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas; Greenville, South Carolina; and Memphis, Tennessee.

Now, under the 1916 Cotton Futures Act, every bale of cotton tendered under a contract listed on a U.S. exchange must be sampled and classed or graded by the United States Department of Agriculture. However, seeing that cotton is grown all over the world, my bill targets cotton that is grown and delivered outside of the United States' borders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the problem, the concern that our bill is solving. As I mentioned earlier, because of the fact that there are only five domestic cities that are cotton delivery points listed under the 1916 Cotton Futures Act, there has been much concern that the Cotton No. 2 contract cannot accurately reflect price movement in foreign markets and, therefore, cannot provide an effective risk management tool. That is simply the problem.

Now, to solve this problem, what our bill will do is simply allow U.S.-based future exchanges flexibility in how they handle foreign-grown cotton and foreign delivery points that will never touch the United States at all.

Mr. Speaker, we live now and we operate in a rapidly changing global economy. It is very important that we not put our cotton producers or our commodities exchanges into a disadvantaged position competitively when it comes to being able to get the price fluctuations that occur in foreign markets, thereby providing our businesses with the most effective tool by which they can manage their risk.

So because the United States Department of Agriculture does not have the manpower to deploy personnel all over the world at one time, our bill will allow cotton grown outside the United States to be classed by either a United States Department of Agriculture testing lab inside the United States or an international lab deemed to have comparable comprehensive rules and regulations equivalent to the United States. That is it. It is clean and simple.

Our bill solves this problem. It gives our cotton producers and it gives our exchanges that ability to be able to know how prices are sliding in each foreign country that is producing cotton while, at the same time, our producers and our exchanges, without that, cannot apply good risk management. That is why this is so essential.

So let me state again, as my colleague from Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT, made clear, I, too, want to make clear that our bill does not change the fact that 100 percent of all domestically produced and delivered cotton will be classed by the United States Department of Agriculture. There is absolutely no change here.

Furthermore, the bill does not change or alter the Cotton No. 2 contract. What our bill does is simply allow our U.S.-based futures exchanges that much-needed flexibility that is needed in order to list cotton that will never touch the United States through a world cotton contract.

As I said, we live in a global marketplace. It is important that our rules and regulations reflect the modernization that has happened in our global markets since this act was written 100 years ago. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we keep the United States economy the strongest economy in the world, and our bill, H.R. 2620, will do just.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 2620.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, Mr. SCOTT, and I have said, this is simply a necessary, minor change. I would just ask all Members to support passage of H.R. 2620.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2620, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY HEADQUARTERS CONSOLIDATION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1640) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1640

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 ''Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY HEADQUARTERS CONSOLIDATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project within the National Capital Region. Such report shall include each of the following:

(1) A proposed occupancy plan for the consolidation project that includes specific information about which Department-wide operations, component operations, and support offices will be located at the site, the aggregate number of full time equivalent employees projected to occupy the site, and schedule estimates for migrating operations to the site.

(2) A comprehensive assessment of the current and future real property needed by the

Department in the National Capital Region in order to carry out the mission of the Department to secure the homeland and defend the Nation against future acts of terrorism.

(3) An analysis of the difference between the current and needed capital assets and facilities of the Department.

(4) A current plan for construction of the headquarters consolidation at the St. Elizabeths campus that includes—

(A) the estimated costs and schedule for the current plan; and

(B) any estimated costs savings associated with reducing the scope of the consolidation project and increasing the use of existing capacity developed under the project.

(5) A current plan for the leased portfolio of the Department in the National Capital Region that includes—

(A) the total rentable square feet, number of personnel, and proposed utilization rates;

(B) the replacement and consolidation plan, including—

(i) an end-state vision that identifies which Department-wide operations, component operations, and support offices do not migrate to the St. Elizabeths campus and continue to operate at a property in the leased portfolio;

(ii) the number of full time equivalent employees who are expected to operate at each property, component, or office; and

(iii) timing and anticipated leased terms, for leased space under the plan referred to in paragraph (4); and

(C) the costs and benefits of leasing and construction alternatives for the headquarters consolidation project.

(6) A detailed list of alternatives considered by the Department during the development of the plan referred to in paragraph (4), including the costs and benefits of alternatives to such plan.

(b) UPDATE OF COST AND SCHEDULE ESTIMATES.—Not later than 180 days after date of the submittal of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, shall complete the update of the cost and schedule estimates for the portions of the consolidation project that are not yet complete as of such date based on the information contained in the report. Consistent with the recommendation of the Government Accountability Office in GAO–14–648, such estimates shall conform to relevant Federal guidance for cost and schedule estimates.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—

(1) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the update of the cost and schedule estimates under subsection (b) to evaluate the quality and reliability of such estimates.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the completion of the update of the cost and schedule estimates under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on the results of the review required by paragraph (1).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term ''National Capital Region'' has the meaning given such term under section 2674(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

□ 1615

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1640. Mr. Speaker, since 2006, the Department of Homeland Security and the General Services Administration have been working towards completing a consolidated headquarters on the historic St. Elizabeths campus in Washington, D.C.

However, as with many other Federal projects, the consolidation has run up against cost overruns and construction delays, at times estimated to be more than $1 billion over budget and 12 years behind schedule.

Earlier this year, I visited the site personally to see firsthand the progress being made and the immense challenges that lie ahead. I remain concerned that taxpayers' dollars will be put at risk without better management.

This bill, H.R. 1640, the DHS Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015, would require the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, to investigate and submit a report on the estimated costs and property needs of the project.

While we were encouraged by the updated DHS St. Elizabeths plans published earlier this year, we still believe that increased oversight of the consolidation project will help ensure accountability and the efficient use of our constituents' taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, accountability is a fundamental aspect of citizen-ruled government and something that our constituents expect their representatives to uphold. H.R. 1640 does just this, and I look forward to the bipartisan support this legislation will receive.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 1640, the Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountably Act of 2015. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1640, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the house floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1640, the ''Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support a request by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction.

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

Sincerely,

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1640, the Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, in 2006, 3 years into the Department of Homeland Security's existence, President Bush proposed consolidating the headquarters functions of the Department and its components from the more than 50 locations to the St. Elizabeths campus in southeast Washington, D.C.

Construction began in 2009, but between sequestration and tightening budgets, appropriations for the project have been $1.2 billion less than President Bush and President Obama requested.

Naturally, Congress' failure to consistently and adequately fund the project has greatly slowed construction and led to increased costs. It has also forced DHS to revisit its master plan and reduce the scope of the project.

At this juncture, it is important that the Department have a realistic and

achievable plan. The legislation under consideration seeks to do just that. If enacted, this legislation would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress an updated plan for St. Elizabeths to inform future funding decisions.

Importantly, H.R. 1640 requires the submission of a proposed occupancy plan for St. Elizabeths that includes a list of components and offices to be housed there. A key consequence of the Department having to scale down the breadth of its consolidation plans is the reality that its portfolio of leased space will need to remain large.

In fact, with up to 69 percent of DHS' commercial leases in the national capital region expiring between fiscal years 2016 to 2020, we should all be aware that DHS will be forced to embark on the expensive process of recompeting and possibly relocating its operations and personnel.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, I would like to acknowledge that I am pleased that the bill includes an amendment I offered to give the Department adequate time to engage the General Services Administration, the construction manager for the project, in preparing the updated plans, assessments, and estimates.

GSA's participation in the development of these key materials is essential to ensuring that what is transmitted to Congress is realistic and achievable.

As a supporter of the St. Elizabeths project and DHS' Unity of Effort initiative, I urge passage of H.R. 1640. Colocation of DHS' personnel in one headquarters has the potential of not only achieving cost savings, but fostering an environment where integration and collaboration drives more effective and efficient operations.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the bipartisan approach taken on this legislation. The St. Elizabeths project is about more than real estate; it is about ensuring the Department of Homeland Security has a home where diverse components can come together.

That is the thinking behind the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative. Enactment of this legislation will help to ensure that DHS has a realistic plan for St. Elizabeths.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for their work on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this strong bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1640, the "Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015."

I support this bipartisan legislation which directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee for unanimously supporting the inclusion of my amendments to H.R. 1640.

Together, the Jackson Lee amendments offered a comprehensive look at the Department's real estate obligations related to its headquarters consolidation project at St. Elizabeths, as well as its leased portfolio in the National Capital Region.

Further, the Jackson Lee amendments help clarify how DHS will relocate its personnel and operations at the headquarters level and across its components at St. Elizabeths as construction continues on the headquarters consolidation project.

Mr. Speaker, since DHS initiated its headquarters consolidation in 2006, it has progressed despite changes in senior leadership and waning funding support from Congress.

As a result, in April 2015, DHS and GSA announced that the construction sequence and timetable for the headquarters consolidation would be adjusted to reflect reduced funding by Congress.

DHS must now re-compete up to 69 percent of its commercial leases in the National Capital Region as they are scheduled to expire between 2016 and 2020.

My first amendment directs DHS to provide information related to the expected timing and terms of any lease renewals in the National Capital Region.

My second amendment requires the Department to report on the numbers of its full-time equivalents who are expected to occupy each DHS-leased or owned property, which will guide the Department in adjusting its expenditures on the headquarters consolidation project.

Together, they will ensure that DHS and GSA develop a comprehensive picture of which employees and operations will migrate to St. Elizabeths and which will not.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in strong support of the suspension bill, H.R. 1640, the "Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1640, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS PAID ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1633) to provide for certain improvements relating to the tracking and reporting of employees of the Department of Homeland Security placed on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1633

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 "DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY IMPROVED INTERNAL TRACKING AND REPORTING OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296; 6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 104. INTERNAL TRACKING AND REPORTING OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR PERSONNEL MATTERS.

"(a) INTERNAL REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015, and quarterly thereafter, the head of each component of the Department shall submit to the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department—

"(1) the number of employees of the component who had been on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters for a period of six consecutive months or longer as of the last day of the period covered by the report;

"(2) the total cost to the component associated with such administrative leave and such paid non-duty status (including salary and benefits) for the period covered by the report; and

"(3) the average duration that employees are placed on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters for a period of six consecutive months or longer, as of the last day of the period covered by the report for the component.

"(b) CHCO TRACKING.—The Chief Human Capital Officer shall—

"(1) maintain records of the number of employees of the Department who are placed on administrative leave or paid non-duty status without charge to leave for personnel matters and the costs (including salary and benefits) associated with such leave or non-duty status; and

"(2) in consultation with the head of each of the components of the Department, determine any appropriate actions to be taken by the Department to resolve any personnel matter objectively, appropriately, and expeditiously or to reduce the use of administrative leave and paid non-duty status without charge to leave in addressing any personnel matter.

"(c) PERSONNEL MATTERS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'personnel matters' means, with respect to an employee, any personnel investigation (including any investigation into misconduct and any national security or suitability investigation), any criminal matter, or any adverse action proposed or taken by the Department, including any action under chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code.

"(d) LEVERAGE OF EXISTING SYSTEMS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary is

encouraged to leverage systems and operations in use on the date of enactment of the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015 to implement the requirements of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 103 the following new item:

''Sec. 104. Internal tracking and reporting of administrative leave for personnel matters.''.

SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY POLICY RELATING TO EMPLOYEES ON ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE.

By not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall develop and implement a Department-wide policy in accordance with existing Federal guidance specifically related to the use of administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters. Such policy shall include the responsibilities of the components of the Department for reporting information relating to such administrative leave and such paid non-duty status to the Chief Human Capital Officer, as required under section 104(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296), as added by section 2. Such policy shall provide guidance on expediting the resolution of a personnel matter for which an employee has been on administrative leave or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave for a period of six consecutive months or longer in an objective and appropriate manner.

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY EMPLOYEES ON ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the last day of each calendar quarter of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Chief Human Capital Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the number of Department employees on administrative leave, and any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters for a period of six consecutive months or longer as of the last day of the quarter covered by the report. Each such report shall include—

(1) the costs to the Department associated with the placement of such employees on administrative leave or such paid non-duty status (including salary and benefits) for the period covered by the report; and

(2) a description of any actions taken by the Department to resolve any personnel matter for which an employee has been placed on administrative leave or paid non-duty status without charge to leave.

(b) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—In this section, the term ''personnel matters'' has the meaning given such term in section 104(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296), as added by section 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe our children and grandchildren deserve a better government than the one that we are passing on to them. Families are struggling due to a lagging economy. Government intrusion and senseless regulations on businesses are pushing jobs overseas. With the recent rash of scandals within our Federal Government, the American people are continually losing their faith in representatives of our government.

I know we can do better, and the American people expect to see change. I came to Congress to make a difference, to cut spending, to eliminate waste, and to hold Big Government bureaucrats accountable and make this Nation a place that is more free, safe, and full of opportunity.

This is what the American people expect from us, and now is the time for us to take bold and decisive action, and that is why I am standing here today.

The Department of Homeland Security has roughly 240,000 employees who work around the clock to protect the lives and liberties of Americans, and I am grateful for their dedicated service.

However, due to a lack of proper management and accountability, there are numbers of DHS employees who are staying at home and drawing a paycheck while being investigated for acts of misconduct.

In May of 2014, the former deputy inspector general at the Department of Homeland Security was accused of altering reports and delaying investigations. One of those investigations was the Secret Service prostitution scandal that occurred in 2012.

The Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight delved into this case, which also led to further investigations. However, even though the former deputy inspector general was being investigated for gross misconduct, he was placed on administrative leave, receiving full pay and benefits for almost an entire year.

We all know that there are occasional incidents like this in any organization. However, if this was an isolated case, I would not be standing here today presenting this bill, but there are numerous cases like it.

The Government Accountability Office reported that from 2011 to 2013, the Department of Homeland Security provided its employees with over 1.5 million days of paid administrative leave, equating to over $380 million in taxpayer dollars. Most of this paid leave was granted to employees who were on administrative leave for reasons of misconduct.

Unfortunately, the Department has no agencywide standards or reporting policies regarding paid administrative leave for employees being investigated for misconduct. This lack of management and accountability allows employees with disciplinary issues, like the former deputy inspector general, to fall through the cracks.

This bill, H.R. 1633, the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015, requires the Chief Human Capital Officer to implement an agency-wide policy regarding those who are on paid administrative leave for more than 6 months being investigated for misconduct. In addition, it requires the Department to report to Congress the number of employees on administrative leave during investigation, as well as the associated costs.

Having a commonsense policy, as mandated by this bill, will potentially save the Department millions of dollars and provide for critical oversight and accountability.

The bill will also require the Chief Human Capital Officer to submit quarterly reports to the House and Senate Homeland Security Committees. These reports will allow more oversight by Congress and ensure DHS is no longer squandering hard-working taxpayer dollars.

DHS must do a better job of tracking employees under investigation for misconduct and, in a timely manner, take appropriate action to hold them accountable. Employees who tarnish the Department's reputation do not deserve paid vacations at taxpayer expense.

Americans are tired of government carelessly giving away their future through mismanagement and thoughtless spending habits.

I encourage my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1633, a commonsense bill that will help prevent fraud, alleviate waste, and better safeguard taxpayer dollars.

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in strong support of H.R. 1633, the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, this measure which was unanimously approved in committee, seeks to enhance how certain paid administrative leave is tracked and managed by the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 1633 was introduced in response to a 2014 Government Accountability Office report that looked at paid administrative leave expenditures across government between fiscal years 2011 and 2014.

In that report, GAO found that, overall, agencies spent $3.1 billion on paid administrative leave. Of that amount, the Department of Homeland Security spent $380 million on this category of leave. Agencies approve administrative leave for a variety of reasons, from severe weather events, to jury duty, to voting, to disciplinary matters subject to investigation.

H.R. 1633 focuses on helping to improve DHS' management of just one segment of paid administrative leave expenditures, leave that is paid for 6 or more consecutive months to an employee that is under investigation by the Department for a conduct or criminal matter.

This legislation directs the Department's Chief Human Capital Officer to maintain records from throughout the Department on the number of employees who are paid leave for 6 or more consecutive months during a DHS personnel investigation; the total costs, including salaries and benefits associated with this leave; and the average length of time that an employee in these circumstances is on paid administrative leave.

H.R. 1633 also directs the Department's Chief Human Capital Officer to develop and implement department-wide policy on how components can comply with this recordkeeping requirement and guidance and on how components can expedite the resolution of personnel matters for an employee in these circumstances.

In committee, language I authored was accepted to ensure that when a component expeditiously works to resolve personnel matters, as directed by this bill, that component must do so in a way that is objective and fair.

□ 1630

The addition of this language is important because we do not want to create the impression that Congress values expediency and cost-cutting over fairness.

Even as we look to foster greater accountability, we must not lose sight of the fact that we are talking about people's careers here.

Before I close, I would add that this legislation does nothing to disturb the discretion that the Department has to make leave decisions, and this bill should not impact the availability of paid administrative leave to the DHS workforce.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1633, the DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015, introduced by my colleague from Georgia, BARRY LOUDERMILK.

Over the span of 2 years, Department of Homeland Security employees racked up approximately 1.5 million days of paid administrative leave, which amounts to hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. Some of these employees were placed on leave due to investigations into alleged misconduct.

Stopping wasteful government spending has been a top priority for me during my time in Congress, which is why I am proud to cosponsor this piece of legislation.

This bill increases government transparency by establishing an accountability system within the Department of Homeland Security. This system is essential in safeguarding against waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am glad that it is a bipartisan measure. I look forward to its passage, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1633 and stand with this commonsense legislation that saves taxpayer dollars.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), my colleague, friend, and fellow member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1633.

From 2011 to 2013, over 200 DHS employees were placed on paid administrative leave. While administrative leave may be necessary on a case-by-case basis, more frequently, we hear of Federal employees who are under investigation for conduct-related actions. These investigations can last for several months, which can result in a substantial cost to taxpayers.

For example, in 2013, a DHS employee was placed on paid administrative leave for running a Web site that predicted and advocated a race war. Such action should not involve paid leave. It clearly should involve termination of employment.

Another example involves former Acting and Deputy DHS Inspector General Charles Edwards. Mr. Edwards was placed on paid leave in May of 2014. As of October 2014, he was still on paid administrative leave.

This bill protects precious taxpayer dollars by requiring DHS to track and report on employees placed on administrative leave for personnel matters. By keeping track of who is on paid administrative leave, we can better ensure we are not using the taxpayers' dime to pay for DHS employee misconduct.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, this legislation would do nothing to disturb the availability of paid administrative leave for DHS workers who need it to vote or to serve on a jury. It is narrowly focused on getting a handle on how much the Department is spending on paid administrative leave for individuals under investigation for 6 or more months.

These circumstances are often tough for all involved. The sooner there is an appropriate resolution, the better it is for everyone involved. If enacted, H.R. 1633 would help to ensure that such matters are resolved in a timely and appropriate manner.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this strong, commonsense, and bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1633, the "DHS Paid Administrative Leave Accountability Act of 2015."

This bill makes needed improvements relating to the tracking and reporting of employees of the Department of Homeland Security including administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, and personal matters, and for other purposes.

I support this bipartisan legislation, which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the head of each component of the Department of Homeland Security to submit on a quarterly basis two reports to the Chief Human Capital Officer of DHS.

Mr. Speaker, Title I of Homeland Security Act would be amended by adding Section 104 which provides for the improvement of internal tracking and reporting for administrative leave.

First, this bill directs that the number of employees who had been on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters for six consecutive months or longer be reported.

Second, DHS agency heads must report the total cost to the component associated with such leave and paid non-duty status for that quarter.

The Chief Human Capital Officer is responsible for determining appropriate actions to be taken by DHS to resolve any personnel matter expeditiously or to eliminate or reduce the use of such leave and paid non-duty status in addressing any personnel matter.

The Chief HCO is also to develop and implement a department-wide policy in accordance with existing federal guidance specifically related to the use of such leave of paid non-duty status for personnel matters.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1633 enhances transparency and allows for more fiscally conservative policy in regards to the costs associated with paid administrative leave.

However, it may be more difficult to accomplish this level of transparency in regards to how data for leave is extracted and recorded.

These are time sensitive additions which will require that within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter, the department heads are required to submit their reports to the Chief Officer.

In that same time span the Chief HC Officer is to promulgate a department-wide policy in accordance with existing Federal guidance specifically related to the use of administrative leave.

I join my colleagues in working to strengthen efficiency in all areas of government and supporting fiscally conservative methods to achieve this goal.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of H.R. 1633.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1633, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND SECURITY DRONE ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS ACT

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1646

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 ''Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act''.

SEC. 2. DRONE ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Energy, and the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission research how commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aircraft, excluding aircraft over 1,300 pounds could be used to perpetuate an attack and, based on such research, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop policies, guidance, and protocols for the Department of Homeland Security to prevent such an attack or mitigate the risks of such an attack. Not later than 180 days after the completion of the research required under this subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security may provide, as appropriate, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Energy, and the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission information, based on such research, regarding how to best prevent and mitigate the risk of such an attack.

(b) DISSEMINATION TO STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall disseminate information to State, local, and tribal law enforcement officials and State and major urban area fusion centers, as appropriate, regarding how such officials may bolster preparedness for and responses to attacks perpetrated by commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aircraft, excluding aircraft over 1,300 pounds.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate an assessment of the security risk associated with commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aircraft, excluding aircraft over 1,300 pounds. Such assessment shall be informed by research conducted in accordance with subsection (a), shall contain recommendations, if applicable, to prevent and mitigate the risk of an unmanned aircraft system attack, and may be developed in coordination with the Centers of Excellence of the Department of Homeland Security and other academic institutions.

(d) PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act. This Act shall be carried out using amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1646.

The rapid increase of commercially available small-and medium-sized unmanned aerial systems, or UAS, most often referred to as drones, poses an emerging security threat. This is further evidenced by recent high-profile events at the White House, French nuclear power plants, and numerous airports and sports venues. Drones have been a part of foiled terrorist plots, used to smuggle drugs across our borders, and the negligent use of this technology presents a public safety risk.

During this Congress, bills have been introduced that focus on topics such as the commercial uses of drones and the privacy concerns associated with their use. However, nobody has tackled the security implications of expanding the use of drones. H.R. 1646, the Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act, requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how commercially available small- and medium-sized drones could be used in an attack and to develop policies, guidance, and protocols for the Department of Homeland Security to prevent an attack.

By the end of fiscal year 2015, the Federal Aviation Administration is expected to establish new rules to remove the waiver requirement and allow the operation of drones for nonrecreational purposes in U.S. airspace. Undoubtedly, these regulations would be better informed by a DHS assessment of the potential security risks associated with the expanded use of small- and medium-sized drones. H.R. 1646 is a good first step towards protecting the country and the American people from this emerging threat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, WASHINGTON, DC, JUNE 9, 2015.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 1646, the Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act. This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1646, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. In addition, the bill's sponsor and the Committee on Homeland Security have agreed to include two changes to the bill in a Manager's Amendment on the House Floor. Finally, I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to any conference committee named to consider H.R. 1646.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 10, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1646, the ''Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego further action on the bill.

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1646, the Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act, and in support of the House's adoption of H.R. 1646. I introduced this legislation in response to testimony that we received in committee this past March on gaps in our

understanding of the security implications of unmanned aerial systems, UAS, in domestic airspace.

For example, off-the-shelf systems widely available today, in the wrong hands, can jam transmitted signals, take surveillance imagery, and carry dangerous weapons. Given these systems' capabilities, it is important that there be a comprehensive study of the security risks and plans to address them.

To that end, H.R. 1646 directs the Department of Homeland Security to research how a commercially available small- and medium-sized drone could be used to perpetrate an attack, and to develop policies, guidance, and protocols to prevent such an attack or mitigate the risk of such an attack.

As amended in committee, my legislation directs DHS to work with the U.S. Departments of Transportation and Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to carry out this research, and allows for DHS to share advice and information based on that research with these key Federal partners.

Mr. Speaker, drone technology holds great promise, with significant social and economic benefits not yet fully realized. However, given the rapid growth in the domestic drone market, it is important that we identify and have strategies to mitigate the associated security risk.

If enacted, H.R. 1646 will enhance our Nation's security while, at the same time, clarifying the framework for Americans' legitimate interest in producing and using drones lawfully and safely.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 1646, to further the Department of Homeland Security's efforts to work with other agencies on the security risks of small- and medium-sized drones in domestic airspace.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this strong, bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1646, the "Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act."

I support this bipartisan legislation because it addresses the potential terrorist threat posed by small and medium-sized drones throughout our country.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN of New Jersey, for introducing this thoughtful and necessary legislation that will assist the Department of Homeland Security.

The Homeland Security Drone Assessment and Analysis Act would require the Department of Homeland Security to research how commercially available small and medium-sized drones could be used to perpetrate an attack.

Agencies will be tasked with the responsibility of taking the lead for developing effective policies and guidance along with the proper protocols which will assist in preventing an attack perpetrated with a drone.

Information regarding how to properly respond to the potential threats from these drones will be distributed to state and local law enforcement agencies to allow them to develop approaches to mitigate identified threats.

The protocols that will be developed as a result of this legislation will assist every level of law enforcement in coordinated responses to a drone related emergency.

Recent news reports of small drones crashing in areas such as on the White House lawn and incidents including near misses with commercial aircraft demonstrate the need for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that can and must continue to be done is to protect our homeland from evolving threats.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I join my colleagues in working to strengthen the laws that allow the Department of Homeland Security to create policies that will address emergency protocol threats such as the proliferation of commercial use of drones.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 1646.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H. R. 1646, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how certain commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aircraft systems could be used in an attack, how to prevent or mitigate the risk of such an attack, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS FOIA EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1615) to direct the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in the implementation of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1615

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 ''DHS FOIA Efficiency Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) DEADLINE FOR UPDATING REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, as appointed pursuant to section 552(j) of title 5, United States Code, shall finalize and issue an updated regulation implementing section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), which shall include—

(1) public guidance on procedures to be followed when making requests under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code;

(2) updated guidance to the components of the Department responsible for processing such requests, which may include information on how to adopt automated processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code;

(3) detailed information on fees and costs associated with such requests; and

(4) detailed information on the appeals process for such requests.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief FOIA Officer, in coordination with the Chief Financial Officer of the Department and the heads of each of the relevant components of the Department, shall identify the total annual cost to the Department of implementing section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Chief FOIA Officer shall develop guidance on reporting standards related to the direct and indirect costs to the Department associated with the processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(c) COST SAVINGS.—The Chief FOIA Officer, in collaboration with the heads of each of the relevant components of the Department, shall—

(1) identify unnecessary and duplicative actions taken by the Department in the course of processing requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) eliminate unnecessary and duplicative actions taken by the Department in the course of processing requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, by not later than 12 months after the identification of such action under paragraph (1).

(d) FOIA TRACKING SYSTEMS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief FOIA Officer shall develop a plan to automate the processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code to the Department. Such plan shall take into account the specific needs of each of the components of the Department responsible for processing such requests and address required and recommended technology capabilities and elements. Such plan shall include an assessment of the costs and benefits associated with establishing and using electronic processing systems to process requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) FOIA BACKLOG.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Privacy Officer of the Department, in consultation with the Chief FOIA Officer, shall update and issue guidance to the heads of each of the relevant components of the Department regarding the goal of reducing the backlog in processing requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, by 50 percent between fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2018.

(f) REPORT.—

(1) SEMIANNUAL PRIVACY REPORT.—The Chief FOIA Officer shall include in each

semiannual privacy report submitted under section 1062(f) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1(f)) each of the following:

(A) The total costs to the Department of meeting the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, for the period covered by the report.

(B) An assessment of progress made toward meeting the backlog goals pursuant to subsection (e) during the period covered by the report and the periods covered by the two preceding reports.

(C) An assessment of whether the Department has adequate staffing and other resources to address the backlog goals pursuant to subsection (e) for processing requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(D) An assessment of the progress made towards automating the processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, during the period covered by the report.

(2) FISCAL YEAR 2016 REQUIREMENTS.—The Chief FOIA Officer shall include in the second semiannual privacy report for fiscal year 2016 each of the following:

(A) A description of any cost savings identified under subsection (d).

(B) The plan developed under subsection (d).

(g) DUPLICATIVE ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''duplicative actions'' means actions carried out by two or more components or programs that are engaged in the same activities or provide the same services related to the processing of FOIA requests to the same beneficiaries.

SEC. 3. PROGRESS ON AUTOMATION.

Upon completion of the plan to automate the processing of requests made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, the Chief FOIA Officer shall provide the plan to the heads of the components of the Department and seek written feedback from each head of a component agency regarding the extent to which that component will adopt the plan, the associated costs, and the projected timelines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1615.

In November of 2014, it was reported that DHS had received and processed the most FOIA requests out of any Federal department. It holds the largest backlog of unprocessed FOIA requests of any Federal agency. In fact, since 2010, DHS FOIA requests have increased by over 65 percent, and DHS currently holds almost half of all Federal FOIA requests of any government agency—about 50,000 of 95,000 requests.

In addition, 3 weeks ago, I was informed that the increase in DHS FOIA requests was partly due to requests for immigration records for people requesting information for their future deferred action cases. My bill, H.R. 1615, the DHS FOIA Efficiency Act of 2015, streamlines the process to address the tremendous workload and backlog and bring transparency to the cost of FOIA requests to the Department.

In the recent past, DHS has received poor evaluations regarding its efficiency in handling FOIA requests. For these reasons, my bill directs the chief FOIA officer of DHS to work with other officers within the Department to update their capabilities in handling the large amount of FOIA requests and identify the total annual costs associated with processing these requests.

By updating their capabilities and reporting to Congress on how the Department is addressing their poor performance, my bill will direct the Department to address its backlog and inefficiencies in an appropriate and quick manner.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1615, the DHS FOIA Efficiency Act.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which was unanimously approved by the committee on May 20, seeks to improve the Department's processing of Freedom of Information Act requests.

In November 2014, the Comptroller General reported that DHS faces the largest backlog of unprocessed FOIA requests of any Federal agency. While resource challenges and inefficiencies in DHS' internal processes help explain in part the backlog, we must not be complacent and accept these challenges as excuses for the backlog.

A cornerstone of our democracy is that the government is accountable to its citizens. The FOIA process is a key mechanism to ensure accountability. I am pleased that the approach taken under this bill is consistent with the Department's unity of effort initiative.

Specifically, H.R. 1615 requires that the Department's chief FOIA officer collaborate with FOIA officials in component agencies to track the total annual costs associated with processing FOIA requests, identify and adopt cost-savings measures, and strategize on addressing the backlog.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note that in committee, measures authored by Democratic members to promote automation and address staffing resources were adopted with bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1615, a bipartisan bill that seeks to improve the responsiveness of the Department of Homeland Security to the American public, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, timely compliance with FOIA requests is imperative to an open government. The DHS FOIA backlog has existed for too long and needs to be addressed.

I thank Representative CARTER and Chairman MCCAUL for their bipartisan efforts on the DHS FOIA Efficiency Act, which marks an important first step in addressing this FOIA backlog and promoting greater automation in the processing of requests.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this strong, bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1615, the "DHS FOIA Efficiency Act of 2015."

I support this bipartisan legislation, which addresses DHS' FOIA backlog by requiring the department's chief FOIA officer to issue updated regulations on obtaining records under the Act.

I am pleased that H.R. 1615 incorporates two key Jackson Lee amendments offered during the committee markup of the bill.

In 2014, DHS had 67,097 FOIA requests that carried over from 2013; added 291,242 requests; and processed 238,031 FOIA requests.

The agency still had 120,308 FOIA requests that were carried over into 2015.

Because FOIA is a critical component of creating our nation's open and transparent government, the process of citizens getting access to information regarding government matters of personal or public interest is important.

DHS's ability to meet public demands for information through FOIA should not be hampered by a lack of technology.

One of the Jackson Lee Amendments included in the bill directs that the agency include information on how to adopt automated processing to meet FOIA obligations triggered by agency: Public Notices published in the Federal Register; Final rules; decisions, outcome of adjudicated matters or other agency actions; and obligations to reply to citizen FOIA request.

Another Jackson Lee Amendment included in H.R. 1615 directs that a report be drafted that provides an assessment of DHS progress made toward automating the FOIA process.

That Jackson Lee amendment also provides that upon completion of the FOIA automation plan that the Chief FOIA officer provides the plan to the heads of the components of the Department.

Mr. Speaker, it is true as Justice Brandeis famously observed that "sunshine is the best disinfectant."

He was speaking of the power of knowledge to illuminate and to enhance the ability of people to understand and evaluate government actions when presented with information.

I agree with Justice Brandeis that "the most important political office is that of the private citizen."

I support H.R. 1615 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1615, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. 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 motion will be postponed.

DHS IT DUPLICATION REDUCTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1626) to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1626

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 ''DHS IT Duplication Reduction Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DHS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DUPLICATION REDUCTION.

(a) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DUPLICATION REDUCTION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that includes the following:

(1) The number of information technology systems at the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) An assessment of the number of such systems exhibiting duplication or fragmentation.

(3) A strategy for reducing such duplicative systems, including an assessment of potential cost savings or cost avoidance as a result of such reduction.

(4) A methodology for determining which system should be eliminated when there is duplication or fragmentation.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term ''duplication or fragmentation'' of information technology systems means two or more systems or programs that deliver similar functionality to similar user populations.

(2) The term ''information technology'' has the meaning given such term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

(c) NO NEW AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING.—This section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise appropriated or made available to the Department of Homeland Security. No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1626.

Call me crazy, but it just doesn't make sense to me to have Federal agencies using multiple IT systems that do the same thing. As chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Information Technology Subcommittee and a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I see these cost overruns and hear stories of duplicative systems on a daily basis. It is a ridiculous and outrageous waste of taxpayer dollars.

This year, the GAO's annual High Risk report designated information technology as a new area of high risk within the government. Federal agencies spend nearly $80 billion a year on IT projects, and nearly 80 percent of them are on outdated and legacy systems. In the Department of Homeland Security, there are more than 600 IT systems in FEMA alone.

The DHS IT Duplication Reduction Act is designed to change that. My bill requires the DHS Chief Information Officer to identify all IT systems in the Department, figure out which ones are redundant, and then come up with a strategy to reduce their number.

Mr. Speaker, when I was building a cybersecurity firm in the private sector, things like this didn't happen because there is no way that a small business trying to grow would ever waste their money like this.

Washington should have the same mentality, especially since this money being wasted isn't Washington's in the first place. I believe Washington can and should be much better stewards of the dollars taxpayers have entrusted to them. It is past time to change the ''it is not my money, so let's spend it'' culture here in Washington that leads to this kind of waste.

Taxpayers should be able to trust that every dollar is being used carefully and thoughtfully on effective and efficient government that works for them. I believe this legislation is a good start in reining in Federal IT spending and getting our government back on track.

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1626, the DHS IT Duplication Reduction Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1626 seeks to address duplication or fragmentation within the Department of Homeland Security's information technology systems. Specifically, H.R. 1626 requires the Department's Chief Information Officer to report on the number of IT systems throughout the Department and identify and address those areas where duplication or fragmentation may exist.

This undertaking at the headquarters level should help inform the Department's IT budget planning which, in light of sequestration and the downward trend of the Department's budget, becomes all the more important when considered in the critical missions entrusted to DHS.

This legislation is in the spirit of the Department's Unity of Effort initiative and has the potential of fostering more coordinated IT planning and management among the Department's components. In committee, a number of technical refinements authored by Democrats were accepted to ensure that reducing redundancy frees up resources for DHS' operations.

Mr. Speaker, I do urge support for this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I, once again, want to point out the bipartisan efforts in regards to this measure. This measure has the potential of fostering more coordinated IT planning and management among the Department's components.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage and support of this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN, and my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee for their support on this bill.

I, once again, urge all my colleagues to support this strong, bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1626, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SUNSHINE ACT OF 2015

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1637) to require annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and

development centers within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1637

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 ''Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROJECTS OF FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall annually submit to the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a list of ongoing and completed projects that federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security have been tasked to complete.

(b) PROHIBITION ON NEW AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING.—This section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise appropriated or made available to the Department of Homeland Security. No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1637, the Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent 700,000 north and east Texans. They have sent me here to Washington to pull the curtain back and shine a light into this Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Federal agencies can be inefficient, ineffective, and resistant to oversight. They don't like to be held accountable, not by the American people or by individuals like me who are elected to represent those folks here in Congress.

As a committed conservative who is fighting to secure the American homeland, I believe that increased transparency is a national security issue, and because of that, every taxpayer dollar that we spend must be scrutinized.

We have to evaluate the government's programs and activities to see if they are worthwhile and to craft reforms that eliminate waste and bolster our national defense. A sluggish national security apparatus simply won't suffice. The American people deserve more.

Congress can't even begin to conduct effective oversight and cut waste, fraud, and abuse if we don't know what is going on behind closed doors. That is why I introduced H.R. 1637. This bill will increase transparency at the Department of Homeland Security by directing the Secretary to give Congress a detailed account each year of the ongoing and completed projects that federally funded research and development centers, or FFRDCs, within the Department of Homeland Security have been assigned.

FFRDCs conduct specialized research and development for the Federal Government. The two FFRDCs within the Department of Homeland Security provide independent analysis of homeland security issues. Currently, the Homeland Security Committee is expected to oversee these FFRDCs; yet the committee doesn't even receive an account of the status of ongoing or completed projects. It is hard to be a vigilant steward of hard-earned taxpayer dollars when you have a blindfold on.

My legislation will enable the committee to have visibility into the scope of FFRDC projects that the DHS has tasked them to meet their mission needs. This detailed accounting will allow committee members to have insight into current research and development projects and be able to further scrutinize them, thereby increasing oversight and transparency of the entire Science and Technology Directorate operation at DHS.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that Congress is aware of the Department of Homeland Security's research and development efforts and funding priorities to ensure that it is meeting the mission needs of its components, and this bill today will shed light on those activities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill. I think that we all agree that we can support increased transparency and a stronger, more secure homeland.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1637, the ''Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015,'' which your Committee ordered reported on May 20, 2015.

H.R. 1637 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will not seek a sequential referral. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1637, the ''Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support a request by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction.

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

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1637, the Federally Funded Research and Development Act of 2015, and.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to prepare annual status reports on the research activities of federally funded research and development centers, or FFRDCs, on behalf of the Department.

□ 1700

DHS looks to these institutions that are largely operated by universities and not-for-profit organizations to help meet special long-term research and development needs.

In addition to the two FFRDCs that DHS sponsors, there are 17 national labs managed by the Department of Energy that provide research and technical assistance in support of the Nation's homeland security.

Among the areas of research expertise offered by these labs are critical

infrastructure protection; cybersecurity; chemical, biological, and nuclear forensics; biodefense countermeasures; biodetection; and emergency preparedness.

I believe that timely and regular information about how DHS is utilizing these institutions is important to assessing progress on a wide range of homeland security challenges. That is why I support H.R. 1631 and urge passage.

I want to commend members of the Homeland Security Committee on the bipartisan nature in which this legislation has been crafted. It is important for us to know how DHS is using federally funded research and development centers to address homeland security challenges.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this strong, commonsense bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1637, the "Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015."

I support this bipartisan legislation which requires annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and development centers within the department of Homeland Security.

The bill requires that the secretary of Homeland Security annually submit to Congressional oversight committees a list of ongoing and completed projects lead by federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security have been assigned or completed.

Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) act as a vehicle for special research and development contracting within the federal government.

The FFRDCs provide DHS with independent and objective advice and quick response on critical issues throughout the Homeland Security Enterprise.

Homeland Security Systems Engineering and Development Institute (HSSEDI) and Homeland Security Studies and Analysis Institute (HSSAI) perform high-quality research and provide advice that is authoritative, objective and free from conflicts of interest caused by competition.

I support H.R. 1637, which provides much needed transparency on the research conducted by the Department of Homeland security.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in strong support of the suspension bill, H.R. 1637, the "Federally Funded Research and Development Sunshine Act of 2015."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1637.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND SECURITY UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS REVIEW ACT

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2390) to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2390

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 "Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act".

SEC. 2. REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.

(a) GAO STUDY OF UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study to assess the university-based centers for homeland security program authorized by section 308(b)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 188(b)(2)), and provide recommendations to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate for appropriate improvements.

(b) SUBJECT MATTERS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A review of the Department of Homeland Security's efforts to identify key areas of study needed to support the homeland security mission, and criteria that the Department utilized to determine those key areas for which the Department should maintain, establish, or eliminate university-based centers.

(2) A review of the method by which university-based centers, federally funded research and development centers, and Department of Energy national laboratories receive tasking from the Department of Homeland Security, including a review of how university-based research is identified, prioritized, and funded.

(3) A review of selection criteria for designating university-based centers and a weighting of such criteria.

(4) An examination of best practices from other agencies' efforts to organize and use university-based research to support their missions.

(5) A review of the Department of Homeland Security's criteria and metrics to measure demonstrable progress achieved by university-based centers in fulfilling Department taskings, and mechanisms for delivering and disseminating the research results of designated university-based centers within the Department and to other Federal, State, and local agencies.

(6) An examination of the means by which academic institutions that are not designated or associated with the designated university-based centers can optimally contribute to the research mission of the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security.

(7) An assessment of the interrelationship between the different university-based centers and the degree to which outreach and collaboration among a diverse array of academic institutions is encouraged by the Department of Homeland Security, particularly with historically Black colleges and universities and minority serving institutions.

(8) A review of any other essential elements of the programs determined in the conduct of the study.

(c) INFORMATION RELATING TO UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.—Subparagraph (D) of section 308(b)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 188(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(D) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Each such report shall—

"(i) indicate which center or centers have been designated pursuant to this section;

"(ii) describe how such designation or designations enhance homeland security;

"(iii) provide information on any decisions to revoke or modify such designation or designations;

"(iv) describe research that has been tasked and completed by each center that has been designated during the preceding year;

"(v) describe funding provided by the Secretary for each center under clause (iv) for that year; and

"(vi) describe plans for utilization of each center or centers in the forthcoming year.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in support of H.R. 2390, the Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act of 2015, authored by the ranking member, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will require the Government Accountability Office to initiate a study to assess the university-based centers for homeland security and provide recommendations to Congress on improvements.

The Department of Homeland Security Centers of Excellence play a vital role in providing long-term research and support of technology development in areas of emerging threats.

Additionally, these centers play key roles in supporting the Department of Homeland Security and its mission in protecting our homeland. I look forward to seeing the results of this study and how we can better improve the effectiveness of these university centers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 2390, the ''Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act,'' which your Committee reported on May 20, 2015.

H.R. 2390 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2390, the ''Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego further action on the bill.

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2390, the Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act.

I introduced H.R. 2390, the Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act, with my colleague Mr. RICHMOND, to provide Congress with the full picture of the Department's management of the Centers of Excellence program.

This program dates back to the Department's earliest days. It was authorized in the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to be ''a coordinated, university-based system to enhance the Nation's homeland security.'' Since that time, however, we have not had a comprehensive review of the Department's management of this vital research and development program.

H.R. 2390 marks the most significant effort to assess the Centers of Excellence program to date. The measure directs the Government Accountability Office to issue a comprehensive report that, among other things, evaluates how the Department aligns decisions about establishing, maintaining, or eliminating a center with its research needs; how DHS identifies, prioritizes, and funds projects; and how DHS measures progress on its research goals.

The bill also directs GAO to examine how DHS promotes collaboration among the centers, as well as with institutions outside of the network, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority-serving institutions.

I have the privilege of representing Jackson State University, which is part of the Department's Coastal Resilience Center of Excellence program. I am proud that in its capacity, Jackson State has contributed research and modeling that informed realtime operational decisions at the Coast Guard and FEMA in the wake of Hurricane Sandy and other disasters.

I know that throughout this country, there are other institutions that could benefit from and bring unique knowledge and expertise to DHS' ten standing Centers of Excellence.

Mr. Speaker, the Homeland Security Committee has been involved in vigorous oversight of the Centers of Excellence, particularly encouraging the Department to adopt policies that help diversify university and student participation in the homeland security enterprise.

In my opinion, the DHS Science and Technology Directorate's robust outreach effort to universities and institutions of recent years is that direct result of our oversight, but we need to understand whether S&T's outreach, along with its effort to better manage the Centers of Excellence, are really working.

H.R. 2390 is an important first step in effectively assessing the value of the Centers of Excellence and evaluating whether or not the research and development potential of our Nation's universities are being effectively leveraged.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am grateful for the cooperation of the subcommittee chairman, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and the full committee chairman, Mr. MCCAUL, for their help to improve the Department's Centers of Excellence; and I urge passage of this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their leadership on this bill.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a strong bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2390 ''Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act.''

I support this bipartisan legislation which requires an annual report be sent to Congress to assess the university-based centers for homeland security program and provide recommendations for appropriate improvements.

Mr. Speaker, the research that our designated institutions conduct is imperative to the current progress and future success of protecting our nation's greatest asset, the American people.

I join my colleagues in working to safeguard our investment by requiting annual reports that give detailed reviews of how our funding is being spent and more effective ways we can use the information yielded from these studies in a real world applicable way.

This bill requires a review of the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) efforts to identify key areas of study needed to support the homeland security mission, and criteria that the Department utilized to determine those key areas for which the Department should maintain, establish, or eliminate university-based centers.

DHS's mission is to ensure a homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards.

H.R. 2390 supports that mission by overseeing the funding of a university-based research program that invests in the homeland security, science and technology of the DHS.

It is imperative that we have oversight of how the funds are being used to meet DHS's university program criteria and this bill requires a review of how university-based research is identified, prioritized, and funded.

The Centers of Excellence (COE) network is an extended consortium of hundreds of universities conducting groundbreaking research to address homeland security challenges.

Sponsored by the Office of University Programs, the COEs work closely with the homeland security community to develop customer-driven, innovative tools and technologies to solve real-world challenges.

The Institute for Infectious Animal Diseases (IIAD) and Texas A&M Engineering Experiment Station, have used this program to develop a mobile Certificate of Veterinary Inspection (CVI) application to support veterinary practitioners submitting animal health certificate records from the field.

This real-time information sharing is an alternative to email or web-based systems, and helps improve communication between veterinarians and state animal health offices by supporting certificate submission from the field.

The Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act requires a review of the Department of Homeland Security's criteria and metrics to measure demonstrable progress achieved by university-based centers in fulfilling Department taskings, and mechanisms for delivering and disseminating the research results of designated university-based centers within the Department and to other Federal, State, and local agencies.

Mr. Speaker, because these funds are used to enrich our future generations of leaders and

it is important that the different university-based centers reach out and collaborate among a diverse array of academic institutions, particularly with historically Black colleges and universities (HBCU) and minority serving institutions.

I applaud Rankin Member THOMPSON for including specific language that reaches out to diverse universities, specifically often overshadowed historically Black colleges and universities.

HBCU such as Texas Southern University, in my Congressional district, is preparing technically savvy Homeland Security professionals for Maritime Transportation Security.

All educational institutions who meet criteria should be eligible to participate in the Department of Homeland Security's University Program.

This bill supports the program's mission needs of building a stable community of homeland security researchers and educators at U.S. colleges and universities.

Fostering a homeland security culture within the academic community through research and educational programs is a great partnership between government and our education institutions.

Strengthening U.S. scientific leadership in homeland security research and education giving our students a competitive ranking on a global level.

Generating and disseminating knowledge and technical advances to advance the homeland security mission helps to recruit future partners and participants.

Integrating homeland security activities across agencies engaged in relevant academic research will help partners work in concert to develop critical technologies and analyses to secure the nation's security interest.

The Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Centers of Excellence develop multidisciplinary, customer-driven, homeland security science and technology solutions and help train the next generation of homeland security experts.

The Homeland Security University-based Centers Review Act regulates the institutions designated with this distinguished honor of training the next generation of leaders in the scientific and technological fields.

Raising the visibility and status of the government sponsored programs creates an environment where each institution has to take responsibility for the use of their funds and prove those uses furthered the mission needs of DHS.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bipartisan bill and strongly urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2390.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2390, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CBRN INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2200) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2200

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 ''CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 210G. CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security shall—

''(1) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of terrorist actors, their claims, and their plans to conduct attacks involving chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials against the Nation;

''(2) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of global infectious disease, public health, food, agricultural, and veterinary issues;

''(3) support homeland security-focused risk analysis and risk assessments of the homeland security hazards described in paragraphs (1) and (2), including the transportation of chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological materials, by providing relevant quantitative and nonquantitative threat information;

''(4) leverage existing and emerging homeland security intelligence capabilities and structures to enhance prevention, protection, response, and recovery efforts with respect to a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack;

''(5) share information and provide tailored analytical support on these threats to State, local, and tribal authorities as well as other national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders and other Federal agencies, as appropriate; and

''(6) perform other responsibilities, as assigned by the Secretary.

''(b) COORDINATION.—Where appropriate, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis shall coordinate with other relevant Department components, including the National Biosurveillance Integration Center, others in the Intelligence Community, including the National Counter Proliferation Center, and other Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities, including officials from high-threat areas, State and major urban area fusion centers, and local public health departments, as appropriate, and enable such entities to provide recommendations on optimal information sharing mechanisms, including expeditious sharing of classified information, and on how they can provide information to the Department.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate having legislative jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or Senate, respectively, over the matter concerned.

''(2) The term 'Intelligence Community' has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

''(3) The term 'national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders' means officials from the Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities and individuals from the private sector who are involved in efforts to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from a biological attack or other phenomena that may have serious health consequences for the United States, including infectious disease outbreaks.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subtitle the following:

''Sec. 210G. Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing.''.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on—

(A) the intelligence and information sharing activities under subsection (a) and of all relevant entities within the Department of Homeland Security to counter the threat from attacks using chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials; and

(B) the Department's activities in accordance with relevant intelligence strategies.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The report shall include—

(A) a description of methods established to assess progress of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis in implementing the amendment made by subsection (a); and

(B) such assessment.

(3) TERMINATION.—This subsection shall have no force or effect after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ANALYZED BY THE DEPARTMENT TO STATE, LOCAL, TRIBAL, AND PRIVATE ENTITIES WITH RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 201(d)(8) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121(d)(8)) is amended by striking ''and to agencies of State'' and all that follows and inserting ''to State, local, tribal, and private entities with such responsibilities, and, as appropriate, to the public, in order to assist in preventing, deterring, or responding to acts of terrorism against the United States.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I rise today in support of H.R. 2200, the CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015.

We know that terrorists have long strived to employ chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear—or CBRN—materials in their attacks. ISIS and other terror organizations have attempted to use chemical weapons, and experts suggest that terrorist interest in utilizing chemical agents has increased. In fact, reports indicate that ISIS may be currently using chemical weapons in Syria and Iraq.

Since the procedures and equipment required to develop biological weapons are the same as those used for legitimate research purposes and are readily available, it is imperative that intelligence information related to bio threats is appropriately analyzed and shared with those who would be on the front lines of response in the event of a biological attack.

Furthermore, events such as the Boston Marathon bombing in 2013 illustrated the need for better information sharing between Federal and local officials.

H.R. 2200 will enhance intelligence analysis and information sharing to fill this need and will work to ensure that State and local officials get the actionable intelligence information necessary to stop or mitigate a CBRN attack.

This legislation considers information garnered from the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications hearings on the threat of chemical and biological terrorism. During two hearings earlier this year, we heard from numerous stakeholders that information sharing with appropriate State and local officials and emergency response providers about these threats is critical.

Specifically, this budget neutral bill requires the Office of Intelligence and Analysis at DHS to support homeland security focused intelligence analysis of CBRN threats, including emerging infectious diseases, working in coordination with the Department's National Biosurveillance Integration Center and the intelligence community.

As information and intelligence is only useful if it is shared with those who can take action, such as State, local, tribal, and private entities, H.R. 2200 directs the Office of Intelligence and Analysis to not only share information with these partners, but also engage with them and get their feedback on mechanisms for two-way sharing of information.

Finally, H.R. 2200 directs the Secretary of DHS to report annually for 5 years on the Department's intelligence and information sharing activities to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction and DHS's activities in accordance with relevant intelligence strategies.

The House passed nearly identical bills during the 112th and 113th Congresses with bipartisan support.

I urge Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2200, the CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act.

Mr. Speaker, in the years following the September 11 attacks, Congress worked to address many of the preparedness gaps identified by the 9/11 Commission, including the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction. Pursuant to the 9/11 Commission's recommendations, Congress established the Weapons of Mass Destruction, or WMD Commission.

In 2008, the WMD Commission issued a series of recommendations to counter the proliferation of WMDs and build a more robust national capability to respond to such attacks.

□ 1715

Subsequently, the WMD Commission and its legacy organization, the WMD Center, issued a series of report cards evaluating the Federal Government's progress in implementing the WMD Commission's recommendations. Unfortunately, each report card found that the Federal Government was not acting quickly enough.

In the years since the WMD Center issued its final bio-response report card in 2011, WMD threats have continued to evolve. What we know now is that the threats posed by WMDs are more dynamic and that our enemies are growing more agile. H.R. 2200 focuses on an important aspect of our Nation's ability to prevent, to prepare for, and to respond to a WMD attack—information sharing.

At the full committee and subcommittee levels, the Committee on Homeland Security has devoted significant time and resources to assessing Federal activities to address the threat of WMDs. I have heard one message consistently from the witnesses who have come before us: we need to improve coordination and information sharing with State and local governments and emergency responders. Situational awareness is essential to ensuring a robust response to a CBRN incident and to saving lives; and I appreciate Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications Subcommittee Chairwoman MCSALLY's efforts to improve CBRN threat-related intelligence and information sharing.

If we learned anything from the 9/11 attacks, it is that information sharing saves lives. From putting desperate pieces of information together, to stopping an attack, to ensuring that first responders are equipped to respond safely and effectively, information sharing plays an essential role in complete situational awareness. H.R. 2200 will improve the way we use information related to evolving threats posed by chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological agents. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2200.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation that will enhance the sharing of CBRN-related threat information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2200, the CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015.

I would like to begin by thanking my colleague, MARTHA MCSALLY, for her work on this important bill.

This bipartisan piece of legislation would direct the Department of Homeland Security to analyze terrorist intentions with respect to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear material, and share this information with state, local and federal entities.

The bill includes my amendment, which was accepted in Committee, to require DHS to assess the specific risks presented by transporting these materials, addressing a key concern in Western New York.

The Department of Energy plans to begin shipping highly-enriched uranium liquid from Canada to South Carolina next year. This material, which is far more radioactive than spent nuclear fuel, would be shipped in casks that have never been certified to carry highly-enriched uranium liquid.

The Department proposes to transport this waste across the Northern Border at the Peace Bridge, the second busiest crossing for cargo and the busiest crossing for passengers on the Northern Border.

The Peace Bridge crosses the Niagara River which connects two Great Lakes, the contamination of which could endanger the world's largest fresh water supply.

The nuclear casks would then proceed from the Peace Bridge through downtown Buffalo, a high-density urban area.

The Department of Energy approved this route nearly twenty years ago, and it reflects the pre-nine-eleven mindset on the threat and consequences of terrorism.

The legislation before us today would allow the Department of Energy to reconsider the wisdom of transporting dangerously radioactive material through high-risk areas like Buffalo.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, MARTHA MCSALLY, for her work and leadership on this issue and urge passage of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2200, the "CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015."

I support this bipartisan legislation which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to: (1) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of terrorist actors, their claims, and their plans to conduct attacks involving chemical, biological, radiological, and

nuclear materials against the nation and of global infectious disease, public health, food, agricultural, and veterinary issues; (2) support homeland security-focused risk analysis and risk assessments of such homeland security hazards by providing relevant quantitative and no quantitative threat information; (3) leverage homeland security intelligence capabilities and structures to enhance prevention, protection, response, and recovery efforts with respect to a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack; and (4) share information and provide tailored analytical support on these threats to state, local, and tribal authorities as well as other national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders.

I am pleased that H.R. 2200 incorporates an amendment by Congresswoman MCSALLY that directs the department to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security.

The Nation's chemical facilities represent a terrorist target that must be protected.

It is my hope that this bill will improve upon current legislation authorizing the Department of Homeland Security to regulate security practices at the Nation's chemical facilities.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we must equip ourselves to be able to detect attacks of a CBRN nature.

H.R. 2200 ensures a standardized communication platform for need to know industries dealing with such sensitive information.

There is no room for error when it comes to our nation's security.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting to pass, H.R. 2200, the "CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2015."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2200, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. 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 motion will be postponed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 615) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act'' or the ''DHS Interoperable Communications Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''Department'' means the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) the term ''interoperable communications'' has the meaning given that term in section 701(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3; and

(3) the term ''Under Secretary for Management'' means the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES IN RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT.

Section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including policies and directives to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'interoperable communications' has the meaning given that term in section 7303(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 194(g)).''.

SEC. 4. STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a strategy, which shall be updated as necessary, for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department, including for daily operations, planned events, and emergencies, with corresponding milestones, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of interoperability gaps in radio communications among the components of the Department, as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Information on efforts and activities, including current and planned policies, directives, and training, of the Department since November 1, 2012 to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department, and planned efforts and activities of the Department to achieve and maintain such interoperable communications.

(3) An assessment of obstacles and challenges to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department.

(4) Information on, and an assessment of, the adequacy of mechanisms available to the Under Secretary for Management to enforce and compel compliance with interoperable communications policies and directives of the Department.

(5) Guidance provided to the components of the Department to implement interoperable communications policies and directives of the Department.

(6) The total amount of funds expended by the Department since November 1, 2012 and projected future expenditures, to achieve interoperable communications, including on equipment, infrastructure, and maintenance.

(7) Dates upon which Department-wide interoperability is projected to be achieved for voice, data, and video communications, respectively, and interim milestones that correspond to the achievement of each such mode of communication.

(b) SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL.—Together with the strategy required under subsection (a), the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on—

(1) any intra-agency effort or task force that has been delegated certain responsibilities by the Under Secretary for Management relating to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department by the dates referred to in subsection (a)(7); and

(2) who, within each such component, is responsible for implementing policies and directives issued by the Under Secretary for Management to so achieve and maintain such interoperable communications.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 100 days after the date on which the strategy required under section 4(a) is submitted, and every 2 years thereafter for 6 years, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the status of efforts to implement the strategy required under section 4(a), including the following:

(1) Progress on each interim milestone referred to in section 4(a)(7) toward achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department.

(2) Information on any policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary for Management.

(3) An assessment of the level of compliance, adoption, and participation among the components of the Department with the policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary for Management to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components.

(4) Information on any additional resources or authorities needed by the Under Secretary for Management.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

Sections 4 and 5 shall only apply with respect to the interoperable communications capabilities within the Department and components of the Department to communicate within the Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I rise today in support of H.R. 615, the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act, of which I am proud

to be a cosponsor. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. PAYNE.

The bill amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to include, among the responsibilities of the Department of Homeland Security's Under Secretary for Management, achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the Department's components.

H.R. 615 addresses the findings and recommendations of a November 2012 DHS Office of Inspector General report, which stated that the Department does not have the appropriate oversight or governance structure to ensure communications interoperability among its components. It is vital that the Department's components are able to effectively communicate day to day and, most importantly, during emergencies.

In response to the findings of this inspector general's report, I joined Chairman MCCAUL and Oversight and Management Efficiency Subcommittee Chairman PERRY in requesting a review of this issue by the Government Accountability Office. Their report, which was released in March, found that nearly 3 years after the inspector general's report, communications problems persist in the Department and among its components. In particular, Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel reported to the GAO that the lack of interoperability in some cases along the border resulted in missed apprehensions and jeopardized agent safety.

My district is on the southwest border. I know the challenges our Border Patrol agents, CBP officers, and ICE agents face in meeting their vital missions. It is unacceptable that they lack the tools and training necessary to communicate with each other. This bill seeks to make this more of a priority at the headquarters level.

In order to ensure the Department is taking the necessary steps to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities, H.R. 615 requires the Department's Under Secretary for Management to submit an interoperable communications strategy to the Committee on Homeland Security no later than 180 days after enactment and to periodically report to Congress on efforts to implement this strategy.

This bill passed the House in February by a vote of 379–0. I appreciate the swift action of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee under the leadership of my friend, Chairman JOHNSON. Their thoughtful additions have served to further improve this bill. I urge all Members to join me in supporting it.

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

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

I rise in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 615, the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act.

In November 2012, the inspector general of the Department of Homeland Security issued an assessment of the interoperable communications capability among DHS components. The inspector general found that, of the 479 field radios that attempted to communicate on a specific common channel, only one user could do so. That is a 99 percent failure rate.

In short, DHS, which is the Federal entity charged with providing guidance to State and local governments to improve interoperable emergency communications, was not practicing what it preached. The inspector general found that DHS' interoperable challenges were not technological in nature. Rather, they were attributed to the fact that there was no one leading the effort to drive changes in the field. Further, there were no policies in place to ensure that the 123,000 radio users at DHS understood how to use the communications equipment issued to them.

Throughout my tenure on the Committee on Homeland Security, I have repeatedly sought opportunities to drive home the message that interoperable communications are critical to the Homeland Security mission at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Addressing this fundamental operational challenge is consistent with the DHS Unity of Effort initiative. So it would seem that the timing is right for real progress. However, late last month, we learned from the inspector general that, nearly 3 years after the issuance of the first report, DHS' components' inability to communicate effectively on the DHS common channel persists and that DHS has not completed the corrective actions necessary to resolve the problem. The inspector general's most recent findings confirm that it is going to take directing the Department in law to get this done. That is why I was happy to support Ranking Member Donald Payne, Jr., when he introduced this legislation.

H.R. 615 would put DHS components on the path to achieving interoperable communications by directing the Department's Under Secretary for Management to develop a strategy to achieve interoperability. The taxpayers have spent $430 million on interoperable communications capabilities at the Department so far. In this austere fiscal climate, we cannot afford to waste more money investing in communications capabilities when DHS lacks the policies that are sure to be effective.

With the help of full committee Chairman MCCAUL and subcommittee Chairwoman MCSALLY, the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act passed the House unanimously earlier this year. Subsequently, our Senate counterparts approved H.R. 615 by unanimous consent with some enhancements. I urge my colleagues to concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 615 and send this bill to the President's desk.

The inspector general's report identifying the urgent interoperable communications problem at DHS came out 3 years ago. A comprehensive solution is long overdue. Unfortunately, the Department has still not implemented appropriate corrective action. I commend subcommittee Ranking Member PAYNE for introducing this important legislation and for his efforts to get it enacted into law. I urge my colleagues to concur with the Senate amendment of H.R. 615.

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

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

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 615, which seeks to enhance interoperable communications at the Department of Homeland Security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 615.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 1190, and motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 805 and H.R. 2576.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board,

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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 154, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

YEAS—244

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—154

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—35

Aderholt
Brown (FL)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clyburn
Cook
Courtney
DeSantis
Engel
Fincher
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kelly (MS)
Kirkpatrick
Lofgren
Marchant
Marino
Meng
Napolitano
Payne
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Russell
Sanchez, Loretta
Titus
Vela
Wagner
Waters, Maxine
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)

□ 1856

Messrs. CLEAVER, HONDA, and CROWLEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. NEAL changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 376 I was delayed due to airline late departure. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 376 on H.R. 1190, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 376 I was delayed by a transportation difficulty. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 376, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF SHOOTING AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, in just a moment, I will request a moment of silence, but before I do, I stand here with other Members of the South Carolina delegation to say our colleague JIM CLYBURN, who right now is back home visiting with aggrieved families on the coast of South Carolina, and many of us, like Senator SCOTT and others, will be going back during this week to visit with those same families.

I am joined as well by members of the Congressional Black Caucus and Members of this body who have been deeply shaken by the events of this last week in Charleston, South Carolina.

I rise with this group on behalf of the nine families who have been impacted back home, on behalf of the people of the First District of South Carolina, and on behalf of the people of South Carolina who have shown a whole lot of heart and a whole lot of love here over the last week.

I say this because, less than a week ago, as we all know, a young man with incomprehensible malice came into the Mother Emanuel AME Church on Calhoun Street in Charleston, South Carolina, and did the unthinkable as he joined a Bible study and he gunned down nine of the members, the parishioners, there in the church.

Fortunately, our story doesn't end there because the family members of the victims also did the unthinkable. I say that because there, at the bond hearing, they did the unimaginable, the incomprehensible in, I guess, showing human grace is a reflection of God's grace and what is talked about in Romans in not repaying evil with evil, but repaying evil with good because, at the bond hearing, the first family comes up, and they say: ''I am in incomprehensible pain, but I forgive you.''

The next family comes up: ''I am in incredible pain, but I forgive you.'' Those were the words that were repeated by each of the nine families: ''I forgive you, I forgive you, and I forgive you.''

That set in motion and, if you will, set the stage this last week in Charleston for a level of community that I have never before seen in my life and amazing things done at the church and in the community at large.

It is for that reason that we all stand here to remember the names of the nine victims and to pause for a moment of silence here in just a moment.

If I might, let me read the names of the victims: Reverend Clementa Pinckney; Tywanza Sanders; Cynthia Hurd;

Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton; Myra Thompson; Ethel Lance; Reverend Daniel Simmons, Sr.; Reverend Depayne Middleton-Doctor; and Susie Jackson.

Would you all join me and join us in a moment of silence.

DOMAIN OPENNESS THROUGH CONTINUED OVERSIGHT MATTERS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 805) to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility over the Internet domain name system until the Comptroller General of the United States submits to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to such system, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 25, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—378

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

NAYS—25

Amash
Babin
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Byrne
Capuano
Duffy
Fleming
Gosar
Herrera Beutler
Jones
Labrador
Lummis
Massie
McClintock
Mulvaney
Poe (TX)
Posey
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Salmon
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Stutzman

NOT VOTING—30

Brown (FL)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clyburn
Cook
Courtney
DeSantis
Engel
Fincher
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kelly (MS)
Kirkpatrick
Lofgren
Marchant
Marino
Meng
Napolitano
Payne
Roybal-Allard
Russell
Sanchez, Loretta
Titus
Vela
Wagner
Waters, Maxine
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1909

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSCA MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HURD of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2576) to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 1, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—398

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison

Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

NAYS—1

McClintock

NOT VOTING—34

Brown (FL)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clyburn
Cook
Courtney
DeSantis
Engel
Fincher
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hudson
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Kelly (MS)
Kirkpatrick
Lofgren
Marchant
Marino
Meng
Napolitano
Payne
Roybal-Allard
Russell
Sanchez, Loretta
Titus
Vela
Wagner
Waters, Maxine
Westmoreland
Zinke

□ 1916

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Mr. AMASH changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes on Tuesday, June 23, 2015. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 376, "yea" on rollcall vote 377, and "yea" on rollcall vote 378.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2822, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2042, RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 26, 2015, THROUGH JULY 6, 2015

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–177) on the resolution (H. Res. 333) providing for consideration of the bill (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; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2042) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability; and providing for proceedings during the period from June 26, 2015, through July 6, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZING OUR MILITARY FAMILIES

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, behind every man and woman in uniform serving our country are family members: husbands, wives, mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, sons, daughters, and other family members who make sacrifices as members of military families.

Recently, I attended the dedication of a new Minnesota military family tribute that is now part of the Capitol Mall area in St. Paul at our State Capitol. It was built entirely with private donations. It commemorates the military Gold Star families, Blue Star families, and families of our veterans. This memorial is the first of its kind in the country, and it recognizes the military family members that do so much to support our servicemen and -women and our veterans.

Being a member of a military family comes with many sacrifices. It means many sleepless nights during deployment. It means unexpected moves around the country and serving as the frontline resource when our soldiers transition into a new life. Every military family does this proudly.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Bill and Teri Popp and everyone who has worked so hard to make this tribute recognizing our military families possible.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank before its charter expires on June 30.

In fiscal year 2014 alone, the Ex-Im Bank supported $27.4 billion worth of U.S. exports, with $10.7 billion of that total representing exports from small businesses. Additionally, 90 percent of all Ex-Im transactions directly supported small business and more than 163,000 American jobs. That is why 180 Democrats signed a discharge petition to force a vote on this important issue.

Despite this data, some Republicans wrongly think the Ex-Im Bank represents crony capitalism that should be ended. For those Members, I will leave you with this: Men lie, women lie, but numbers don't lie. Reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

NATURAL GAS VEHICLES SHOULDN'T BE PENALIZED IN THE TAX CODE

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance

of a simple modification to our Tax Code that will greatly support the consumer-driven growth of natural gas in the transportation sector.

Today's abundant and domestically produced natural gas is an increasingly important fuel to our transportation sector, from small passenger vehicles in my home State of Indiana, to container ships that transport goods from America's heartland to overseas markets.

Now, our Tax Code is still taxing cars and trucks that run on natural gas at a higher rate than their diesel equivalent because the tax was instituted years ago when our energy picture looked vastly different. We need to correct this disparity. It is a simple fix and just one example of how Congress can create a more level playing field while diversifying our energy mix.

I urge my colleagues to work with me on this matter.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, last week Pope Francis echoed the chorus of 97 percent of climate scientists whose findings prove that climate change is real and is manmade, and climate change has the potential to destroy the only planet that we have. Let me say that again. Climate change is real, it is manmade, and it can reverse all the progress we have made as a nation.

Pope Francis frames the reality of climate change in a way that we must consider if we are to protect our environment as directed by our Creator for future generations, future economic development, and future progress. The leader of the Catholic Church accurately points out that it is a moral imperative to act on climate change; it is a moral imperative to act as a good steward of the environment and the gifts we have been given.

I thank Pope Francis, and I hope the words he shared last week will ring true with all of us, including those who continue to deny climate change, both in this body and around the world. I hope the Pope's encyclical will encourage deniers to work with us to find creative ways to clean up our environment, help create jobs, and make our world just a little bit better for our kids and grandkids.

RELIGIOUS CLEANSING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Roman Empire was notorious in its massacre of Christians 2,000 years ago. Now Christians are once again facing deadly persecution. Barbaric terrorist groups like ISIS are stalking and attacking Christians wherever they find them. Christians are disappearing, and some are fleeing countries like Syria and Iraq, home to Christians since the days of early Christianity.

ISIS boasts of brutally killing and enslaving thousands of Christians. There are more and more reports of ISIS sex-trafficking young girls that are stolen away from their Christian parents. ISIS even posts videos online of their barbaric beheading of Christians.

Why the hate, kidnapping, and murder? Because Christians will not renounce their Christian faith. The world, and the United States in particular, needs to denounce the murder of people based on their religious beliefs, whether Christians, Jews, or Muslims.

We cannot accept nor tolerate ISIS' genocide of Christians. Justice demands ISIS be held accountable for their crimes of religious cleansing.

And that is just the way it is.

JUNE IS NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

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

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on the House floor today may not know that June is National Dairy Month. As a dairy farmer myself, I believe this month is a perfect opportunity to recognize how important the dairy industry is to the Central Valley.

Not only are there dairy farms in all 50 States, but dairy is the number one agriculture business in 10 States, including Idaho, New York, and Wisconsin. However, my home State of California is the biggest dairy producer in the country and is responsible for 21.3 percent of the U.S. milk supply. My own district, California 21, produces the most dairy of any congressional district in the Nation.

However, dairy isn't just important to farmers. Not only do Americans consume at least two cups of dairy products each and every day, but America's dairy industry is important to our Nation's agriculture market and our entire economy.

Dairy farms across the country improve our national economy. The U.S. dairy industry creates an estimated $140 billion in economic output, $29 billion in household earnings, and is responsible for creating more than 900,000 jobs.

So this summer when you stop for ice cream on a hot night or a bowl of cereal on a rushed morning, remember the hard-working Americans who brought dairy to your grocery store.

□ 1930

CONGRATULATING INGERSOLL RAND

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last month, Ingersoll Rand, a global leader in products that enhance energy efficiency, productivity, and operations for its customers, celebrated the 50th anniversary of its Mocksville, North Carolina, plant.

Opened in 1965, the Mocksville plant began machining rotary components for air compressors. Throughout the years, the workers in Mocksville have manufactured assemblies and components for a number of products within Ingersoll Rand's portfolio.

Within the last 6 years, the plant has experienced tremendous growth as select assembly operations for Trane and Thermo King equipment were moved to the plant. During difficult economic times, these jobs have strengthened the local economy.

The company's major investment in Davie County is a tribute to the area's skilled workforce, men and women who are dedicated to producing the best products in the world.

Congratulations to everyone at Ingersoll Rand in Mocksville as you celebrate this significant milestone.

CONFEDERATE FLAG

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley's call to remove the Confederate battle flag from the South Carolina statehouse grounds, and North Carolina Governor Pat McCrory's call to discontinue State-issued Confederate flag license plates.

As one who grew up in the South, Mr. Speaker, and a proud North Carolinian, I fully understand that to many the Confederate flag represents history and heritage of their forefathers who fought for self-governance of the States. However, I cannot ignore that this same flag has also been used as a symbol of hate, and therefore causes immense pain for many of our citizens—yes, our brothers and sisters.

In Romans, chapter 14, the Apostle Paul writes, ''Let us therefore make every effort to do what leads to peace and to mutual edification. Do not destroy the work of God for the sake of food''—or, might I add, a flag.

Let us be proud of our heritage, and let us give our descendants reason to be proud of our proper and thoughtful works today.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to celebrate the life of Michael James Sullivan and offer my condolences to his friends and family.

Michael passed away on June 14, 2015, after an 11-year battle against ALS, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

When Michael was diagnosed with ALS in 2004, he was determined not to let the disease control his life. He found hope in his family, friends, and faith. This hope encouraged him to become an advocate for the 30,000 other Americans who live with ALS.

Mike encouraged others and their families to be strong and resilient in the face of illness. His upbeat and optimistic personality was a constant reminder to take advantage of every opportunity that life hands us. He was a frequent visitor to my office. He was a tireless self-advocate who remained upbeat, compassionate, and personable—even in the face of a horribly debilitating disease.

Mr. Speaker, we can all learn from Michael Sullivan's exemplary service, selflessness, and love. He will be greatly missed. His friends and family are blessed to have known such an honorable man. In the words of Michael: ''One day together, we can create a world without ALS.''

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

(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 am pleased that the House showed leadership tonight in passing H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015.

The IPAB board was going to be very problematic for seniors, and H.R. 1190 is going to be a very important tool in correcting the wrongs of the Affordable Care Act and preserving access to health care. It would indeed have had an unelected board making Medicare spending decisions which, again, would be shifting power to Washington, D.C., and away from that all-important doctor-patient relationship, where it really should be.

We want to talk about savings in the medical field—and we need to—because not nearly enough is done, whether it was in the Affordable Care Act or other conversations around D.C. We need to talk about and work on actually achieving cost cutting, reduction of unnecessary costs delivering health care, litigation, and the time it takes to bring miracle pharmaceuticals to markets.

These are the kinds of things that we need to be doing to make health care more affordable and, indeed, more accessible.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure it is going to be that controversial, but I was just looking outside the Capitol before I came in to make this presentation, and it is raining. It is a downpour. For those of us from California, it has been a long time since we have seen a downpour.

The Golden State, the seventh largest economy in the world and home to over 35 million people, is in the throes of a historic drought. This is the fourth year, and it is a world of hurt in California.

The economy is moving along. We are not complaining about the economy. Many parts of it are moving along. But for everyone in the State of California, whether you are in the far north up near Mount Shasta or way down here in the San Diego area, we are hurting.

There is a lot of talk. Water restrictions are taking place in every city, whether you are on the coast, up in the north, or in the far south at Laguna Beach. Wherever you happen to be in the State of California, these restrictions are tightening up on the ability of communities to prosper, grow, and keep their lawns green, but more important in some communities, to even live there.

In some parts of the Central Valley, down here in the Fresno area, there are communities that are out of water. Communities of 3,000, 5,000, maybe even 10,000 people, have virtually no water at all.

This is a problem today. As we look to the future, we are going to see the State's economy and population grow and the demand for water will ever increase, unless we do something. What we must do is develop a water plan for all of California.

Unfortunately, what we do most of the time in California is fight over water. There is the famous saying from Mark Twain: ''Whiskey is for drinking. Water is for fighting over.''

And so it has been ever since my great-great-grandfather came to California in the early days of the Gold Rush up here in the mother lode region. You couldn't mine without water. And fighting over that water was the order of the day, and it is today.

So as this entire State and much of the Southwest region—Nevada, southern Oregon, Utah, New Mexico, and even the western parts of Texas—suffer through this historic drought, we have taken to fighting in California. And I want to spend a few moments this evening talking about what we must do immediately and then a long-term solution for the State of California.

Immediate, we are going to have to seek help. The State of California is using some bond money from past bond acts and some bond money from the historic passage of Proposition 1 last November to immediately try to fix problems that exist in those communities without water. And so that money will begin to flow to those communities, wherever they happen to be.

There are a couple up here in the Sacramento Valley and further down in the San Joaquin Valley. The deserts have always been without water, so this is not new to them, although it is more extreme.

It is good that the bond act can provide immediate relief, but the rest of the short-term solutions will come from Washington. I want to congratulate and thank the administration for providing $110 million of money for a variety of projects. Some of those projects are to dig deeper wells for those communities without water, to find ways to improve the conservation immediately, and to set about other programs that are short-term in nature—all to the good. And that should continue.

In the days ahead, we are going to take up the appropriations bill for water. In that appropriations bill, we should direct the administration to do what it is doing—and to continue doing it through this drought—and that is to focus all of those resources on the immediate drought that is occurring.

Whether it is aid for ranchers and farmers or cities, it makes no difference. It is broad and it needs to be done, and it should line up with Proposition 1 of the last November ballot. That is both short-term and long-term. So the Federal Government supports those projects that would be funded under that $7 billion bond act that the citizens of California voted for in an overwhelming majority.

But I would also like to talk about the long-term here. Because droughts will come and go, and we must be prepared not only in California, but across the West.

For many years, the Department of Water Resources in California has looked at the problem and has made many, many suggestions; but until about 4 years ago, those suggestions were never put together in a comprehensive plan.

I am familiar with this. I am a water warrior in California. I have represented this part of California for nearly 40 years, the great Central Valley of California. I will put up another map so you can get a better look at it.

So the plans that were put together by the California Department of Water Resources deal with the Sacramento River, which flows south, and the San Joaquin River, which flows north from the Fresno area. This is way beyond Sacramento. Mount Shasta and Oregon, it is way up there.

These are the two great rivers of California, together with the Colorado, which is way to the south. It flows into an area here which is called the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. This is the

largest estuary of the Western Hemisphere, which is on the West Coast. From Alaska to Chile, there is no other estuary as important to fish and species of all kinds and to the environment and the economy of California.

As this water flows down the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, it is collected here and pumped south into the San Joaquin Valley and over the Tehachapi Mountains way down here to southern California. That is the Great Southern water project and the Federal water project.

But the result of that pumping is an extreme decline in the environment of the delta, Suisun Bay, and San Francisco Bay. Along with it, the salmon and other species have been largely decimated by those projects.

So what are we to do? We will take the information that has been developed over these many years by the California Department of Water Resources and develop a comprehensive plan.

One plan, which actually dates back some 60 years now, is one that would take the water around the delta and deliver it to the pumps down here at Tracy. That plan, first proposed in the forties and then in the fifties, was taken up by our current Governor, Governor Jerry Brown, in the late 1970s and early 1980s. It was called the Peripheral Canal—peripheral, that is around the delta, delivering water to the pumps.

I represented the delta at that time, and I said: Governor, what you have managed to create here is the great vampire ditch.

The Peripheral Canal was big enough to take the water from the Sacramento, depriving the delta of the freshwater that it needed for its environment, and deliver it to the pumps.

So we had another great water war. It actually went on the ballot, and the people of California decided not to build that canal. And so there it sat until the second iteration of our current Governor, and he decided it was time to address this problem.

And so now his suggestion is, instead of a canal, bury it underground so nobody can see it. He said: Don't worry about the canal. Don't worry. You will never see it.

I said: Because it is not going to get built?

He said: No, no. Because it will be underground.

Two massive tunnels, each 40 feet in diameter—about as tall as this Chamber, actually, if we consider this is probably 50 feet in here—big enough to take all of the water out of the Sacramento River half of the year, creating an existential threat to the delta.

Something needs to be done, no doubt about it. So by cobbling together the plans that were developed by the Department of Water Resources and others, I put together what I called, a Water Plan for All California.

By the way, this tunnel was first priced at $25 billion and did not create 1 gallon of new water—not 1 gallon of new water.

□ 1945

What it did was to create an existential threat to the delta, in that it was big enough to deprive the delta of the fresh water half of the year. I said: Governor, that doesn't work. Let's look at this in a serious way that can create water for California's future.

This proposal was put together from plans that the State agencies had developed in the past. I commend this to anybody that really wants to look at what California's water future could be. Instead of a battle royal, which we are now commenced with as we fight over these tunnels, and $25 billion—oh, by the way, there is a new iteration of it, and they are throwing aside most of the habitat restoration and most of the environmental restoration and just going for the straight tunnels and just a little bit of mitigation.

Let's do something different. Let's create water that California will need in its future. Let's build a system that will actually deliver more water for California, while protecting the environment, and that is what this plan is all about, a water plan for all California.

There are the following elements in it: conservation; recycling; storage; fixing the delta, which actually has to be fixed; letting science run the process rather than politics; and make sure you protect the water rights that have been in existence for more than a decade and a half—excuse me—a century and a half.

These are the principal elements, and we are going to go through them one at a time and explain why, if we were to spend, let's say, the full $17 billion, the current cost of the tunnels, and that is the first bid; that is not the final cost. Let's say we would spend that $17 billion.

Let's allocate some of it for conservation, agricultural conservation. Now, every agriculturalist—and I am one—in California will say, Yes, but we are already conserving water. Indeed, we are, and a lot of water conservation has taken place, but that much more can be done again.

There are somewhere, by the estimates of the State, 3 to 4 million acre feet of new water, available simply through conservation, and that does not include the urban conservation.

Now, understand, in today's drought, conservation is on everybody's mind, and in fact, it is mandated by law and executive order, but we can do maybe 3 million acre feet of new water. That is enough for over 120,000 homes a year per million acre feet.

Secondly, recycling—I often say, and I think this is more or less accurate, that the fifth largest river on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere are the sanitation plants in Southern California.

Whoa, what do you mean the fifth biggest river? Well, consider this: the Colorado River, over here, abutting Arizona and Nevada, water is taken from the Colorado River, 200 miles into the Los Angeles Basin.

Water is taken from northern California, the Sacramento River, in a canal, pumps here at the delta, in a canal, 5,000 feet over the Tehachapi Mountains, into the Los Angeles Basin. That water is cleaned once. It is used in the Los Angeles Basin, cleaned again, in most cases, to a higher standard than the day it arrives in southern California; and nearly all of it is dumped into the ocean.

What? You do that in California? Well, we do. Fortunately, Orange County, a bastion of conservatism, is far ahead of the rest of the State and probably the Nation in water recycling. We need to do more of it.

For a few million, a couple of million dollars—excuse me, a couple of billion dollars, we could recycle at least a million acre feet of new water in southern California, water that is already there, water that is not being used.

In northern California, the San Francisco Bay area, for my friends in San Francisco, you are taking what you tell the world is the cleanest water in America, right out of Yosemite National Park, piping it across the Central Valley into the San Francisco area, clean it—well, you really don't have to do much cleaning because it is already clean—use it once, then you pipe it a mile offshore and dump it in the ocean.

Recycling is necessary in every part of California. Another million, perhaps, more acre feet of water could be available through recycling.

So conservation, recycling, 3, 4 million acre feet—we are getting close to what California needs in the future.

So where are you going to put the water? Even in the midst of a drought, we have had heavy rain flows—no place to put the water.

My colleague from northern California, the Sacramento Valley, Mr. LAMALFA and I have introduced a bill to build an off-stream storage reservoir here on the west side of the Sacramento Valley, a reservoir that could hold 2 million acre feet of water—well, slightly less—and that water would be available when needed.

It could flow down the Sacramento River, sweetening, pushing back the saltwater in the delta; or it could be used for agricultural purposes in the Sacramento Valley or down in the San Joaquin Valley.

It also gives flexibilities to the great reservoirs of Shasta, the Oroville Reservoir on the Feather River, and the Folsom Reservoir here on the Sacramento River, giving flexibility to the water managers.

When it is needed for salmon and other species, you could use the water out of Sites Reservoir. When it is needed for agriculture or for water quality in the delta, you could use it out of Sites Reservoir, keeping the cold water in Shasta, Oroville, or Folsom that is

necessary for the salmon that spawn in those rivers.

Storage, off-stream storage, off-stream storage here, just east of Contra Costa, in Los Vaqueros Reservoir, off-stream storage further south down here in Los Banos at the San Luis Reservoir, and the biggest off-stream reservoir of all, the great aquifer of the Sacramento, San Joaquin Valley, the great Central Valley of California, arguably, the second or third largest aquifer anywhere in the world, one that is now seriously overdrafted, as Californians, agriculture, cities, and others thirst for the water in this drought.

These storage reservoirs in northern California are just one part of the storage systems that are needed for the future. The other part actually exists here in southern California, out here along the coast, the West Basin, the San Fernando Valley, the San Gabriel Valley, the Santa Ana in Orange County, and as you move east into Riverside and San Bernardino.

These are all historic aquifers that could be available to take that recycled water, put it back in the ground, pull it out, clean it, and recycle and recycle and eventually, these aquifers, many of which are contaminated, would be clean and available for the future.

We could probably add all of the capacity of these aquifers in southern California and have greater storage capacity than the largest reservoir in the State of California, which is Shasta Reservoir, way up here in northern California.

By using the aquifers as a storage facility in what we call conjunctive water management, when you have a lot of rain, you store it—store it off-stream, store it below ground in the aquifers. Then when you have your dry periods, as California historically does, you can take that water out, but you cannot take out as much as currently being taken from these aquifers in California.

We are seeing the collapse of the aquifers in the San Joaquin Valley. We are seeing the land subsiding in some places, as much as a foot a year as the water is extracted, so we have to stop that, and so water management becomes extremely important in the process.

I want to now turn to the delta, put this delta map back up and remind us, the Sacramento River coming down, the San Joaquin River coming north. From the north, the Sacramento, from the south, the San Joaquin, meeting here in the great delta of California—this delta is seriously at risk, as I said a moment ago.

What to do about this? The Governor's plan, to take water around it, to deliver it to the pumps down here, I think, creates an existential threat. Don't build something that could destroy the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

Instead, build something that is the right size, recognizing that while the delta is imperiled, perhaps by earthquakes, perhaps by sea level rise, nonetheless, all the plants call for water to be pumped out of the delta, even if it is taken around the delta.

The first thing to do, right now, is to armor, strengthen those key levees in the delta that are necessary for the transfer of water to the pumps, for the protection of the cities here on the eastern side, and to make sure that you are able to always be able to take that water through the delta. It is called the armored delta.

Under the Governor's plan or my plan or any other plan, those levees are going to be used for at least the next two decades, if not for a much longer period of time. Improve the delta, levees, and that is a job for the Federal Government.

I talked earlier about what could be done immediately by the Federal Government, and that is to secure some of these key delta channels by improving the levees on those channels. That is step one.

Step two is what I call science. This area, the richest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere, home and nursery to salmon, to other species, such as the delta smelt and many other species, requires very careful attention and very careful scientific study.

We are talking over here, in a place called Rio Vista, about building a science center, bringing together all the State and Federal agencies so they can work in a collaborative science program. That is a great program called the Rivers Program. There are other science studies that are underway.

You have to let science drive this process. You cannot allow politics to drive it; otherwise, you put at risk the communities in this area; you put at risk the environment; you put at risk the fish species, and you put at risk the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

Keep in mind that the Congress of the United States, twice in the last 4 years, has passed legislation that removes the environmental protections for this estuarine system and simply grabs 800,000 acre feet of water that was meant for the environment and sends it into the southern valley, into the southern valley here.

It is a rip-off. It is part of what has taken place in California since the gold miners came in the 1850s, and that is, if you want water, you simply take it from somebody. In this case, you are taking it from the delta, from the environment, from the agriculture; and you are pushing aside the environmental protections. Don't do it. It is not necessary.

There is another thing, in addition to fixing the levees, and I call it the ''Little Sip, Big Gulp.'' Here it is. This is a map of the delta of California. Sacramento is up here, the confluence of the American River and the Sacramento River. That is the State capital. This is the delta here.

We were talking about it in the larger map. San Francisco Bay is over here, Suisun Bay and the rest. This is the heart of the delta. Stockton is down here. Tracy and the big massive pumps at Tracy, capable of taking well over 15,000 cubic feet per second, are down here in this area.

The tunnels that the Governor wants to build would start here, travel through some of the richest agricultural land in the delta, or in the Nation, agricultural land that has been in production since the 1850s and 1860s, along the Sacramento River, displacing, oh, maybe 4 or 5 miles of habitat and agriculture and communities along this area. The tunnel would come down into this—the tunnels would come down into this area.

$17 billion—why would you do something that, first of all, is large enough to allow for the destruction of the delta? Why would you spend all that money, when a good portion of that project is already built? This is it.

This is the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, an ocean, a channel that begins at San Francisco Bay, comes up the Sacramento River, and then, in a channel that was built by the Army Corps of Engineers, all the way up to the Port of Sacramento here in West Sacramento, on the other side of the State capital.

This is a deep water shipping channel. Ocean ships come into San Francisco Bay and come all the way up here. It is a pretty good economic activity. Agricultural products are shipped out.

I was over that way this last weekend, and they have log decks. I guess these are logs from the various fires that have occurred in California, and those are going to be shipped off to China. I sometimes wonder why we don't use those logs for the things that we should be making in America, but that is another subject for another day.

So what is an alternative? I call this the little sip solution, ''Little Sip, Big Gulp solution.'' Take the water out of the Sacramento River here, 3,000—not 15,000—3,000 cubic feet per second. We know how to do that. Fish screens are already built to do that.

□ 2000

Let it flow down the Deep Water Channel to about here, just north of Rio Vista. Put in a single ship lock and a pump.

Alternative one: put it in a small pipe through the delta down here to this area; and then, in an open channel along what is called Old River, take it down to the pumps at Tracy, 3,000 cubic feet per second.

You could do that most every day of the year, and it could deliver 2 million acre-feet of water to the pumps at Tracy in most years. In this drought year, it wouldn't be possible.

A second alternative would be to take it down the Deep Water Channel, 3,000 cubic feet, to the shipping lock and the pump, put it into a canal that

goes behind Rio Vista here, crosses Sherman Island at the confluence of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin Rivers, and over to Contra Costa County to the pumps.

This is a very interesting solution because this solution creates a fail-safe solution for about 7 million people that live in the San Francisco Bay area, because this particular route intersects six aqueducts: the Solano aqueduct here, this would intersect it down here in Contra Costa; East Bay Municipal Utility aqueduct; the Contra Costa County aqueduct; the Los Vaqueros aqueduct for the Los Vaqueros river; zone seven, down here in the Livermore area, over here in this area; and also the South Bay aqueduct, going all the way down to Silicon Valley.

What has happened, if this solution were chosen, should the need ever arise for some reason, these critical water districts that supply the water to this entire Bay area could get access to the Sacramento River water. So if, for some reason, the delta was to become saline as a result of a collapse of a levee system or any other reason, we have a fail-safe solution for the entire Bay region, except Marin County, which has its own water system.

Either of these is a system that would be right-sized. That is a Little Sip big enough to provide 2 million acre-feet of water, which is roughly 40, 45 percent of the amount of water needed south of the delta for southern California, for Los Angeles, and for the San Joaquin Valley.

That is the Little Sip solution: a route through the delta, a pipeline from here to Old River, and then an open channel on the east side of Old River to the pumps, or a canal across Contra Costa and Solano County. Either of them would work. And it would be a fraction of the cost of the massive twin tunnels that would come this direction, destroying the agricultural communities here in Portland and Clarksburg and putting at risk the entire delta because of the enormous size.

This is a 15,000-cubic-foot-per-second tunnel system. Now, granted, they are only going to build three of the intakes here on the Sacramento River. Okay. It is good to have only three. That gives you 9,000, which is roughly two-thirds of the water going down the Sacramento River half of the year.

So what does that mean for the delta? It means the delta is going to be salty and deprived of the freshwater that this estuary needs. And all they need to do is to put in one more intake, and then they can take all of the water half of the year.

Don't do it. Never build something that could be so destructive of such a precious natural resource as the delta.

So this is the Little Sip.

Where does the rest of the water come? It is called the Big Gulp. Even in this drought year, there have been two very heavy rains that have sent a surge of water down the San Joaquin and down the Sacramento. The pumps were turned on—not to their full might, but the pumps were turned on, and the water was shipped to the south.

Okay. It worked. Can it work in the future in normal years?

There is sufficient water in the delta in a normal year to get another 2, 2.5 million acre-feet of water out of the delta, itself, and that is the Big Gulp. So you combine a small facility with a Big Gulp when the water is available in the delta.

Now, keep in mind, this project and the twin tunnel project that the Governor is proposing both require storage south of the delta. Neither project will work. And, in fact, the California water system today will not work without storage south of the delta.

That is why—to back up to a map of all California—we have to have storage offsite, at Sites Reservoir. There is talk of enlarging Shasta Reservoir, way up here in this area. There is talk of building a new reservoir here on the San Joaquin River at Hanford's flat. There is talk of enlarging—in fact, this one is almost certain to happen—enlarging Los Vaqueros Reservoir. The San Luis Reservoir down here needs to be rebuilt because of earthquake safety, and it could be expanded.

There is another reservoir site just south of it, Los Banos Grande. That is another large reservoir. And, of course, the aquifers in the entire Central Valley of California, and we have already talked about the aquifers in southern California.

So you have to have storage south of the delta. If you have storage south of the delta, then the Governor's plan or my plan, the Little Sip, Big Gulp plan will work. Storage is absolutely essential in all of these configurations. Fail to do the storage, and nothing is going to work.

Let me just review what we have been talking about here. We have been talking about a water plant for all California.

Conservation, to be sure, the great agricultural areas—even over here in the Salinas Valley—conservation along this entire area, conservation in southern California, the great metropolitan areas, and in the Bay area. In doing so, the State's own estimate was 5 million. Let's just say you get 3 million acre-feet. Agricultural conservation, urban conservation, 3 million acre-feet of new water, water that is currently unavailable but there.

Recycling, we talked about recycling here in southern California. A $2 to $3 billion investment will give you 1 million acre-feet of water, and you already have the storage systems in place, the underground aquifers of southern California. Similarly, recycling in the Bay area.

Sacramento, right here, starting just a month ago, a new recycling program, a $2 billion recycling program in Sacramento to recycle water—some for that area, the rest to put clean water down the river rather than some of the water, which is a little shady.

So recycling, another million acre-feet at least, maybe more, as you bring on the recycling in the Bay area.

Now we have got 3 to 4 million acre-feet of water.

Storage systems, it is estimated that the Sites Reservoir can add in this drought here, were it available, would have been 900,000 acre-feet of water in this drought year. Of course it is not built; it is not available. But on average, it should provide some 500,000—400,000 to 600,000 acre-feet of water annually out of Sites Reservoir; plus, as I described earlier, the ability to reoperate the great reservoirs and, together, be able to perhaps get even more water as a result of Sites Reservoir. The other reservoirs can provide additional water also.

So we ought to be able, through these processes, to get somewhere near 5 million acre-feet of new water for California. If we have conservation, if we have the storage and we are able to get through the current drought, it is a safe bet that 5 million acre-feet of annual water yield will carry California into the next 30 to 50 years and beyond that, depending on population growth and technologies.

I had not mentioned the use of this water out here. Well, that is the Pacific Ocean. Desalinization and recycling use exactly the same technology. Recycling happens to be cheaper, in that it takes less energy to clean recycled water than to clean the ocean water because the ocean water has a lot of salts and other things in it, and it is just more expensive. But clearly, desalinization is also in our future.

Down here, in the San Diego area, a new recycling plant is going online this year. They have been talking about one in Santa Barbara that actually was built but then mothballed because it rained again. But that one in Santa Barbara is likely to go back online as a result of the current drought and in anticipation of future droughts.

So desalinization is also in California's future.

Those are the basic elements: conservation; recycling; creation of new storage systems; fixing the delta, the levees; Little Sip, Big Gulp strategy; science-driven process.

Keep in mind, you have got to be right on the science; otherwise, you are going to destroy this extraordinarily valuable habitat of the delta and other places.

Finally, you had better be paying attention to the water rights and the laws of California, which, unfortunately, in the first iteration of the bill that passed Congress 4 years ago, just blew aside California water rights. So if you want to start a big, big water war, if you want to heighten and enflame a water war in California, push aside the water rights which, incidentally, is now taking place as a result of the drought.

That is a Water Plan for All of California. It is here. It is available. My Web site has it. I recommend it to anybody that is interested in a solution for

California's long-term water problems; and also, I recommend to people that we have the Federal Government in the short term align its water policy programs from the EPA—the Environmental Protection Agency—the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Army Corps of Engineers, that those water programs in the short term be aligned with the State of California's bond act so that we can promote, augment, and advance the projects that would be undertaken in the $7 billion water bond that the California voters passed last November.

My plea to those who think the tunnels are the solution is: stop, take another look. Take another look at the Little Sip, Big Gulp solution. This actually was something that was first proposed by the Natural Resources Defense Council. We were working with this about 5 years ago. They came up with the Little Sip, Big Gulp name, and with some modification, it is now a proposal that would cost a fraction of what the twin, massive, 40-foot-in-diameter tunnels would cost.

So, for California, there is a future. It is the Golden State. It is an economy unmatched by any other in the United States. It is an economy particularly—well, actually, the entire State's economy is stressed as a result of the drought. And if we take the kind of steps that I have been talking about here, we will be able to provide the water that California needs in the next drought and in the years to come as the population grows and as the economy grows.

So that is the water plan for all California. There are many other pieces of the puzzle, one of which I am going to take just a second to talk about. And that is this week, as we take up the appropriations for water programs in the State of California—actually, water plans for the United States, not just the State of California—we ought to be mindful of a project called the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a program that has been in effect for half a century. It takes the royalties from the offshore oil and minerals onshore and allows much of that royalty to be spent on preserving the special places of America—the wildlife refuges, very unique habitat areas—setting aside those areas, using that money to buy up the land and, in some cases, to buy up easements so that the land will forever remain available to future generations in a more natural state. That is the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Unfortunately, the authorization for it expires this year, and at the moment, there is no perceived movement by the Congress of the United States to reinstitute and reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

When I was deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior in the mid-nineties, we used this fund to set aside redwood forest off along the coast of California, to protect the Everglades of Florida, to set aside some of the land along the sand dunes on the Great Lakes. This is a project for all of America, one that is worthy of being reauthorized and properly funded.

With that, Mr. Speaker, perhaps enough about California's drought. No, I will take that back.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, we have got a problem in California, short term and long term, and it deserves the attention of the Congress of the United States because California is the seventh largest economy in the world and critically important to the future of this Nation.

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

INJUSTICE AT HOME AND ABROAD

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, it has been a tough week, for all Christians in the country have lost three brothers and six sisters in the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina. The whole country mourns—well, probably not everybody. Evil has those who support it and wallow in it, as did the evil perpetrator of the killings.

Our prayers continue to go out to the immediate family members and to the church family members for their peace and for their comfort because those of us who are believers know that those we have lost are at the foot of the Saviour in Paradise.

I learned today that the President will be going to speak at the funeral. I recall a speech in Arizona, and so as I encouraged our prayer caucus tonight, we should be praying for the President to be a uniter as he speaks.

I thought about the way a great President named Abraham Lincoln concluded his second inaugural address. The war was not over; there was great hatred and bitterness. Of course, he mentioned in his inaugural address—talking about North and South—both read the same Bible, both pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other.

He goes on to give what is one of the great theological treatises on the nature of God; he quotes from the Old Testament a couple of times, but with all the killing that occurred during the Civil War, he ended trying to encourage uniting. I know there are those who advise the President that he should not let a good crisis go to waste, but for many of us, the hope and prayer is that at this week's funeral, he will be a uniter.

Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln closed his second inaugural with the words: ''With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.''

Mr. Speaker, that was a man who sought to unite, who knew there was a Heavenly Father to Whom we could pray and Who would answer our prayers. I hope and pray that will be the outcome at the funeral of my brothers and sisters in Charleston, South Carolina.

Of course, then there is the judge side of me. Having sentenced people both to prison and to death, the judge side of me says, from what we know, it sure cries out for the death penalty, but we will let the justice system in South Carolina take care of that.

In the meantime, as we think about injustice, it is also hard not to think of our friends and our allies in Israel who have trouble finding any friends. They are persecuted on every side. We got this report from the U.N., an article talking about it from Marissa Newman of The Times of Israel: ''Israel slams 'politically motivated and morally flawed' U.N. Gaza report.''

The article says: ''Israel on Monday said it would 'seriously' evaluate the United Nations Human Rights Council inquiry on the Gaza conflict, while politicians from left and right slammed the international body for bias and declared that the international investigators lacked access to evidence.''

The article goes on down further: '' 'The report is biased,' said Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in response. 'Israel is not perpetrating war crimes but rather protecting itself from an organization that carries out war crimes. We won't sit back with our arms crossed as our citizens are attacked by thousands of missiles.' ''

The article says: ''The Human Rights Council 'in practice does everything but worry about human rights,' the prime minister charged. 'The commission spends more time condemning Israel than Iran, Syria and North Korea put together.' ''

It seems that these are the times that cry out for a moral, pragmatic, and unified response to the anti-Semitism that is growing—it is just unbelievable—in Europe and in the United States colleges and universities. It is incredible.

Mr. Speaker, the Bible talks about times when right will be wrong and wrong will be right; perhaps we are entering such an era. A country like Israel is under attack from virtually every front, every side; and Palestinians, radical Islamists, and Iranians declare that they will see that it is annihilated.

Their leaders make statements such as ''we are glad that they are gathered in Israel so that we can annihilate them all at once,'' and the U.N. basically sees somehow level parties on the same plane: terrorists and people who promote democratic beliefs and carry them out, allow people to vote, believe

in the rights of women, and believe in equal rights.

Israel is a place where Muslims can freely vote and don't have to worry about a radical Islamist killing them if he or she doesn't believe and perform exactly like their radical Islamist leader tells them to.

The article says that the Israeli Foreign Ministry also castigated the U.N. Human Rights Council investigation for failing to distinguish between the Israeli military and Hamas:

''It is regrettable that the report fails to recognize the profound difference between Israel's moral behavior during Operation Protective Edge and the terror organizations it confronted.''

''Likud minister Yuval Steinitz compared the conflict to a Palestinian suicide bomber commandeering a bus full of Palestinian civilians and ramming it into an Israeli tank. 'Many Palestinian civilians would die,' he told Army Radio. 'But that doesn't mean the tank is to blame.' The U.N. panel's approach was 'absurd,' he said, in that it would require Israel not to fire back when terrorists fire at its civilians 'because the terrorists are hiding behind their civilians.'

''Steinitz also said the U.N. Human Rights Commission's obsessive focus on Israel points to anti-Semitism. Asked whether Israel would have done better to cooperate with the panel, he said, 'You can't explain to people who are not prepared to listen.'

''Yesh Atid leader Yair Lapid also rejected the idea that Israel should have cooperated, saying the panel had drawn its conclusions before it even began its probe.''

It goes on to discuss the report from the so-called Human Rights Council. The United Nations Human Rights Council is an abomination. It should be an affront as it is an outrage to anyone who cares about human rights.

What has happened at the United Nations? We have had so many nations join the United Nations that don't care about human rights, and they don't care about women. Of course, they are so brutal in the treatment of those who would oppose it, that apparently it scares off feminist groups who are afraid to attack those who really are inhumane in their treatment of women, enough so the feminist liberal groups are afraid to take them on.

Hopefully, some day, they will gain the courage to see where women are truly being abused in horrendous ways, and they will join with some of the rest of us in trying to stop that, instead of going after Christian groups or groups who believe that everyone, once conceived, should have a right to live.

Maybe if some of those groups quit attacking those who are pro-life and spent a little time attacking those who are true abusers of women, then we would find common footing, and we would be able to work better together.

There is another article here from Anne Bayefsky. This one is headlined: ''U.N. report denies Israel's right of self-defense, advocates arrest of Israelis instead.''

It really is outrageous, and the United States, as has been suggested by some writers, should withdraw from participation in the Human Rights Commission. The ICC, International Criminal Court, obviously from its actions and its efforts, is quite anti-Semitic. The United States has no business supporting the efforts of those who support the effort and abuse of Israelis and the effort to eliminate them from off of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, if there had been an Israel during the Holocaust, Jews would have had a place to go, and there would not have been 6 million killed in the Holocaust. This is no time for anyone who cares about world peace and the avoidance of suffering to stand up and decry Israel. This is a time to stand with Israel.

Israel is an actual democratic republic in the middle of the Middle East that respects women like no nation around in the Middle East and supports the value of life and private property. How in the world are we not a better friend to them?

I would like to see, as some writers have suggested, that we withdraw from anything that might lend our support to the International Criminal Court because of its anti-Semitic views.

Mr. Speaker, I realized, as I was reading these articles about additional anti-Semitic efforts by the United Nations, that the U.N. has been overtaken by so many countries that don't believe in human rights for their people.

□ 2030

Many of them, they are abusive, have no problem with torturing those with whom they disagree, have no problem killing people who convert from, for example, Islamic beliefs to Christian beliefs—get the death penalty in some of these countries.

You know, it is time to begin a new organization of democratic republics that respect the rights of women, men, children, and who have fair elections.

Let's have an international community like that. Let's have an international group that, when it speaks, it is not with blood dripping off of the votes of its members. It would mean something.

A human rights commission, for example, for a while had Libya as the head. Are you kidding me? This is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I realized, in reviewing these articles, I have not yet filed the bill that I normally file, the U.N. Voting Accountability Act.

What I have learned around this body is, if you keep filing a bill long enough, even if it requires somebody else putting their name on it to get it to the floor, you get that done; you get it passed, and you don't care who gets the credit.

The U.N. Voting Accountability bill is very simple. It basically says any nation that votes against the United States more than half of the time in the preceding year would get no assistance from the United States of any kind whatsoever. As I have said for years, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free. It is still true.

It is time to leave that money here. It is time for this administration to stop sending weapons that it knows have continuously fallen in the hands of the Islamic State and made it extremely difficult for the courageous Kurdish fighters to fight and defeat the radical Islamic State.

Let's start sending those weapons directly to the Kurds. Baghdad is not letting them get them. They cannot easily defeat the weapons, the up-armored vehicles, the things that we have sent that we knew ultimately were falling into Islamic State hands.

As some Muslim friends, leaders in Middle Eastern states have continued to ask: Why is it that the United States administration keeps helping the Muslim Brotherhood? Don't they know that is who is at war with the United States?

They ask: Why do you keep helping your enemies?

It is time that we quit helping our enemies. It is time that we help those here at home.

I applaud our conference passing the bills we did tonight. One is going to make it easier for seniors to get access to the health care that ObamaCare has made it very difficult for them to get, so there is some good news.

Our prayers continue so that, by the end of the week, there will be even better news.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSSELL (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of travel in connection with official duties and personal reasons.

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending the burial mass for her mother-in-law, Lorretto Wagner.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through June 26 on account of official business in district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical appointment.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, REBECCA TALLENT, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 1 AND MAY 11, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rebecca Tallent	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(3)				1,500.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		654.00		(3)				654.00
	5/6	5/7	Germany		395.00		(3)				395.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		378.00		(3)				378.00
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(3)				1,960.00
Committee totals					4,887.00						4,887.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

REBECCA TALLENT, June 9, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HUNGARY, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 15 AND MAY 19, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael Turner	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		3,365.00				4,024.00
Hon. Tom Marino	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		3,365.00				4,024.00
Hon. Gerry Connolly	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		9,769.00				10,428.00
Hon. Ted Poe	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		3,365.00				4,024.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/16	5/18	Hungary		659.00		3,365.00				4,024.00
Morley Greene	5/16	5/19	Hungary		912.00		3,365.00				4,277.00
Janice Robinson	5/15	5/19	Hungary		1,012.00		3,365.00				4,377.00
Ed Rice	5/16	5/19	Hungary		912.00		3,365.00				4,277.00
Committee totals					6,131.00		33,324.00				39,455.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, June 18, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1883. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral James A. Winnefeld, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1884. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Performing the Duties of the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress addressing the military retirement recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1885. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Amendments to the 2013 Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Rule Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth In Lending Act (Regulation Z) and the 2013 Loan Originator Rule Under the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) [Docket No.: CFPB-2014-0028] (RIN: 3170-AA48) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1886. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Commission Guidance Regarding the Definition of the Terms ''Spouse'' and ''Marriage'' Following the Supreme Court's Decision in United States v. Windsor [Release Nos.: 33-9850; 34-75250; IA-4122; IC-31684] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1887. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a list of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to Congress within sixty days, in accordance with the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1888. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-050; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1889. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding commitments in the Joint Plan of Action, pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 Sec. 1245(d)(5) and 1245(d)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1890. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency, with respect to the Western Balkans, originally declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2015; (H. Doc. No. 114–44); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1891. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency, with respect to North Korea, originally declared on June 26, 2008, by Executive Order 13466, as amended and extended, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2015; (H. Doc. No. 114–45); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1892. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the 6-month period of October 1, 2014 — March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1893. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, 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.

1894. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, the semiannual reports to Congress from the Treasury Inspector General and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, during the reporting period of October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1895. A letter from the Executive Director for Operations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a letter providing the Web site address where the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has posted its commercial activities inventory, pursuant to the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of

1998 and the Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-76, ''Performance of Commercial Activities''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1896. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Child Welfare Outcomes 2010-2013 Report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 105-89, Sec. 203(a); (111 Stat. 2127); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1897. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2015-42] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1898. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Additional no-rule area — grantor trusts and Sec. 1014 basis step-up (Rev. Proc. 2015-37) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1899. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Applicable Federal Rates — July 2015 (Rev. Rul. 2015-15) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1900. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Application Procedures for Approval of Benefit Suspensions for Certain Multiemployer Defined Benefit Pension Plans under Sec. 432(e)(9) (Rev. Proc. 2015-34) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 971. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program (Rept. 114–172, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 387. A bill to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2620. A bill to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 114–174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 805. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility over the Internet domain name system until the Comptroller General of the United States submits to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to such system; with an amendment (Rept. 114–175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2576. A bill to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 333. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (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; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2042) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability; and providing for proceedings during the period from June 26, 2015, through July 6, 2015. Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. S. 971 referred 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. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2846. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of cancer care planning and coordination under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2847. A bill to encourage African countries provide first-time access to electricity and power services for at least 50,000,000 people in sub-Saharan Africa by 2020; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to penalize aliens who overstay their visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2849. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 2850. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2851. A bill to require each insurer that considers marital status in the rating or underwriting of an insurance policy to consider the proposed insured to be married if the proposed insured is legally married under the laws of any State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 2852. A bill to provide for the eligibility for burial in Arlington National Cemetery of certain members of reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2853. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 2854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the occupational tax on gambling with respect to wagers authorized under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2855. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the time limitation for use of eligibility and entitlement to educational assistance under certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2856. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2857. A bill to facilitate the addition of park administration at the Coltsville National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 2858. A bill to phase out cosmetic animal testing and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2859. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Sonoran Corridor connecting Interstate 19 to Interstate 10 south of the Tucson International Airport as a future part of the Interstate System, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2860. A bill to direct the Mayor of the District of Columbia to establish a District of Columbia National Guard Educational Assistance Program to encourage the enlistment and retention of persons in the District of Columbia National Guard by providing financial assistance to enable members of the National Guard of the District of Columbia to attend undergraduate, vocational, or technical courses; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HAHN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BASS, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit to certain recently discharged veterans, to improve the coordination of veteran job training services between the Department of Labor, the Department of Veteran Affairs, and the Department of Defense, to require transparency for Executive departments in meeting the Government-wide goals for contracting with small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Small Business, Education and the Workforce, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RIGELL):

H.R. 2862. A bill to authorize the amendment of the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide for an increase in 2 levels if the defendant intentionally selected any victim or any property as the object of the offense of conviction because of the victim's military service or status as a veteran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RIGELL):

H.R. 2863. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit unrecognized individuals from charging fees for legal services provided to veterans related to appeals before the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2864. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from extending the renewable fuel program past 2022 if the Administrator waives applicable volume requirements in prior years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2865. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to make a technical correction relating to the amendments made by Public Law 113-243; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 2866. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a special enrollment period for pregnant women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARPER:

H. Res. 334. A resolution designating the Ulysses S. Grant Association as the organization to implement the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, Civil War General and 2-term President of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BOST, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 335. A resolution congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

68. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution 527, urging President Barack Obama and Congress to make federal funds available to the Illinois Community College System; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

69. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware, relative to House Resolution No. 17, reaffirming the commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and Delaware; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. CAPPS:

H.R. 2846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce, as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This law is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 to the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 2850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.'' Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, ''to promote the general welfare.''

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 2853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 2854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18,—''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this

Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.'' To better ensure the due process rights guaranteed in Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; and

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses:

1) ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States''

3) ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''

7) ''To establish Post Offices and post Roads''

18) ''To make all Law which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make Rules for the Government and Regulations of the land and naval Forces

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 of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make Rules for the Government and Regulations of the land and naval Forces

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 of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 2865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

Specifically, Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 18

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 2866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 12: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 24: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 167: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 169: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 188: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 197: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 232: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 244: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 247: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 263: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 276: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 359: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 402: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 427: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 510: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 540: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 563: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 581: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 602: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 605: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 612: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 616: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 624: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 653: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 662: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 664: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 672: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 699: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 702: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 745: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 756: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 767: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 774: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 800: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 812: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 815: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 822: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 823: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 824: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 829: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 835: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 842: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 855: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 865: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 879: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 885: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 893: Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 910: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 918: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 920: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 921: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 923: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 931: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 932: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 969: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 972: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 986: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 990: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1002: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1061: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1087: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1091: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1098: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1101: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1130: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1178: Mr. HARPER and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1185: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1197: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1202: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1221: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1250: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1258: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1288: Ms. HAHN and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1299: Mr. OLSON and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1321: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1338: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1342: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1343: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1369: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1378: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1387: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1388: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1401: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1427: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1439: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1448: Mr. KEATING and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1462: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1475: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1477: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1479: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1487: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1506: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1515: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1516: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1549: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1555: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 1567: Mr. FARR and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1581: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1595: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1610: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1644: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1665: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1671: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1726: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1737: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1739: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1752: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1753: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1760: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1769: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1786: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1814: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1817: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1818: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1832: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1846: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1853: Mr. TROTT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. Pittenger.

H.R. 1856: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1859: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1920: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1930: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1937: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1941: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1968: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1994: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 2023: Mr. COOPER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2061: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2072: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2140: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2147: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2152: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2156: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2169: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2193: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2197: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. BASS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2216: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2259: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 2287: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 2302: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2303: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2315: Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2342: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2358: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2360: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2362: Mr. TIPTON and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 2382: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2400: Mr. LANCE and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2404: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 2405: Mr. PAULSEN and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2410: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2412: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2449: Mr. COHEN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2466: Mr. MICA and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2493: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2501: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2513: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2514: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 2520: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2530: Ms. MOORE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2539: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2560: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2568: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2576: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2588: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2602: Ms. SPEIER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2606: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2615: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2639: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2646: Mr. HANNA and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2652: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2654: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2658: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2660: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2669: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2689: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2698: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2716: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2726: Mr. KILMER and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2737: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2738: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2742: Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2748: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2767: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2768: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2770: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2773: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2790: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2798: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2800: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2802: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2810: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2813: Mr. KILMER and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2815: Ms. GRAHAM and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2820: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 2826: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 2838: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 2841: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.J. Res. 25: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.J. Res. 36: Ms. KUSTER.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 12: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. FUDGE.
H. Res. 28: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 50: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Res. 56: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 102: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 147: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Res. 204: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 209: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. PITTENGER.
H. Res. 210: Ms. MOORE and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H. Res. 227: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 291: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 294: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, and, Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 310: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 316: Mr. HENSARLING.
H. Res. 318: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HENSARLING, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 327: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FARR, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. NORTON.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative PALLONE or a designee to H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. BABIN

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

OFFSHORE DRILLING PERMITS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Interior to block approval of offshore drilling permits.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE THE THREATENED SPECIES LISTING OF THE LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the lesser prairie chicken under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. HUELSKAMP

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PROPOSED RULE FOR LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKEN

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to write or issue under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) a proposed rule for lesser prairie chickens (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*).