United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2015 No. 102

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 24, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. 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 11:50 a.m.

REBUILDING OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a flurry of activity regarding infrastructure funding in recent days. We had the first hearing in the Ways and Means Committee in the 55 months since my Republican friends took over to deal with transportation finance. There have been press conferences and proposals, and actually, a few other hearings have been scheduled.

Despite all the furor, there is only one solution which is broadly supported, which is easy to implement, and which does the job. That solution is raising the gas tax.

Now, we heard at the hearing on Ways and Means the three basic arguments that are offered against that: that it is not politically possible, that there is really no time to do this so we have to extend it to the end of the year, and that this would somehow be a burden on families.

Actually, that is not true. The notion that it is not politically possible is not remotely the case. There are 20 States in the last 2½ years that have stepped up to raise their gas taxes.

Ironically, information submitted by the American Road & Transportation Builders Association at our Ways and Means hearing pointed out that the legislators in those States who voted to increase the gas tax were reelected at an over 90 percent rate, and the legislators that voted for the gas tax in the States were reelected at a higher percentage than those who voted against it.

If anybody needs more proof, just look at what has happened already this year where six very red States—Idaho; Utah; South Dakota; Iowa; Nebraska, overriding a Governor's veto; and Georgia—have all met their responsibilities raising the gas tax. It absolutely is something that can be done with a little political courage.

The notion that somehow there is no time, that we have got to fuss around and it is going to take extensive hearings to come forward with the proposal—well, only if it is a complex, convoluted, untested, and controversial proposal. Raising the gas tax would take about 1 week's work, could be implemented quickly, and is the simplest and least expensive revenue measure to implement.

What about this notion that somehow it is a burden on American families? Well, the proposal that I have introduced would cost less than 25 cents a day, and those families that would pay the increased user fees are suffering over $350 a year damage to their vehicles from poorly maintained roads. The American Society of Civil Engineers suggests that that cost per family is going to be over a $1,000 a year by 2020. And the American public is paying by being stuck in traffic, in congestion, costing $120 billion a year. It costs money to them—money that could have been used for more productive purposes—and time away from their families.

Imagine if we just came back from our July recess and dedicated the week of July 13 to solving the infrastructure crisis in this country where America is falling apart and falling behind. The people who were experts at the hearing that weren't heard from could have answered all those questions.

Where else are we going to find something that is broadly supported by business and labor, by truckers and AAA, bicyclist, engineers, environmentalists, local governments? We would have all of those people before us supporting a solution to this important challenge. I can't think of any other issue that would bring all those people together and support congressional action.

We could stop the slide of America falling apart and falling behind. We could put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs all across America while we strengthen our communities, make them more livable, and provide an economic boost for the future.

Why don't we do that? Why can't we take ''yes'' for an answer, deal with the broadest coalition of support for any major issue, and have another victory like we did with the SGR? We can do it, and it is hard to think of something that would be more important.

Printed on recycled paper.

HEALTHCARE.GOV DATA BREACH

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, throughout my life, I have learned that the American people are strong and resilient. Throughout our history, we have shown time and time again our unique ability to overcome every obstacle and every adversary that has blocked our path to freedom. This resilience is what has advanced our Nation from being a ragtag rabble of citizens who took up arms in the American Revolution to being the greatest superpower in the world.

Throughout our advancement as a nation, we have not always been perfect. In fact, we have made some grave mistakes. However, our shared dedication to liberty and justice for all people has put us back on course. And though it sometimes takes years, or even generations, the spirit of American exceptionalism overshadows our mistakes and, with the spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation, we move forward.

However, when the government and its leaders purposefully mislead the American people, they are much less willing to forgive and forget, especially when such deception puts the people at risk, threatens their God-given rights or the sovereignty of this Nation. Mr. Speaker, I fear the American people and the Members of this Congress have, once again, been deceived, and I intend to get to the bottom of it.

When the 111th Congress ran through this body the Affordable Care Act, the American people were sold a bill of goods with deceiving statements and deceptive promises, statements such as, ''If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.'' Although this disastrous legislation passed against the will of the people, some Americans trusted that the law would not take away their chosen healthcare plan. Unfortunately, the American people found out the hard way they have been deceived.

Now, Mr. Speaker, new reports give evidence of another deception surrounding ObamaCare. Prior to the launch of the healthcare.gov Web site, officials of this administration assured Congress and the American people that personal information submitted via the ObamaCare Web site would be secure and would not be permanently stored. However, new evidence suggests this may have been just another bait-and-switch tactic.

Contrary to what we have been told, the government is apparently storing American citizens' personal identifiable information obtained through the healthcare.gov Web site. If this is indeed true, then, this is not only another assault on the good faith of the American people, but, more importantly, it puts them at significant personal risk.

This government has recently shown its inability to secure computer systems and protect sensitive information. In the past several months, we have been inundated with reports of security breaches of government computer systems, disclosing personal and official information that potentially harms our national security.

With many Americans being forced into the government healthcare exchange, over 11 million people have registered with healthcare.gov. A breach of this system could be larger and potentially more disastrous than any of the previous breaches, which is a serious concern.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, our Founders gave us a government of the people, not a government of elitists, establishment, or executive privilege. We are a nation of laws, not a nation of feelings or good intentions. We are bound by the Constitution, but that Constitution is only as sound as the integrity of those who have sworn to uphold it.

The American people expect their government to operate within the constraints of the Constitution, the limits of the law, and to be transparent and accountable. Unconstrained activity by government agencies has gone on far too long, and now their deceptions and reckless behavior is threatening the safety and the security of the American people. These actions put the future of our Nation at great risk, and they must stop.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Science, Space, and Technology, I intend to diligently pursue this issue, to find the truth, expose those who have violated the trust of the American people, and ensure the illegal collection of data by our government is stopped and the previously collected data is permanently removed.

I intend to use the power given to this body through our Constitution and the trust invested in us by the American people to right these wrongs. Our citizens deserve better than this, and I am committed to ensuring that the American people have a nation that is once again free, safe, and full of opportunity.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, nine parishioners were shot and killed inside Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, one of the oldest African American churches in the United States.

In the days following the horrific tragedy in Charleston, we paused to reflect and send our prayers to families grieving an unimaginable loss. I wish this tragedy in Charleston were an isolated incident, but it seems to be part of a terrible recurring pattern.

After national tragedies, society should engage in a discussion about how to address and potentially prevent such tragedies from happening again. Let's remember that after Katrina, we talked about FEMA and national readiness. But the gun lobby doesn't want us to have this conversation. They accuse anyone who tries with exploiting the deaths of innocent people.

With that logic, we couldn't talk about solutions when 13 people were killed and 8 were injured during the shooting in the Washington, D.C., Navy Yard; or after a person opened fire during a midnight screening of a film, ''The Dark Knight Rises'' in 2012, killing 12 and injuring 58 others; or when 28 people were shot and killed, including 20 innocent children, at Sandy Hook Elementary School; or when a man shot 3 people and killed 7 others at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin; or when 14 people were shot and 6 were killed in 2011 during a constituent meeting hosted by our colleague, Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, in a supermarket parking lot in Tucson; or when a man opened fire in Fort Hood, Texas, in 2009, killing 13 people, injuring 30 others; or in 2008 when a man opened fired at a lecture hall at Northern Illinois University, shooting 21 students and killing 6; or when a senior at Virginia Tech went on a shooting rampage on campus in 2007, killing 33 people and injuring 23 others; or when 2 seniors at Columbine High School attacked their classmates and teachers, wounding 24 and killing 15; or in Chicago and cities across the country which experience gun tragedies every day.

Yet, since I have come to this Congress nearly 7 years ago, the people's House has refused to hold even one hearing on the epidemic of gun violence we are facing.

Last Sunday alone, in Chicago, 14 people were shot and 1 man was killed, all within a matter of hours. In May, Chicago saw 300 people shot and 37 people killed in shootings. Every day in America, 297 people are shot and nearly 90 people are killed by guns.

According to Harvard University researchers, the rate of mass shootings has increased threefold since 2011, occurring an average of every 64 days. Let me repeat that. A mass shooting occurs in the U.S. on the average of every 64 days.

□ 1015

When will enough be enough? When will we stand up and say we may not be able to stop every crime, but we can stop some of them and at least minimize the damage of others? When will we realize and acknowledge that this type of mass violence does not happen in other advanced countries? When will we finally be able to have a national discussion about gun violence?

Instead, the gun lobby stymies debate by arguing that no gun regulation can prevent criminals and the mentally ill from killing people with guns, but I don't buy that. Sure, no single law or set of laws can prevent every act of

senseless violence. Ending the American epidemic of gun violence will require more than a change in law.

It is clear we need a change in our culture; but oftentimes, changing our culture starts with changing our laws. By enacting reasonable reforms, we can make a difference. We can make it more difficult for would-be assassins to access guns. We can ensure every gun in America is purchased after a background check rather than only 60 percent of guns, as is currently the case.

We can crack down on the flow of illegal guns onto our streets by improving gun trafficking data, and we can reduce the fatality rate by banning assault rifles and high-capacity magazines that are designed exclusively for killing dozens of people at once.

Let's face it, when you have an assault rifle with a high-capacity magazine, you are not hunting deer; you are hunting people. The gun lobby tries to argue that any attempt to regulate gun access is an attempt to restrict all gun access, but there is such a thing as commonsense, middle-ground gun reform, and most gun owners support it.

Can we stop every shooting? No. But can we reduce their frequency and deadliness? Absolutely—the first step toward keeping dangerous guns out of the hands of dangerous people is to begin the conversation. Let's break the silence, stop the violence, and start the conversation.

NO DEAL IS BETTER THAN A BAD DEAL

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration and Tehran are yet again running up against another deadline. This one comes next Tuesday when the clock expires on reaching a comprehensive nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, if you head over to whitehouse.gov, there is a site outlining the current nuclear negotiations. On the front page of this Web site, when discussing what a possible deal with Iran should do, it states: ''prevent Iran from using the cover of negotiations to continue advancing its nuclear program as we seek to negotiate a long-term comprehensive solution that addresses all of the international community's concerns.''

Mr. Speaker, what have we seen in reality? It is a possible deal that could block international inspectors from having unrestricted access to all of Iran's nuclear sites to verify their compliance. Mr. Speaker, what could Iran possibly have to hide if their nuclear work is solely for peaceful purposes?

We have also seen a deal that doesn't require Iran to disclose all of its previous nuclear work and possible military dimensions. It is a bad deal because, if Iran expects the world to trust them and lift sanctions, why not come clean?

I also see a deal that could lift all sanctions once the ink is dried, which is a bad deal, because what would this instant relief be rewarding? Years of covert work, violations of U.N. resolutions, and the export of terror across the globe—no one in good faith could say that the deal before the world right now prevents Iran from obtaining a pathway to the bomb. If anything, Mr. Speaker, it puts them on a pathway to the bomb.

It has been clear for some time now that this administration has been negotiating not with Iran, but with itself. We have seen them consistently move the goalpost on what they are willing to accept with respect to essential components of a good deal. This ranges from the number of centrifuges to inspections to the dismantling of nuclear infrastructure.

The parameters of what this administration is willing to accept has moved so many times, I don't believe it would surprise anyone if reports emerged before next Tuesday that showed even more concessions have been made.

Mr. Speaker, the administration needs to prevent Iran from having a pathway to the bomb. They need to hold good on their word that no deal is better than a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see how anyone right now, with the exception of Iran, could accept the reported deal as a ''good deal.'' Let's not settle for a bad deal; let's not stand for a nuclear Iran.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank's charter, which has served this Nation well. The Export-Import Bank is an important program used to support our Nation's entrepreneurs—the best in the world—and keep them competitive in today's global economy.

It is a tool. It is a tool that has enjoyed bipartisan support over the years, just like trade agreements are a tool to, in fact, increase jobs here in America, good-paying jobs.

The Bank provides trade financing to solutions to boost U.S. job growth, and it has been successful in increasing exports for American goods and services—American goods that are made here—at no cost—no cost—to the American taxpayer.

This program is set to expire, sadly, tomorrow—tomorrow. Unfortunately, the House Republican leadership is refusing to bring it to the floor for a vote, with thousands of American jobs at risk.

Now, if the Bank charter expires, American workers and American businesses that are trying to sell their products and goods overseas face a completely unnecessary blow to their ability to compete.

In total, the Ex-Im Bank—otherwise known, abbreviated—has created and sustained over 1.5 million jobs in the private sector since 2007 alone—1.5 million jobs since 2007. Last year alone, the Bank sustained over 164,000 export-related American good-paying jobs.

If you want to build it in America, you have got to ensure that American workers and businesses can compete. The Ex-Im Bank represents a vital pillar, therefore, in our ability to be competitive overseas, and it has had significant impacts in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent.

Why? Well, many of the businesses that I talk to that use the Ex-Im Bank tell me: JIM, we have the ability to compete. We make our products better, but when we are sitting at the table with foreign competitors, many of these countries want to know, do you have a financing plan in place?

It is because, contingent upon their ability to choose us or choose our competitors, many of these countries want to know that this can be financially put together in a fashion so that the deal works for everybody, and that is what the Bank does.

In my district alone, the Ex-Im Bank has afforded a number of small business exporters—some of which are minority and women owned—to have exports in places all over the world, places like India, Mexico, Turkey, Hong Kong; and I could go on. These businesses export $77 million worth of goods, ranging from machinery to manufacturing to crop production of the variety and diversity of agricultural exports that we do in California.

As a matter of fact, in California, the Ex-Im Bank has resulted in increased exports of over $27 billion. Now, let's put this in perspective. Last year, California exported $174 billion in products.

The Ex-Im Bank was responsible for helping to finance $27 billion of that $174 billion. As a matter of fact, $19.4 billion of the $174 billion that was exported last year from California were agricultural products grown in the San Joaquin Valley.

The Bank helps level the playing field, therefore, for American workers and American businesses, allowing them to compete and succeed in the global economy that we live in today. That is just the facts.

In these trying times, the last thing Congress should be doing is jeopardizing the economic health of our Nation by refusing to provide Americans with the tools—the tools, which is what this Bank is—they need to compete effectively in the global marketplace.

It is important to note that there is a vast bipartisan support for renewing the Bank's charter. Let me be clear. Despite attempts to paint this as a partisan issue, I do not believe it is. Sadly, though, there are some of my colleagues on the other side who have decided to play partisan politics with the Bank. That, then, therefore threatens American jobs, halting economic

growth and undermining American businesses' ability of all sizes to compete in this global market.

Now is the time for long-term reauthorization of the Bank so that American entrepreneurs can use this tool to create more jobs in our country. This can only happen with bipartisan support. I stand and ask my colleagues to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank on behalf of American workers and American businesses.

NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the single greatest threat to the national security of the United States is Iran's drive for nuclear weapons. The result of the negotiations being conducted by President Obama and our Western allies will shape the long-term security and stability of the United States for years to come.

Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terror, a stronghold for terrorists whose very mission is to spread oppression. Iranian leaders have called for the complete annihilation of Israel, calling Israel a ''barbaric, wolflike, and infanticidal regime.'' Iranian leaders have said that the United States of America has ''no place among the nations.''

By its own declaration, Iran is not looking for a peaceful path of coexistence. There can be nothing more dangerous for America or our allies than a nuclear-armed Iran. That is why a bad deal with Iran, one that leaves the door open for Iranian nuclear weapons, must be avoided at all costs.

In order to alleviate these concerns, the President and his national security team have said over and over that a bad deal is worse than no deal at all; but will that sentiment actually stop this administration from entering into a bad deal with Iran? What I have seen so far, through the framework agreement released in April, raises serious concerns.

Under this framework agreement, not a single Iranian nuclear centrifuge will be dismantled. No nuclear facilities will be shut down. While some of Iran's nuclear infrastructure will be temporarily warehoused, most of Iran's nuclear infrastructure will remain completely intact. All of these factors point to a flawed understanding of a ''good deal'' by President Obama; yet this is the deal we may well be given.

Twenty years ago, the United States was negotiating with another country on nuclear weapons development. During these talks with the Soviet Union and Gorbachev in the 1980s, President Ronald Reagan used the proverb ''trust, but verify'' throughout those discussions.

I do not see this administration using that same tactic. In fact, it seems to me that in regards to Iran, the Obama administration is operating on the principle of ''trust and don't verify.''

As things stand, these ongoing nuclear negotiations are placing far too much faith in a country that has proven itself both deceptive and unpredictable.

Mr. President, a good deal must contain the following five points: first, a deal that requires anytime, anywhere inspections; second, a deal that would only lift sanctions when Iran demonstrates compliance with its obligations; third, a deal must require Iran to provide a complete report of its past nuclear activities; fourth, a deal must require Iran to dismantle its nuclear weapons infrastructure; and, last but not least, a good deal must not allow Iran to become a nuclear state ever.

Without these conditions in place, the United States will, without a doubt, be prioritizing a bad deal over no deal at all.

□ 1030

HONORING DICK HORIGAN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very dear friend, Dick Horigan.

Richard hails from my hometown of Amsterdam, New York. Dick turns 90 on Friday, and it is worth noting this milestone because he has epitomized the generosity, humility, and dedication of the World War II generation, and he has made Amsterdam a better place as a result.

Richard T. Horigan wasn't born in Amsterdam, nor did he grow up there. In horse racing terms, a sport he continues to enjoy at the nearby historic Saratoga Race Course, Dick was a ''shipper'' from Scranton, Pennsylvania.

After serving in the Navy in the Pacific during World War II, he enrolled in Georgetown University. On a blind date, he met Marie Smeallie, the beautiful daughter of Donald and Agnes Smeallie of Amsterdam, and they were married shortly thereafter. Upon Dick's graduation from Georgetown law school, Marie convinced him to move to Amsterdam and begin his law practice there.

Since 1951, Dick has been a pillar of our community. Retired now, he was very active in the American Bar Association and the American College of Trial Lawyers. Dick was the consummate attorney and a leader in his field. He was the village attorney for nearby Hagaman, and practiced before the United States District Court, the Northern District of New York, and the United States Court of Appeals.

In the 1970s, he struck out on his own, and his son, Tim, joined him to start Horigan & Horigan, which continues to be one of the top firms not only in Amsterdam, but throughout New York's greater capital region.

While his love of his profession is strong, his love of family is even stronger. When Marie passed away in 1977, he found himself spending more and more time with Ellie Smeallie, who had been widowed many years earlier. In 1979, Ellie and Dick were married. This good-looking couple merged two great families and brought them even closer together.

Dick is the patriarch of 13 children, 33 grandchildren, and, yes, 3 great-grandchildren. While many of them live outside of the region now, they all come back to visit, especially in August, when the historic Saratoga Race Course is open.

In addition to horse racing, his other passions include golfing and helping St. Mary's Catholic Church, where I would often see him at mass in the mornings.

We wish a happy 90th birthday to Richard Horigan. I hope there are many more to come, Dick. You are a beloved, reliable patriarch of an awesome clan. You are a respected, loyal friend to countless many, including myself.

My message here on the House floor is: To a great man, have a great day. It is my honor to recognize your 90th birthday.

ENDLESS WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the week before last, the greatly respected conservative columnist Thomas Sowell wrote:

> What lessons might we learn from the whole experience of the Iraq war? If nothing else, we should never again imagine that we can engage in nation building in the sweeping sense that term acquired in Iraq—least of all, building a democratic Arab nation in a region of the world that has never had such a thing in a history that goes back thousands of years.

The week before last, the longtime conservative leader David Keene wrote in the Washington Times about our Middle East wars:

> The concept of U.S. national interests was stretched beyond any rational meaning with the argument that ''democracies don't go to war with democracies,'' so rebuilding the world in our own image was seen as our ultimate national interest.

Mr. Keene went on and said:

> America took on more than we could possibly handle. The result is a generation of young Americans who have never known peace, a decade in which thousands of our best have died or been maimed with little to show for their sacrifices, our enemies have multiplied, and the national debt has skyrocketed.

The week before last, the publisher of The American Conservative magazine, Jon Utley, wrote an article entitled: ''12 Reasons America Doesn't Win Its Wars.'' The Magazine said:

> Too many parties now benefit from perpetual warmongering for the U.S. to ever conclude its military conflicts.

Mr. Utley quoted conservative columnist Peggy Noonan, who wrote:

> We spend too much on the military, which not only adds to our debt, but guarantees that our weapons will be used.

She quoted one expert, who said:

> Policymakers will find uses for them to justify their expense, which will implicate us in crises that are none of our business.

Conservative icon William F. Buckley, shortly before he passed away, came out strongly against the war in Iraq. He wrote:

> A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose but misapplication of pride.

He added that if the war dragged on, as it certainly has:

> There has been skepticism about our venture, there will be contempt.

A couple of weeks ago, we saw an Iraq army, which we have trained for years and on which we have spent megabillions, cutting and running at the first sign of a fight. We should not be sending our young men and women to lead and/or fight in any war where the people in that country are not willing to fight for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, fiscal conservatives should be the ones most horrified by and most opposed to the horrendous waste and trillions of dollars we have spent on these very unnecessary wars in the Middle East.

Last week, 19 Republicans voted for a resolution saying that we should bring our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan. The Republican leadership of the Foreign Affairs Committee did not want any Republicans to speak in favor of that resolution, so Mr. JONES, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. MASSIE requested, and received, time from the Democratic sponsor, Mr. MCGOVERN.

I did not want to do that, but I at least wanted to point out today that there has been nothing conservative about our policy of permanent, forever, endless war in the Middle East.

In his most famous speech, President Eisenhower warned us against the military industrial complex. We should not be going to war in wars that are more about money and power and prestige than they are about any serious threat to the United States. I think President Eisenhower would be shocked at how far we have gone down that path that he warned us against.

UPCOMING SUPREME COURT DECISION IN OBERGEFELL V. HODGES, TANCO V. HASLAM, DEBOER V. SNYDER, AND BOURKE V. BESHEAR

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the profound hope that, in its upcoming decision, the Supreme Court will strike down laws that prohibit same-sex couples from marrying and to ensure that all States recognize lawful marriages performed elsewhere.

These four cases—Obergefell v. Hodges, Tanco v. Haslam, DeBoer v. Snyder, and Bourke v. Beshear—are an opportunity for the Court to end legal discrimination against committed gay and lesbian couples and their children and to reestablish marriage as a civil right, one that is ''fundamental to our very existence and survival,'' as it was called by Justice Warren in Loving v. Virginia in 1967. As a country, we can no longer allow State governments to burden their citizens by refusing to grant marriage licenses based on whom they love.

Since my earliest days in the New York State Assembly, I have fought alongside the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community for equality under the law. I spoke out in opposition when, in 1996, Congress, for the first time, created a Federal definition of marriage with the Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA, solely for the purpose of excluding gays and lesbians from receiving Federal marriage benefits; and I have long carried legislation to repeal this insidious law, from offering the Respect for Marriage Act to leading the congressional amicus briefs in both Windsor and the current marriage equality cases before the Court. Yet even a full repeal of DOMA would still leave individuals vulnerable to continued State discrimination, which is why there must be a guaranteed right to access to benefits of marriage regardless of where a couple may reside.

When my constituent and friend Edith Windsor began dating Thea Spyer in 1965 and accepted her proposal in 1967, she was not thinking about how the government would view her relationship. She was thinking about the joy and happiness that comes from beginning to shape a life with a partner she loved. Forty years after that proposal, they were able to legally marry in Canada, outside of the country and State they called home.

No one in a free and just country should be forced to leave their home, traveling away from friends and family across State lines, in order to get married. Nor should anyone be faced with the humiliation of being denied government benefits, the tragedy of being barred from a partner's hospital bedside, or the indignity of being refused any of the other thousands of benefits that come with marriage that millions of Americans access every day because a State refuses to recognize their otherwise lawful marriage.

Denying recognition of same-sex relationships signals to the couple, their family, and all others that their bond in love is less deserving of respect, harming the individuals and creating divisions within the fabric of our society.

After Thea's death, Edith bravely fought all the way to the Supreme Court, in the United States v. Windsor, to establish what so many of us have known for decades: that laws that deny recognition of legal same-sex marriages serve no legitimate purpose, stigmatize and shame American families, and are a deprivation of the equal liberty guarantee of the Constitution's Fifth Amendment.

It is time for the long arc of history to continue to bend towards justice and for similarly discriminatory State laws to be struck down once and for all.

Should the Court rule for equality, there will be no losers. No one will be harmed by the granting and recognition of same-sex marriages. Those claiming otherwise are either promoting discredited claims about the dangers of gays and lesbians or falsely believe they have the right to involve themselves in the private affairs of others.

More than 70 percent of Americans already live in jurisdictions that provide for same-sex marriages. It is unconscionable that anyone would propose to continue to deny universal access and recognition, as well as the associated safety and security, to these families.

The Court has the immediate responsibility to expand upon its decision in Windsor to ensure that State laws comply with established basic constitutional protections and that all Americans are given the equal respect and support they deserve.

Much as in Loving v. Virginia, which also rolled back government-enforced marriage discrimination based on race, outdated prejudices and intolerance cannot be allowed to rule the day. It is time that we make the Constitution's promise of equality a reality for gay and lesbian couples throughout the Nation.

Regardless of the forthcoming decision, we have a long way to go to ensure full equality for LGBT Americans who can still be fired from their jobs, denied housing, and turned away from stores simply for being who they are. We must work together to pass comprehensive nondiscrimination legislation to protect these vulnerable Americans.

SPYING AND SNOOPING BY GOVERNMENT ON AMERICANS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I store a lot on my computer and on my phone: family photographs, personal calendars, emails, schedules, and even weekend to-do lists, or, as my wife calls them, honey-do lists. But this information stored on a phone like the one I have here is not private from the prying, spying eyes of government.

Most Americans have no idea that Big Brother can snoop on tweets, g-chats, texts, Instagrams, and even emails. Anything that is stored in the cloud is available to be spied on by government, as long as it is older than 180 days.

Now, why is that? Well, it goes back to the outdated Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986. That act protects the privacy of emails that are less than 6 months old. 1986, those were the days before the World Wide Web even existed. Many of us—I do—have staff that weren't even born before 1986.

We stored letters in folders, filing cabinets, and desk drawers. No one knew what the cloud was because the cloud didn't even exist. There was not any broadband, no social media, no tablets, or smartphones.

The relatively few people who used email—and I remember when email was invented—never imagined keeping emails longer than it took to send it or read it. So it was perfectly reasonable that, in 1986, lawmakers tried to protect emails, but only did so for 180 days. Who would keep anything online for longer than 6 months? Well, three decades later, we know. Everybody stores their emails.

Under current law, every email and text, every Google doc and Facebook message, every photograph of our vacation, is subject to government inspection without a warrant, without probable cause, and without our knowledge if it is older than 6 months. That is an invasion of privacy.

Constitutional protection for 6 months only? That is nonsense.

What is worse, some government agencies don't want the law changed. The Securities and Exchange Commission is lobbying to keep the law on the books. Why does the SEC want to maintain this spying ability? Well, I suspect they want to be able to read our personal financial records and communications without the constitutional protection of a search warrant and without our knowledge. Spying on the citizens by government sounds like conduct reminiscent of the old Soviet Union, to me.

The SEC is not the only government agency that has access to emails over 6 months old.

□ 1045

Any government agency can go and confiscate emails older than 6 months, without a warrant, without probable cause, and without knowledge of the person. This is a clear violation of the Constitution, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, if you go back to snail mail and you write a letter and you put a stamp on it and you put it in the mailbox, that letter floats around the fruited plain until it ends up in somebody's possession. Government generally cannot seize that letter without a warrant and go in and snoop around and look in there and see what it is.

Email is a form of communication. Why should government have the ability to snoop around in our personal emails? They don't have that right, even though they have the ability.

Whatever our political disagreements, on both sides, most Americans, I believe, share the conviction that privacy is protected by the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution: to protect us from unreasonable searches and seizures from government; protect us in our persons, houses, papers, and personal effects.

Government agents can't raid homes or tap into phones or read mail without showing a judge they have probable cause that a crime was committed; then a search warrant must be obtained.

Mr. Speaker, I was a judge for 22 years in Texas, and officers would come to me with search warrants, and I would read and see if they had probable cause. If they did, I would sign a warrant. That is what the Constitution requires before you can go snoop around and spy on Americans. Why should our possessions and communications be less private just because they are online?

Well, they shouldn't be. That is why I have teamed up with Representative ZOE LOFGREN, on the other side, and lots of other Members of Congress in both parties, to introduce legislation to update the outdated ECPA law. There is also a bill in the Senate that enjoys the same support.

Our bills restore ECPA's original purpose, to protect privacy in the ways we live, communicate, learn, and transact business and recreate today. This legislation would protect the sacred right of privacy from the ever-increasing spying government trolls in America.

Our mission is simple: extend constitutional protections to communications and records that Americans store online for any amount of time. There is no need to delay. The bill is written. The votes are there. Let's pass the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, technology may change, but the Constitution remains the same. Thomas Jefferson said in the Declaration of Independence:

> Government is created to protect our rights.

It is about time we make government protect the right of privacy, rather than violate the right of privacy.

And that is just the way it is.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DR. ELSON FLOYD

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Elson Floyd, the president of Washington State University, who passed away this past weekend.

Let me start with a little bit of background. Every member of my family went to the University of Washington, so I was actually raised to root for the UW Huskies and to root against the Washington State University Cougars.

Now, before Dr. Floyd passed, I admitted to him that, having worked with him over the years and having admired his leadership, I suddenly found myself rooting for Washington State University, too. You will be glad to know that eventually my family started talking to me again.

I was proud to call Elson Floyd a friend and a partner. He led the university during incredibly difficult times in our economy, and he never hesitated to make tough decisions that he believed would be best for his university and best for his students. That even included cutting his own salary during the Great Recession. He fought for opportunities for his students, and in fact, the number of students of color at WSU doubled during his tenure.

I think it is worth pointing out, he wasn't just a leader for Washington State University, he was a leader and a visionary for all of higher education in Washington State. It wasn't just about what was good for Washington State University, it was what was good for higher education.

How do we make sure we have an ethic where we are advocating for more people to have more opportunities to get more education to higher levels? He understood that. He understood that because he understood that education is the door of economic opportunity because he had lived it himself.

He did all he could to ensure that opportunity was felt, not just in Pullman, Washington, and not just at the University of Washington in Seattle, but all throughout our State. We saw in my neck of the woods at Olympic College in Bremerton where, because of Dr. Floyd's leadership, WSU set up a 4-year program in engineering.

That sounds kind of wonky, but here is the reality of it. What he did changed lives. It meant that young people in Bremerton could see the opportunity to actually learn at home, study for 4 years, get a degree in engineering, and then go work in private industry or go work at our shipyard.

There are now young people who have opportunities that they would have never had before if it hadn't been for Elson Floyd's leadership. What he did changed lives. He was such a good man. He was ethical, and he was wise, and he had that extraordinary combination of big heart and big brain and courage.

His life has been celebrated in the days since he passed, and I just want to be one of the people to celebrate him. I am going to miss him, and I want to extend to the entire WSU community my condolences.

Most importantly, I want his family to know that we lost a very special person and that our thoughts and prayers are with them.

GOVERNMENT WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I hear from my constituents so regularly is: What are you

doing about our Nation's debt? What are you doing about this out-of-control budget?

From time to time, at our committee, we would hold hearings on an inspector general report and actually look at some waste. This started our office thinking and some of us on the Budget Committee thinking about: How do you begin to quantify that and hold these agencies accountable?

As one of my constituents said: You know, it seems that they are always after one of us, a small-business owner, but they never go ask a Federal bureaucrat or a Federal agency to pony up or to pay back money or to be held accountable.

In our office, our interns this summer have worked with us on a project to actually begin to quantify this waste and to look at these inspector general reports.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we found. Just taking the reports from the 70 agencies that have inspector generals and looking at a 4-year period of time, from 2011 to 2014, what we found is this: we could put our finger on $105.7 billion of waste, and that is $105.7 billion of waste, of taxpayer money that is being wasted. It has been identified by the inspector general's office. That works out to about $1.5 billion for each of these 70 agencies.

Now, what was of concern to us was the fact that many of these agencies are doing nothing about it; and we found that, when you look at the reports that have been issued, which total 81 different reports, the reports for which a management decision was made during the reporting period was only 30 of those reports.

Mr. Speaker, 30 times, management said that they are going to go in and they are going to take an action in response to the recommendations that the inspector general has found.

Now, one of the things that we looked at was where these wasteful occurrences continue to happen and who are the repeat offenders when you look at these IG reports.

Let me give you some examples, Mr. Speaker. Department of Defense, $38.2 billion that has been identified—this is one of the reasons that Republicans are pushing to audit the DOD and hold people accountable for the wasteful spending.

Health and Human Services, $10.3 billion—we found that $2 billion went toward the ObamaCare Web site, which still is barely working.

Department of Agriculture, $9.2 billion; Social Security Administration, $9.1 billion; Department of Energy, $7.7 billion—and by the way, Solyndra, a green energy firm, filed for bankruptcy in September 2011, after they got 536 million taxpayer dollars. The list goes on and on.

What we are going to do—and I commend Chairman PRICE for pushing forward to hold some hearings with these inspector generals, with these departments, to drill down on the total number of reports and to hold them accountable for not taking an action and looking for ways that we, as Members of Congress, can charge back these agencies for the continued misuse—not occasional misuse, not one time misuse, but continued misuse of taxpayer dollars.

When you look at the list of these agencies and what they have done, year after year, there are some of these agencies that end up in the top 10 offenders every year—2014, Department of Defense, HUD, Health and Human Services, Department of Energy, Social Security, Department of Agriculture, VA, Homeland Security, Department of Education, Department of State, and the Agency for International Development.

You can look at 2013, continuing down the list, the top 10 again, Defense, HUD, Energy, Health and Human Services, Railroad Retirement Board, Homeland Security, Agriculture, Social Security Administration, Department of Education, and Department of State—repeated waste, fraud, and abuse of the taxpayer money.

When I came to Congress in January 2003, our freshman class decided our project was going to be rooting out wasteful Washington spending. We continue to be committed to that, and I submit our findings to the body for their review and understanding.

INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS—WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

2011–2014

Total waste (70 agencies) = $105.7 billion

Average waste of the 70 agencies = $1.5 billion

Waste by year:

Our findings

2011 = $20.1 billion

2012 = $19.5 billion

2013 = $40.9 billion

2014 = $25.2 billion

Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity & Efficiency

2011 = $17.2 billion

2012 = $12.8 billion

2013 = $35.1 billion

2014 = n/a

11 agencies accumulated over $1 billion in waste over the 4 years:

1. Dept. of Defense—$38.2 billion
2. Dept. of Health & Human Services—$10.3 billion
3. Dept. of Agriculture—$9.2 billion
4. Social Security Administration—$9.1 billion
5. HUD—$ 7.7 billion
6. Dept. of Energy—$7.7 billion
7. Dept. of Homeland Security—$5.9 billion
8. VA—$3.9 billion
9. Dept. of Education—$3.2 billion
10. Railroad Retirement Board—$2.5 billion
11. Dept. of State—$1.1 billion

Top 10 in 2014 Total Waste

1. Dept. of Defense—$10.4 billion
2. HUD—$2.9 billion
3. Dept. Health & Human Services—$2.7 billion
4. Dept. of Energy—$2.6 billion

S. Social Security Administration—$2.5 billion

6. Dept. of Agriculture—$992.7 million
7. VA—$957.1 million
8. Dept. of Homeland Security—$345.5 million
9. Dept. of Education—$273.4 million
10. Dept. of State—$264.8 million
11. Agency for International Development—$202.9 million

Top 10 in 2013 Total Waste

1. Dept. of Defense—$23.9 billion
2. HUD—$2.9 billion
3. Dept. of Energy—$2.6 billion
4. Dept. of Health and Human Services—$2.5 billion
5. Railroad Retirement Board—$2.2 billion
6. Dept. of Homeland Security—$1.6 billion
7. Dept. of Agriculture—$1.5 billion
8. Social Security Administration—$1.4 billion
9. Dept. of Education—$606.6 million
10. Dept. of State—$266.1 million

Top 10 in 2012 Total Waste

1. Social Security Administration—$3.4 billion
2. Dept. of Defense—$3.0 billion
3. Dept. of Homeland Security—$2.3 billion
4. Dept. of Health & Human Services—$2.3 billion
5. Dept. of Agriculture—$2.0 billion
6. HUD—$1.4 billion
7. Dept. of Energy—$1.2 billion
8. Dept. of Education—$999.4 million
9. Securities and Exchange Commission—$557.1 million
10. Treasury Inspector General on Tax Administration—$404.2 million

Top 10 in 2011 Total Waste

1. Dept. of Agriculture—$4.7 billion
2. Dept. of Health & Human Services—$2.9 billion
3. VA—$2.8 billion
4. Social Security Administration—$1.8 billion
5. Dept. of Homeland Security—$1.6 billion
6. Dept. of Education—$1.3 billion
7. Dept. of Energy—$1.2 billion
8. Dept. of Defense—$979 million
9. Securities and Exchange Commission—$566.9 million
10. HUD—$395.9 million

Other agencies total waste 2011–2014 (no particular order). . .

EPA—$404.7 million

FCC—$24.4 million

Dept. of Labor—$147.1 million

Dept. of Treasury—$38.9 million

Dept. of Commerce—$467.1 million

Dept. of Transportation—$478.4 million.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF KEN FARFSING

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Mr. Ken Farfsing, upon his retirement as the city manager of the city of Signal Hill, California, which will be this coming week, on June 30.

I have had the pleasure of working with Ken on local and statewide issues for almost 20 years, while I served on the Long Beach City Council, as a member of the California State Legislature, and now, as a Member of the United States Congress. I consider Ken to be a dear friend.

Ken has served for over 33 years, in community development, redevelopment, economic development, and city management in five southern California communities. He has spent the last 19 years, however, serving the city of Signal Hill, and I am honored to recognize his outstanding career.

Ken began his career with the city of Santa Fe Springs in California in 1981

as an intern. In 1985, he was promoted to community development director. In 1988, he continued his career as the community development director for the city of Downey. He later became Downey's assistant city manager and director of economic development. He served as the city manager in the city of South Pasadena for 4 years before coming to the city of Signal Hill.

Under his guidance, the city of Signal Hill established three commercial centers, the Town Center North, the Town Center West, and the Signal Hill Gateway Center.

He facilitated the relocation of a Mercedes Benz dealership to Signal Hill and the expansion of the Glenn E. Thomas Dodge dealership, growing sales and tax revenues from $6 million to more than $12 million. Additionally, he completed the development of six community parks and a new police station.

Ken has been active in regional issues, also, and he has been a leader with expertise on water issues, working with 27 of the area's Gateway Cities Council of Governments on water, storm water, and urban runoff regulations and practices.

He has served as the chair of the city manager's steering committee for the Gateway Cities manager's group, and he was a member of the water quality task force for the League of California Cities.

As you can tell, I respect and admire Ken Farfsing's leadership and service to the community of Signal Hill, and he will be greatly missed. I want to wish him the very best as he retires. His impact on the city of Signal Hill will always be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking Ken Farfsing for his 19 years of public service within the city of Signal Hill.

□ 1100

POWER OF THE PURSE ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Power of the Purse Act of 2015. I wrote this bill to restore Congress' ability to set priorities within Federal spending and, quite frankly, to better control it. To do that, my bill simply removes the firewall that exists within sequestration between defense spending and nondiscretionary spending. It allows Congress to regain the power of the purse so that we can take discretionary spending and take defense spending, but right now, the firewall requires us to spend equally on both. The Constitution gives the power of the purse clearly to Congress, and, as elected Representatives, we have an obligation to make the hard choices about where your tax dollars are spent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take you back to 2011. The country was facing its third year in a row with trillion-dollar deficits. Republicans and Democrats alike here in the House, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, and the President of the United States signed into law the Budget Control Act, the result of a failure of Congress to come to a better agreement.

The intention of that act was to control spending, to put caps on spending. But to get Democrats to agree to it, we had to say we would only spend 50 percent of discretionary spending on defense spending; yet Republicans, we would only put 50 percent on nondefense spending. So we locked ourselves and tied our hands, but we couldn't actually prioritize.

In 2011, you could make the argument, as some did—I was here at the time, but prior to that, I was not here—when they argued that we should spend more money here in the United States on domestic spending, and they passed an $800 billion stimulus bill. They had the ability to do that and adjust to the global financial crisis. In 2011, they responded to the terrorist attacks and decided to spend more money on defense.

But today we don't get to respond. We have to say, 50 percent here, 50 percent there, without regard to the circumstances that we face. This makes no sense at all.

Today we are facing a new and an unprecedented number of threats. They are coming at us from all around the world. ISIS poses one of the greatest terrorist threats that we have seen since 9/11, while Iraq, Syria, and Yemen descend further into chaos. Iran remains committed to advancing its nuclear infrastructure while continuing to meddle and support instability in the region. And we have seen an alarming rise in cyber threats from both nonstate and state actors like Russia, Iran, and North Korea. China has started to build islands in the China Sea, raising tensions in Southeast Asia.

By removing the arbitrary firewall that exists under sequestration, budget caps on defense and nondefense discretionary spending, we restore spending control back to the Congress, and we can appropriately respond to these international and global threats and require more focus on defense.

Tomorrow could be just as well something else. It could be infrastructure right here at home or education. This is National Alzheimer's Month. Maybe it would be spending more there to cure that horrible disease. We need to have the ability here to respond to the climate and environment that we face today, not what it was 4 years ago. My bill simply allows us to do that. By taking the taxpayer dollars that are sent by hard-working taxpayers here, it allows this Congress to make the determination on what the priorities ought to be at the time that we face those priorities.

Now, I know Democrats are concerned that we will just blow up and spend more money on defense, and Republicans are concerned that if Democrats control it they would spend more money on discretionary spending. My bill does not remove the caps, but it does make this Congress have to debate with each other and find a conclusion that makes the most sense for the American people, because times have changed right here in the Congress.

Today there are many Republicans who are more libertarian-minded, and they would prefer not to spend money on defense. They would prefer to spend it domestically. Rather than building roads in Afghanistan, they would prefer to build roads here. I have got colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle that feel we need to focus on national defense. They serve on the House Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Affairs Committee and are well aware of the national defense threats that we face. But we can't do anything because we reluctantly hold onto bad policy.

My bill is designed to correct this once and for all. By removing the firewall, we get to have the control of the purse once again that the Constitution has given us.

Benjamin Franklin said that a nation is best off when control of its money is handled by those who are the most ''immediate representatives of the people.'' This Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is called the people's House. Each of us represent well over 700,000 Americans, and our job is to represent them to the best of our ability. We should not and can not continue to tie our hands with some arbitrary decision that was made maybe out of necessity 4 years ago but doesn't recognize the threat today.

I encourage my colleagues to be part of this process and to cosponsor the Power of the Purse Act of 2015.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Dr. Chandra Bhanu Satpathy, Shri Sai Cultural & Community Center, Seattle, Washington, offered the following prayer:

O, Lord, by Your will, we are born in different nations, speak different languages, and follow different religions and cultures; yet we are all Your children and ever grateful for Your love and protection.

Evoke in us pious thoughts and feelings to shun all hatred and violence

and become worthy of Your services. Bless our future generations to imbibe this spirit of love, sacrifice, and cooperation.

Guide us in following saints like Shirdi Sai Baba, who proclaimed in Hindi ''sabka malik ek,'' meaning ''God is the master of all.'' Inspire us, as Your trustees, to nourish and protect the world around us to sustain all life.

Guide us along the ethical and holistic path of self-control, purity of purpose, and dedication enshrined in the Shrimad Bhagavad Gita.

O, Lord, bless this august assembly and this Nation in performing its national and global responsibilities towards furthering the cause of humanity.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING DR. CHANDRA BHANU SATPATHY

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this morning to welcome our guest chaplain, Dr. Chandra Bhanu Satpathy.

Dr. Satpathy deserves great credit for his earnest and humble leadership of the global Sai movement, which celebrates the teachings and ideals of Shirdi Sai Baba, the most respected of the Indian Perfect Masters and renowned for his teachings of compassion and acceptance.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the global Sai movement, and I can't think of a time when the values of peace, respect, and compassion are needed more here in our own country and in other parts of the world.

Dr. Satpathy's moving invocation this morning serves as a motivation to each of us gathered here to always remember what ultimately unites us far outweighs what divides us, regardless of language, culture, or creed.

Thank you, Dr. Satpathy, for being here today. Thank you for your exemplary leadership in the spirit of Sai Baba's teachings, and thank you for sharing your vision for a peaceful future.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THANKS TO CLEVELAND COUNTY COMMUNITY

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, Americans across the country awoke to the horrific news of nine lives ended in an act of hatred and senseless violence that occurred at Charleston's AME Church.

The senseless act of violence shocked the country and left the Carolinas in a high state of anxiety as the suspect remained on the run. Fortunately, due to the vigilance of quick thinking of one of my constituents and the professional work of local law enforcement, the perpetrator of this heinous act was brought to quick justice.

Thursday morning, Gastonia's Debbie Dills spotted the suspect and his car after having seen photos on the morning news. She quickly called 911, alerted local law enforcement to its whereabouts, and then the Shelby Police Department took over pursuing the suspect and arresting him. A little over 12 hours after the event occurred, the monster who committed this heinous act was in custody.

I want to express my gratitude to Ms. Dills, the Shelby Police Department, local law enforcement, and the entire Cleveland County community for their work in assisting in this arrest.

Their quick thinking and professional work brought this manhunt to a close and allowed all Americans to begin the mourning process for the nine innocent lives that were ended just a week ago.

GUN VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the three individuals killed and 32 injured by gun violence last weekend in Chicago.

They included a 17-year-old boy shot in the head, a 27-year-old man shot to death in his car, and a man who died shielding his mother from bullets fired outside of their home.

In recent days, our media has been gripped by tragic displays of violence. Charleston is what happens when racism and hate find a gun. Charleston is yet another gut-wrenching reminder that, as leaders, we can't stay silent on gun violence or racism. How many more deadly weekends will we allow on our watch? What will you do to stop the next Newtown or Charleston?

We can pass background checks and other commonsense gun safety measures; but in addition and most importantly, we need meaningful conversations and actions around racism, both individual and systemic, to truly have a safe and secure Nation with equal treatment and opportunity for all.

REMEMBERING EMANUEL AME CHURCH

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, nine extraordinary men and women were killed at the Wednesday night Bible study at historic Mother Emanuel AME Church in my birthplace of Charleston. I am grateful for their memories.

Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Cynthia Hurd, Tywanza Sanders, Susie Jackson, Myra Thompson, Ethel Lee Lance, Reverend Daniel Simmons, Reverend Depayne Middleton-Doctor, along with Pastor Clementa Pinckney were all leaders of our community and in their church. One served the youth as a high school track coach, one a lifelong librarian, one a recent college graduate with a bright future ahead of him. Many served their church. Each had a clear love of God and love for their fellow man as followers of Jesus Christ.

The loss of Reverend Senator Clementa Pinckney has been personal, as he was a fellow State legislator. I was honored to host the senator, his wife, and daughters when they visited the Capitol a few years ago. He grew up in Richland as a lifelong friend of my former chief of staff Eric Dell.

A hate-filled, drug-crazed murderer tried to divide our citizens, but he failed, and South Carolinians have unified in love, prayer, and respect.

RENEW THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to lodge my objection that this House is going to recess tomorrow without taking up the renewal of the Export-Import Bank. This is a time when American businesspeople are doing everything they can think of to compete abroad. American manufacturers are seeking to export our goods.

This is an outfit that stands up for American exporting manufacturers. It supports 1.5 million American manufacturing jobs—good-paying, family-sustaining jobs. We can't recess without renewing the Export-Import Bank.

In my district alone, 600 people are employed by companies that benefit

materially from the Ex-Im Bank: Universal Industrial Gases in Easton; Fluortek, Inc., in Easton; Victaulic Company of America in Easton; Noble Biomaterials, Inc., in Scranton; Lehighton Electronics in Lehighton; and Copperhead Chemical Company in Tamaqua.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do the sensible thing and renew the Export-Import Bank. It is as plain as the nose on your face; it is as true as the law of gravity.

LAMENTING DEATHS IN THE AMERICAN FAMILY

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the wake of last week's devastating shooting in a church in Charleston, South Carolina.

The killing of any human is a real tragedy, but to lose nine innocent people while they were in a Bible study simply because of the color of their skin is heinous beyond words. On behalf of the people of southwest Alabama, I want to share our condolences with the families of those who lost loved ones.

Let me be very clear. In today's society, this kind of hate-based act and particularly hate-based on race or ethnicity is deplorable and unacceptable. We are one Nation, and there is no place in our country for racism.

As a southerner, but more importantly, as an American, I feel as if there has been a death in my own family because these deaths were in my family, the family of all citizens in the United States of America.

MARRIAGE EQUALITY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, I stood on the steps of the Supreme Court as the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act was struck down.

On a beautiful day in June, much like today, I stood there with the words ''Equal Justice Under Law'' inscribed on the top of the Court and celebrated a truly historic decision that finally, after decades of injustice, granted LGBT Americans the right to have their marriages recognized by the Federal Government.

That day was even more important to me because I stood on those steps with many of my close friends and many of my staff whom I deeply care about, many of whom for the first time had their basic humanity recognized by the highest court in the land.

I am looking forward again, in the next coming days, to stand on those same steps as the Supreme Court hopefully rules that every American has the constitutional right to marry the person they love.

I am optimistic and hopeful that marriage equality will soon be the law of the land. As a vice chair of the LGBT Equality Caucus, I am committed to continuing to provide Federal policies that recognize the rights of all Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

□ 1215

IPAB REPEAL VOTE

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that I am opposed to ObamaCare. I have been since day one. It is a bad law that is hurting Americans. It is hurting Americans with higher costs; it is hurting Americans because they have lost doctors they liked, and it is hurting our seniors because it will ration their health care.

When ObamaCare created the Independent Payment Advisory Board, it put 15 unelected bureaucrats in charge of what payments Medicare seniors could get for their treatments. Many people have referred to this Board as a ''death panel.''

That is wrong. I have been working to repeal this Board, and yesterday, I was proud to stand up for our seniors by voting for the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, which would do just that.

The Senate needs to pass this commonsense bill now, and we need to keep working to see that ObamaCare is fully and permanently repealed.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE USS GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the christening and launch of the USS *Gabrielle Giffords*, the Navy's 10th littoral combat ship.

My former colleague in the House of Representatives, Gabrielle Giffords, could teach us all a thing or two about honor, courage, and commitment.

On January 8, Navy spouse and former Representative Giffords was shot in Tucson, Arizona, while meeting with many of her constituents and has since made an incredible recovery. She still works tirelessly to serve the people of Arizona, as well as citizens all across the country.

I am pleased that the U.S. Navy christened the USS *Gabrielle Giffords* last week in a ceremony led by Dr. Jill Biden, the sponsor of the ship. Dr. Biden aptly noted that former Representative Giffords represents the same qualities that the Navy embodies, and I could not agree more. As this vessel travels the world, I hope it will inspire patriotism and resiliency.

I am proud that the Navy has chosen to honor former Representative Giffords in this prestigious manner, and I am encouraged by the work she is doing as an advocate for safe and responsible gun ownership in order to prevent needless gun violence.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. The month of June is the Veterans Affairs Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month.

Unacceptably, we lose 22 heroes a day to mental illness, often connected to PTSD trauma. We must take steps to reduce this horrible statistic. Even one is too many. Mr. Speaker, 22 is a disgrace to everything these heroes fought for.

Post-traumatic stress disorder is widespread, affecting one in five when they return home. Only 40 percent will seek treatment, leaving the remaining three-fifths unaware of their condition, uneducated about the resources available to them, and often fearing that seeking help could hurt their career.

Mr. Speaker, our servicemen and -women deserve the best treatment, and so I pledge to continue supporting initiatives that put our troops and veterans first.

I am honored to stand here today to raise awareness about post-traumatic stress disorder and urge others to fight the fight to combat this terrible disease.

CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Juneteenth, a celebration that commemorates the ultimate implementation of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers marched into Galveston, Texas, with the news that the Civil War had ended and the enslaved were now free. Two and a half years after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, its promise was realized at least.

Juneteenth is a celebration of African American freedom, and it also serves as a reminder to constantly strive for the expression and extension of the American idea—one of freedom, independence, and liberty.

This year, I had the honor to join in the 40th annual Buffalo Juneteenth Festival, the third largest in the Nation. People of all backgrounds partake in cultural activities that promote and preserve the African American heritage.

Juneteenth has established its position as an important tradition in western New York and in neighborhoods, towns, and cities throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Juneteenth to celebrate our Nation's rich African American history.

YWCA BRADFORD

(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, I rise today to recognize the YWCA of Bradford, Pennsylvania, on celebrating its 100-year anniversary.

The YWCA of Bradford, which started as the Young Women's Christian League in 1915, seeks to eliminate racism; empower women; and promote peace, justice, freedom, and dignity for all.

In the 1980s, the YWCA was converted from a social organization to one based on service. Since then, it has been the home of McKean County's first program to provide services to victims of domestic and sexual assault.

During its centennial year, the YWCA of Bradford expanded its programs to include services and shelters for the homeless, mentally ill, and intellectually disabled. Meals on Wheels and a food pantry are among the other new amenities offered by the organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to honor an organization that has worked so hard to improve its community, and I thank the YWCA of Bradford for its dedicated service to the citizens of McKean County, Pennsylvania.

LET'S ACT TO CUT DOWN GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, we witnessed an act of pure hatred and evil in Charleston, South Carolina.

This is a time to mourn the victims, to pray for their families, for a community to heal, and for Congress to take action against unchecked and widespread gun violence.

Thirty-plus people are killed every day by someone using a gun. Mass shootings are becoming almost commonplace; yet we continue to do nothing. No legislation will stop every tragedy, but passing commonsense gun laws will at least stop some. We need to pass background checks as our first line of defense against criminals and the dangerously mentally ill getting guns.

We don't know what laws could have prevented the shooting in Charleston, but we do know that background checks help keep guns from dangerous people, and that saves lives.

If the Republican leadership has a better idea to cut down on gun violence, let's see it. If not, let's bring commonsense, bipartisan reforms like my bill to expand criminal background checks up for a vote.

BLUE STAR MOTHERS

(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, it is time we recognize the important role Blue Star Mothers play in supporting our troops by passing my bipartisan resolution which calls for August 2015 to be designated as Blue Star Mothers of America Month.

The Blue Star Mothers have been tireless advocates for our troops and have assisted by providing hundreds of thousands of care packages, sending letters to troops stationed overseas, and hosting thousands of events and ceremonies.

Blue Star Mothers of America is a nonprofit, nonpartisan service organization that was chartered by Congress in 1960 and has currently over 11,000 members in 42 States.

Women who have a son or daughter that is currently serving or previously served in the U.S. Armed Forces are eligible for membership. Many of these Blue Star Mothers have seen their loved ones sent into harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to stand with the Blue Star Mothers of America and support House Resolution 140.

STEVE WILBURN DOESN'T GET IT

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is just one more congressional workday before the charter for the U.S. Export-Import Bank expires. If Republicans allow it to expire, thousands of Americans will lose their jobs and many small-business owners will be hurt, people like Steve Wilburn.

Steve is a pretty amazing guy. He is a former marine who was wounded in Vietnam; he owns a small business, and he is a Republican. Today, Steve runs a biomass-to-energy company, and thanks to the help of our Ex-Im Bank, he had a tentative $300 million deal with the Philippines; but they sent him a letter saying that, if the Ex-Im Bank goes under, so does his deal. Steve won't get the contract, and instead, it will go to a South Korean firm using a South Korean export bank.

Perhaps our ideologically driven friends on the right can explain to Steve and to his employees who are going to lose their jobs why this is a good thing.

We should join together. Let's pass the Ex-Im Bank for American jobs.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

(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 support of Minnesota's dairy industry and National Dairy Month.

In my home State, dairy is one of our largest agricultural products. We are one of the Nation's top dairy-producing States, and Stearns County, in my district, is the top dairy-producing county in Minnesota.

Dairy farming is more than a profession; it is a way of life for many Minnesota families. I have had the privilege of visiting dairy farms across my district and have seen firsthand the hard work these men and women do day in and day out. From waking up before sunrise to milk their cows, to breeding, to delivering and raising newborn calves, it is just another day at the office for these folks.

I am proud of Minnesota's dairy industry, and I hope that every American will take some time to grab an ice cream cone and appreciate the hard work that goes into making some of our Nation's favorite food.

Happy Dairy Month to all of our hard-working farmers.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues who have spoken before in support of the Export-Import Bank, which is an absolutely vital tool that helps businesses of all sizes compete in the world market.

It does this not by competing with private sector lenders, but by partnering with them. The Bank fills gaps and provides loans to folks that the private sector is often unwilling or often unable to provide, and it costs the taxpayers nothing. In fact, since 1990, it has generated $7 billion in deficit reduction.

The Export-Import Bank is overwhelmingly supported by Republicans and Democrats; business groups, like the Chamber of Commerce; and labor, like the AFL–CIO. Presidents Eisenhower, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, and Obama have all been on board.

It sure seems like a commonsense measure, right? I think we have all learned in this Congress that a small, vocal extremist minority can derail the most bipartisan measures. Unfortunately, this is exactly what is happening.

I ask you, Speaker BOEHNER, to not allow that small, vocal extreme minority derail a very good program. That is not the way our government is supposed to work.

Southern Minnesota is working, too. Businesses like Davisco, Fastenal, and AGCO all rely on the Bank. The last thing they need is for Congress to get in the way and stop the growth, putting their prosperity at risk.

Speaker BOEHNER, all we are asking for is a simple thing. Bring it to the floor, and let us vote. If it passes, America is better off.

ARKANSAS RAZORBACK BASEBALL

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Arkansas Razorback baseball team on their successful 2015 season.

After winning their regional and super regional play, they made it to the College World Series in Omaha, Nebraska. This was the Omahogs' eighth trip to the College World Series and their fourth under the leadership of Coach Dave Van Horn.

While their season may have come to an end last week, they still have many reasons to be proud. On April 4 of this year, the team was idling with a .500 record, and postseason play seemed doubtful. They then embarked on one of the greatest turnarounds in the program's history, winning 25 of their next 35 games to finish the season with an impressive 40–25 record.

With their seemingly limitless enthusiasm and spirit, the Razorbacks represented themselves on the national stage with the determination and dedication that made all Arkansans and Arkansas alumni proud.

Congratulations on a great season, and I look forward to your continued success.

Go Hogs, go.

LET'S DREAM AGAIN

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, the other day, I was out in my community and was introduced to a young man, Tyus Ashby, of Boy Scout Troop 447.

Tyus and I got into a conversation, and he discovered I was on the Space Subcommittee. He asked if he could write me a letter. It is one of the requirements to get a Boy Scout merit badge. The other day, my staff passed me Tyus' letter, and I want to read from it.

> Congressman, you told me you are on the committee that looks into why we aren't going to space right now. I hope you can convince them to try again. There is so much more for us to discover. I hope you tell the other people on the committee that kids like me hope they won't let the space program end before we grow up and get to be part of it. We might be missing out on something really fun and important.

Mr. Speaker, let's dream again. Let's explore. Let's invest in the research that is going to take us to the next generation, to Mars, and all the technologies that come with it. Let's not let Tyus' generation down.

□ 1230

ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as Alzheimer's Awareness Month.

In 2014, approximately 270,000 Pennsylvania seniors were diagnosed and living with Alzheimer's disease. Just a little over a decade from now, in 2025, this number is expected to jump by nearly 18 percent to 320,000.

According to the Alzheimer's Association, the disease is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States and is the only cause of death in the top 10 that cannot be prevented, cured, or slowed.

As someone who watched his grandmother suffer and ultimately pass away from this horrible disease, I can say that is a startling trend that needs to be reversed starting now. That is why I am proud to have joined the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease and committed to support greater coordination and cooperation among patients, caregivers, and healthcare providers.

Together, we can improve the long-term health of those diagnosed, and increase our efforts on combating Alzheimer's, preventing it, curing it, and slowing the disease.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark June as Immigrant Heritage Month. I am also proud to represent and support Representative LINDA SÁNCHEZ' House resolution to recognize June as Hispanic Heritage Month.

In the closing days of Immigrant Heritage Month, we celebrate our country being fueled by immigrants from around the world and how America and her immigrants who have built our country are linked and share in a very productive history.

Members of my own staff, people who serve in the military and our armed services, police forces, and all sorts of jobs around our country help add to the history that makes America great. Each weaves their own family's unique experience into the American fabric and makes our country stronger.

Although June 30 marks the end of Immigrant Heritage Month, the universal American ethos of entrepreneurship, inclusion, strength, and resilience unifies all of us and resonates beyond the end of this month. Today and every day, I remain committed to fighting for immigrant families in my district and nationwide.

PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the permanent reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, an important program that benefits every American.

LWCF was founded 50 years ago to utilize revenue from energy projects to fund important conservation efforts. In total, it has conserved approximately 7 million acres of land and water resources, including mountains, forest, waterways, nature trails, and other beautiful aspects of our natural environment.

In New York's 19th District, for example, several different projects have benefited, including the Rensselaer Plateau Alliance's Community Forest and, potentially soon, a new improvement to the Appalachian Trail.

Unfortunately, this critical program expires in about 100 days, potentially jeopardizing important funding for many local communities, States, and private organizations. We simply can't let that happen. We must permanently reauthorize this important program.

AFFIRMING MARRIAGE EQUALITY

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of affirming marriage equality and providing equal protection guarantees to LGBT Americans throughout our country. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of the American public supports marriage equality. They know that same-sex couples should have access to dignity and security that only marriage can provide.

In 37 States in our Nation, this is already a reality. Today, more than 70 percent of our population live in jurisdictions where they are free to marry whom they love. However, at this very moment, marriage discrimination is still openly practiced in 13 States, taking away the securities and protections, financial and otherwise, that many Americans have, but not our LGBT Americans.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker; the failure or prohibition to recognize and allow same-sex couples to marry is discrimination. The fight for marriage equality for our LGBT brothers and sisters is one of the great civil rights battles of our lifetime, and it continues through our tireless efforts to achieve full equality under the law for all.

A positive Supreme Court decision on marriage is an important step towards ending the discrimination that too many American families are suffering because of where they live and whom they love. Mr. Speaker, it is the year 2015. It is well past time we end the discrimination against our LGBT Americans.

THE PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, for too long, Americans all across the Nation have felt the devastating effects of the President's healthcare plan, also known as ObamaCare. One of its many harmful provisions is the job-killing medical device tax, a $30 billion tax hike on medical device manufacturers that has crippled growth in this industry to pay for this flawed program.

For this reason, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, which eliminates the 2.3 percent excise tax imposed on the sale of medical devices by ObamaCare and passed in the House on a bipartisan basis.

As we continue working for full repeal of ObamaCare, this is a step in the right direction to eliminate this job-killing provision in ObamaCare that hinders our economy and hurts patients' access to quality care.

I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to quickly pass this legislation to spur innovation and bring down healthcare costs.

RECOGNIZING THE VICTIMS OF THE CHARLESTON SHOOTING

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victims of the tragic shooting last week in Charleston: Reverend Clementa Pinckney, Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Depayne Middleton-Doctor, Tywanza Sanders, Myra Thompson, Daniel Simmons, Susie Jackson, Ethel Lance, and Cynthia Hurd. My thoughts and prayers are with their families.

And I congratulate South Carolina for trying to lower the Confederate flag. It is the right thing to do.

But we don't stop these tragedies by retiring a racist relic. We stop them by fixing our broken gun laws, gun laws that are failing to keep guns out of the hands of those who seek to do us harm.

To fix them, Congress must act. But what has our response been? Silence: silence after Aurora, silence after Tucson, silence after Newtown, silence after daily acts of gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, America should never accept all this mourning, all this heartbreak, and all this gun violence. And shame on this United States Congress if we remain silent after Charleston.

THE RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, tonight the House will vote on the Ratepayer Protection Act, which is a response to the EPA's proposed 111(d) rule.

The divide between what is right for job creation and the policies coming out of this administration continues to grow deeper. I have heard from countless farmers, manufacturers, businesses, and families who are concerned with the EPA's overreach and what it means for them.

In February, Administrator McCarthy asserted that no EPA rule has ever cost a single job. This is absolutely absurd and demonstrates a myopia that is absolutely stunning.

Outside of the national debt, the EPA, in general—and this proposed rule, specifically—represents one of the greatest threats to the economic prosperity of this Nation.

Our economy is recovering, and many folks are just getting back on their feet. But with this proposed rule and many others, the EPA wants to rip the rug right out from under the American people.

Families and businesses depend on access to affordable and reliable electricity. EPA's proposed 111(d) rule for existing power plants will increase rates by nearly 14 percent.

North Carolina has already reduced CO_2 power plant emissions by 21 percent, without Federal regulations. So for this and many reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Ratepayer Protection Act.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the things that is actually very difficult to explain to my constituents and to most people who don't follow the ins and outs of Washington.

I was at a plant in my district in northeast Philadelphia just 2 days ago, along with Senator CASEY. This company, Agusta Westland, does excellent work and employs Americans right there in Philadelphia and in Pennsylvania. It benefits from something called the Export-Import Bank, something that has existed for 81 years and has been supported by every single President, both Democrat and Republican.

It is a program that supports 164,000 jobs a year, and just last year, created a $675 million surplus for the taxpayers. So we have a program that helps business, creates jobs, and actually gives to taxpayers rather than taking from them. So, of course, Congress is about to allow this program to expire. It makes absolutely no sense.

It is time for the leadership of this House to listen to the will of the vast majority and not the very vocal extreme minority. Let us reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

AN ANSWERED PRAYER FOR THE PEOPLE OF NEPAL

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a prayer has been answered.

On May 15, I took to this very podium and prayed for the people of Nepal. The prayer was that we would accord them temporary protected status if they were living in the United States. I am proud to say that Homeland Security has now issued a mandate for a 180-day registration period, 18-month temporary protected status.

I am grateful to Congressman CROWLEY and Congresswoman MENG for the letter that they sent to Homeland Security making this request that I was proud to sign on to.

I thank the President of the United States for allowing this to happen.

And, Mr. Speaker, I thank God that the people of Nepal will have an opportunity to stay in this country and not go back to the devastation that they have suffered in Nepal as a result of the earthquakes that took place there.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker, and God bless the United States of America.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAYS TO BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is Wear Red Wednesday to Bring Back Our Girls.

The news Monday of Boko Haram using two girls as suicide bombers to kill 30 people in northern Nigeria reminds us yet again why we must act now. Please cosponsor House Resolution 147, as amended, to help the Nigerian Government bring back our girls and defeat Boko Haram.

Tomorrow, Congressman SMITH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, and I will host a classified briefing from the State Department. I invite you to join in this briefing on the future of Nigeria.

Today, I welcome 38 young girls from Camp Congress for Girls. Please join me on the Capitol steps after the first series of votes to take a group picture with these wonderful little girls. They are from all over the country. They are helping in the fight against Boko Haram, and they are in the gallery today.

Don't forget to tweet, tweet, tweet, #bringbackourgirls. Tweet, tweet, tweet, #joinrepwilson.

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. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 333 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 333

Resolved, That (a) at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2015.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from June 26, 2015, through July 6, 2015—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

□ 1245

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 333 provides for a rule to consider important bills that deal with our environment: the first, H.R. 2822, the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016; and the second, H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015. Each bill will be provided the standard 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the majority and the minority. Further, on each bill, the minority is granted the standard motion to recommit, a chance to amend the legislation one final time prior to its passage.

As with nearly all regular order appropriations bills that have come to the floor under the Republican leadership, the Interior-EPA bill will be considered under a modified open rule, allowing every Member of this body the opportunity to come to the floor and offer amendments to the bill that comply with the House budget rules.

H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act, is given a structured rule under the resolution before us today, with the Rules Committee making in order five of the eight amendments offered during consideration of the bill last evening. Of the amendments made in order, one is bipartisan, three were offered by Democrats, and one was offered by a Republican.

H.R. 2822, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016, provides funding for both the Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency. This bill provides funding for many of the national parks and recreational facilities throughout the United States. The bill includes over $30 billion in base funding, decreasing the top line level by $246 million below fiscal year 2015 and cutting $3 billion from the President's budget request.

This spending reduction is necessary to rein in an out-of-control Environmental Protection Agency that is moving at breakneck speed to regulate every aspect of our economy. Following the failure of the House and Senate Democrats to get the disastrous Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade legislation to President Obama's desk in 2009, Lisa Jackson and, now, Gina McCarthy, both administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency, have moved forward with regulatory regimes under the guise of the Clean Air Act to go around Congress to regulate carbon after the American people explicitly rose up and said do not do this.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has held countless hearings and markups to address the out-of-control efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency and has taken over the past few years to push President Obama's harmful environmental policies onto a populace that has rejected those same policies at the ballot box. From carbon dioxide to ozone to every stream, puddle, ditch, pond in America, the Environmental Protection Agency

will not rest until it has regulatory control over every aspect of every life in America.

The appropriations bill before us is an important step toward reining in such a power-hungry agency. The bill contains prohibitions on the Department of the Interior's attempts to regulate hydraulic fracturing, a process that President Obama's own Environmental Protection Agency recently stated has not resulted in any significant environmental or health harms. It includes a provision preventing the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing new ozone standards until at least 85 percent of the country is able to meet current standards, which would seem to be a reasonable request. It prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from moving forward with new greenhouse gas regulations, regulations that the American people have never supported. And it prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from moving forward with regulating every stream and pond in the country, an issue that the Supreme Court has rejected and that farmers and landowners all across America have risen up to oppose.

Even more than the funding levels in this bill, passing the House Interior Appropriations bill will keep the Environmental Protection Agency from doing further damage to the United States economy than has already been done by this administration. Mr. Speaker, I will just point out, we were greeted with the news that in the first quarter of this year, the economy actually contracted by 0.2 percent. That is not the direction that we need to go.

The second bill contained in today's rule is H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, which does address the Environmental Protection Agency's job-killing carbon rules on existing power plants. The bill allows for judicial review of any final rule pertaining to greenhouse gas emissions before requiring compliance with such a rule and allows States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability. This seems like a reasonable ask, that the EPA's own rule, which we know will be litigated anyway, not go into effect until the courts have had a final say on whether or not the Environmental Protection Agency actually followed the law.

The Environmental Protection Agency's proposed regulation on greenhouse gases, a regulation that the Democrats couldn't achieve through legislation, places different limits on different States, allowing the Environmental Protection Agency to pick winners and losers in the carbon wars.

If a State does not comply with the strict guidelines that the Environmental Protection Agency sets out for its electricity market, then the EPA will force its own Federal plan on the State, driving up the cost to ratepayers exponentially.

The EPA's own estimates of this rule—just the rule, without any mention of the other disastrously expensive rules that it is currently proposing, such as the ozone regulations—suggest that the carbon rule for existing power plants will impose annual costs of $5.5 billion to $7.5 billion by 2020, and almost $9 billion by 2030. All of those costs will be passed on to every American who pays an electricity bill.

Of course, as we have seen in previous rules, the Environmental Protection Agency consistently underestimates the cost of its rules to hide the ball from the American people about the true damage that is actually being proposed by the Agency. Outside estimates put the cost of this one regulation at upwards of well over $360 billion to almost $500 billion between 2017 and 2031. That level of harm to the United States economy is insane after seeing such a slow recovery under the current President, but it is exactly what Administrator Gina McCarthy is proposing.

State Governors, regulators, and other stakeholders have submitted thousands of comments on this rule, explaining how difficult it will be to implement and prevent rates from increasing, but those pleas appear to have hit a dead end. The Environmental Protection Agency is moving forward with these rules, and this bill before us presents one of the great opportunities to slow them down before irreversible damage is done to the economy.

Mr. Speaker, the House is moving forward with important legislation today to make the government more accountable. I look forward to both bills having a full debate on the House floor after the passage of today's rule.

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

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation that would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years. The Export-Import Bank allows American businesses to compete in global markets and supports hundreds of thousands of jobs.

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1300

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have one legislative day until the expiration of the Export-Import Bank's authorization. We are going to get to talk about this EPA rule in a few minutes, but there are many Members on my side of the aisle who want to bring forward in the form of a previous question, the only procedural way that we can advance this important piece of legislation to the floor before the House goes home in July, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank would strengthen our Nation's economy. It would provide stability and certainty for American businesses. The Export-Import Bank assists tens of thousands of small-and medium-sized businesses throughout the country. In fact, nearly 90 percent of Export-Import's transactions are with small businesses, and the Bank directly supports 164,000 private sector jobs at over 3,300 companies.

In August, I was honored to receive a visit from Export-Import Bank President Fred Hochberg, who came to my district to highlight the kinds of jobs and companies that Export-Import really benefits and discuss ways that it can work together with some of our local Colorado small businesses. Together, we visited Boulder-based Droplet Measurement Technologies, which was named the Export-Import Bank's 2015 Small Business Exporter of the Year for its work in cloud and aerosol measurements. Roughly two-thirds of this small company's sales come from exports.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of growing business that Export-Import Bank supports—export-related jobs so important in today's global economy—not just the brand names, not big companies, but the types of small-and mid-sized firms that need and deserve our support to compete on the global market.

FiberLok in Fort Collins is a specialty-based printing company in my district that provides heat transfer graphic products like computer mouses and drink coaster rugs. It is family-owned with 70 employees, and about 40 percent of its business is international. They sell worldwide, including Germany, Mexico, and the U.K. In 2008, the company discovered Export-Import Bank through a direct mail campaign that targeted small businesses, and they have been using the small business multibuyer credit insurance since, and through that, with the help of that program, export sales have grown 15 to 20 percent, and the Bank has supported over 2.7 million of FiberLok's exports.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are some on the other side of the aisle that have a philosophical problem with the existence of the charter of the authorization for this Bank. If that is the case, surely unilateral disarmament is not the solution. Perhaps instruct our trade negotiators to remove backdoor subsidies at other export-import banks that other nations have, but as long as these types of efforts are permitted under WTO and trade rules, and as long as other nations support the export economy in their countries through programs like the Export-Import Bank, why would we want to unilaterally disarm? It makes no sense and puts American businesses and American exporters at a disadvantage and would lead to the outsourcing of even more jobs overseas.

Financing assistance from this Bank—which, incidentally, costs zero money to taxpayers—helps ensure that U.S. companies are competing on a level playing field. Canada, China, and Japan, over 60 other nations, have similar banks that extend even more export financing to their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, there is strong, bipartisan support for the renewal of the Bank's charter. I urge every Member who supports that to help defeat the previous question so we can offer our amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), to discuss the previous question and the Export-Import Bank.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado, as well as Leader PELOSI and Whip HOYER, for continuing to fight for the survival of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, with just 1 day left for Congress to act before the Ex-Im Bank shuts down, I am shocked that my Republican colleagues are planning to leave town without even considering legislation to review its charter. Democrats will not sit idly by. That is why I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question in order to force a vote on legislation sponsored by myself, Mr. HECK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HOYER, and nearly every other Democrat in this House to renew and reform the Export-Import Bank's charter for the long term.

Over the past 5 years, the Export-Import Bank has created or sustained an estimated 1.3 million jobs, and it has returned $6.9 billion to the American people over the past two decades. But next Tuesday, that record of success will be stopped in its tracks. The Export-Import Bank will stop creating jobs and supporting our small businesses. It will stop returning profits to the Treasury, and it will stop helping to make our businesses more competitive.

Failure to act hands countries like China, Russia, and countless others that have their own version of the bank a significant victory—at the hands of American workers' products and businesses. But we haven't given up yet. Today we are giving the broad base of Democrats and Republicans who support the Bank an opportunity to cast a vote in favor of keeping this engine of job creation and economic growth alive.

Last week my Republican colleagues who support the Bank failed to stand up for its survival. But with just 1 more day for Congress to save the Bank from shutting down, I am afraid that those who claim to support the Export-Import Bank but refuse to stand up and do so do not truly support the Bank or the jobs it creates.

Mr. Speaker, businesses need to know that our government will stand up for them, not work to undermine them.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to heed the advice of Ronald Reagan, George W. Bush, and Bill Clinton, all of whom supported the Export-Import Bank.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Chair that the issue under consideration today before the House of Representatives is H. Res. 333, which provides for the 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; and further providing for the consideration of 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.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, Dr. BURGESS, has just made an observation, that this resolution is about the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations bill. I will tell Mr. Speaker, as you know—and the American people, I am sure, know—that that Agency is funded through September 30 of this year, which means we have months to go before it will run out of funds.

The other bill that he mentions, of course, as you know, is about a proposal, not a rule. It may be a rule at some point in time, but it is a proposal which has no absolute definite need to be done today or next week or next month.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank, if we do not act by tomorrow, loses its authority to loan money or to support—not to loan money, but to support the selling of goods from America by American workers to those abroad.

We just went through a trade debate which was about jobs and whether or not it was going to undermine jobs in America. Now, my previous colleague, Ms. WATERS, mentioned President Reagan, she mentioned President Bush, and she mentioned President Clinton. But the person who says we are going to lose jobs if we don't pass the Export-Import Bank is the Speaker of this House, Mr. Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER of Ohio. He says, if we don't pass this, we are immediately going to start losing jobs—JOHN BOEHNER, Speaker of the House from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Texas yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, again, I will just remind the House that what is under consideration is a rule resolution, H. Res. 333, for consideration of the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and H.R. 2042 to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a champion of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031, which is within its power to do—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the shutting down of the Export-Import Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I do not yield time for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from being shut down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Texas does not yield for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect hundreds of thousands of American jobs by preventing the shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as you might be able to predict, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill that would protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the shutdown of the Export-Import Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we were hoping at least Mr. BOYLE's would be accepted. But, Mr. Speaker, I yield to another Member of Congress from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a leader in the fight to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down. It is most important in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to myself.

Again, I just want to underscore that the issue under consideration on the House floor today is to consider H. Res. 333, to provide for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2822, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment and related agencies, and to provide for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2042, to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am going to get an enormous frustration off my chest today, the obsessive-compulsive focus of this Chamber on the Ts: trade, trade promotion authority, Trans-Pacific Partnership, and trade adjustment authority. This view that we can distill our entire Nation's future trading prospects to one trade agreement or the TPA leading up to it is wrongheaded, it is myopic, and it does not serve our self-interest. The fact of the matter is, in order for us to be successful in a global economy, we must be much more complex and nuanced in our view.

□ 1315

Infrastructure—we don't even spend two-thirds of the money generated by the harbor maintenance tax, which is generated by trade, on improving the ports so that we can have more trade. Where is that issue?

The International Monetary Fund, 5 years hanging loose the reform. We are Nero; Rome is burning. No reforms to the IMF—and what is the consequence? This is real. This isn't abstract. I didn't make this up. China forms the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank; Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa form the BRICS Bank—all of this while we sit and watch Rome burn.

Lastly, the Export-Import Bank is a deficit-cutting, job-creating machine—$6 billion to reduce our deficit, 164,000 thousand jobs in the country just last year. Ninety-five percent, as has so often been said, of the world's population lives outside the borders of the great country of the United States of America.

If we want to keep our middle class, we are going to have to learn how to sell into their middle class and engage in global trade, but it is more complex than just one trade agreement or IMF or what we do with the infrastructure investment. It is all of these things.

Yes, at the top of that list, the Export-Import Bank, a deficit-cutting, job-creating machine, we need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank—1 day left—because the layoff notices are going out next week.

People will lose that which they value more than anything in life, save their family; and that is the opportunity to be self-sufficient and provide for themselves.

Ladies and gentlemen, I beseech you, vote against the previous question, bring up H.R. 1031, reauthorize the Export-Import Bank in the name of cutting deficits and creating jobs.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, you have heard what we will bring up if we defeat the previous question. You will now hear what this body under this rule has chosen to consider instead—a bill that, as Mr. HOYER said, could be done any time and a bill that is bad.

To explain that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the distinguished member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to House Resolution 333.

The Interior Appropriations bill is a disaster, not only because it would continue the pattern of underfunding core Department of Interior programs and ignoring climate change, but also because it is littered with partisan legislative riders that don't belong in an appropriations bill.

This rule does nothing to improve the bill, and even includes waivers to protect these illegitimate riders. Republicans make the rules, but through this appropriations bill, they seek to break their own rules and sneak significant legislative changes into this spending bill.

The riders protected by this rule would make species extinction more likely, close the courthouse door to American citizens, and grease the wheels for Big Business to make private profits from public resources.

These are all terrible ideas, but they are terrible ideas that should be considered in the Natural Resources Committee, not snuck into an Interior spending bill.

I have the honor of serving as the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, and I would tell my colleagues: we have hearing rooms and a full staff, and if you support delisting endangered species or prohibiting judicial review of resource decisions or giving away public resources to wealthy companies, you should put your name on a bill and come over to 1324 in the Longworth Building for a hearing.

While I cannot speak for the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, as ranking member, I cannot agree to cede jurisdiction over management of our Federal natural resources to appropriators, and I cannot support a rule designed to allow it.

Even though the best available science indicates otherwise, section 121 of the underlying bill would direct the Secretary to reissue two final rules removing wolves in Wyoming and the Great Lakes from the endangered species list.

Another rider would make it more difficult to protect the habitat of the threatened northern long-eared bat. We aren't the experts. We should not interfere with the species listing and recovery processes at all, let alone interfere through an appropriations bill where the merits of such proposals cannot be given any appropriate consideration. This is why the House rules prohibit these riders, and this rule should not protect them.

Another awful rider would block the Fish and Wildlife Service from cracking down on illegal ivory trade within the U.S. Poaching of elephants and trafficking of illegal ivory is currently at an all-time 25-year high here in the U.S., and the U.S. is one of the major markets for the sale of illegal ivory.

Section 120 of the underlying bill would restrict our ability to regulate the trade of elephant ivory in the U.S. and will directly contribute to elephant slaughter. House rules prohibit these kinds of sneaky, partisan riders in spending bills for a good reason, and we should not adopt a rule to protect these provisions.

If these provisions are so toxic that they can only be passed by waiving House rules, they shouldn't be passed at all.

Either way, the question should be considered in the authorizing committee, not in an appropriations bill and not in this rule.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Arizona that this appropriations bill is coming to the floor, as has been the custom during the Republican majority, under a modified open rule, which means that any Member is able to bring an amendment to the floor of the House and have it heard.

This, of course, includes limitation amendments that would be heard at the end of the reading of the bill that would allow for the striking of any of the provisions that he finds objectionable. Then all that is necessary for the gentleman to do is to convince 218 Members of this body to vote with him on an amendment, and he will be able to accomplish his heart's desire.

A modified open rule is a good process, and it does allow the will of the House to be heard on this bill. I look forward to us affirming the previous question, passing the rule to allow the bill to be heard, and then we can get on to the business at hand.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I think the problem with the idea of the gentleman from Texas is that the base bill is so bad, it could take this body weeks or months to fix it. Meanwhile, we are 1 day away from the Export-Import Bank's reauthorization.

At least let's get that done, and then we are happy to begin the work of trying to fix this terrible bill. Although, again, it might be more productive just to defeat it, send it back to Appropriations, and have them come up with a better base bill.

I am proud to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As he points out, we are 1 legislative day away from the end of the authorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

American businesses are already losing contracts as foreign companies must decide whether to structure themselves around American equipment or whether to buy equipment from another source. That foreign source offers stable export promotion authority financing provided by the governments of Germany, Japan, China, et cetera; whereas, we dawdle here.

The purpose of a rule is to decide how the House will devote its time here on the floor. The most pressing matter before us is the Export-Import Bank. That is why we should defeat the rule and focus the House on the most pressing matter, and we should allow the House to work its will. A majority of this body wants to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, but instead, we are being held hostage by a group inside only one of the two caucuses.

I gave 100 speeches for George McGovern. I am proud of that. We were accused of unilateral disarmament being our platform. This is a platform for unilateral disarmament because this is a platform that says Germany, Japan, and China will provide concessionary financing to push their exports, and we will be disarmed in the world of business.

The Export-Import Bank makes money. The CBO concludes that; generally accepted accounting principles conclude that. The enemies of the Bank have concocted a fantasy accounting system, and only under that system, used nowhere else, is there any argument that the Export-Import Bank does not make money.

We have hundreds of thousands of American jobs at stake. They should not be sacrificed on the alter of a new religion. Ayn Rand is not a deity; ''Fountainhead'' is not Holy Scripture, and we need to make practical decisions in the real world where we face real competition from real competitors.

That is why we need to focus the attention of this House on today's most pressing issue, the reauthorization of Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise today to express my support for the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

The Ex-Im Bank is an independent, self-sustaining executive branch agency with one mission, to foster American job growth by helping American companies with the tools they need to compete in the global marketplace.

In short, the Ex-Im Bank provides the business community the certainty it needs to compete in overseas markets and grow jobs at home.

Why am I so supportive of the Ex-Im Bank and its reauthorization? In my district alone, in the month of May, the Ex-Im Bank provided $3.8 million worth of Nebraska's export goods into the global marketplace, companies as large as Valmont Industries, one of the largest manufacturers of center pivot irrigation systems in the world, and companies as small as Volcanic Peppers, that in a small kitchen produced hot sauce that is exported to Australia.

In fiscal year 2014, the Ex-Im Bank supported approximately $107 million in Nebraska exports, 49 percent of which went to Nebraska small businesses.

Since 2007, the Bank has supported $230 million in exports from 52 Iowa companies and $550 million in exports from 39 Nebraska companies. This translates into American private sector jobs in every district of this country.

In real terms, the Ex-Im Bank helps to level the playing field for both large and small businesses who export products abroad.

Simply put, there is no rational reason, Mr. Speaker, for allowing American products and American goods to have a disadvantage in the global marketplace.

Congress must reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank immediately, and I am committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make this happen.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear what we would like to do, what Democrats would like to do, like the probusiness Members of this House would try to do, we want to, with 1 legislative day left, bring forward a reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank for the reasons that have been made abundantly clear by my Democratic colleagues and I know an idea that is shared by many, perhaps less outspoken, Members on your side of the aisle who also support reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Let's have a clean vote. If we defeat the previous question, that is exactly what we will bring forward, a 7-year authorization that I believe will pass this body.

Now, let's talk about what this House is choosing to do instead under these rules—two bills that are not urgent, are not timely, both of which would need Presidential vetoes: the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, which I will talk about, which, again, will go nowhere, even if it gets out of both chambers, will get a Presidential veto and won't have two-thirds in this body to override; and Interior Appropriations, which needs to be done, but could be done next week, while we are up against a deadline of the expiration of the Export-Import Bank.

The Ratepayer Protection Act pertains to the recently proposed clean power plan, which establishes emission guidelines for States to follow in developing plans to control carbon pollution from existing coal and natural gas-fired power plants.

Like so many Presidential initiatives, it stems out of the President's legitimate authority to act in areas under his statutory authority when this body fails to act.

I applaud the President for using his existing executive powers on immigration. I applaud the President for using his existing executive powers for a clean power plan to work with the States and the EPA.

□ 1330

What this bill would do, however, is suspend the implementation of the clean power plan and extend all compliance and submission deadlines until a judicial review can be completed, already in process.

On this point, let me make one thing very clear, that there is no existent rule and that the proposed clean power plan is a proposal. Let's give the executive branch the opportunity to at least come forward with a final proposal before this body decides that it somehow wants to invalidate that very proposal.

I have discussed this proposal with many folks in my district, and there are issues that need to be worked out to make this regulation feasible. I have talked to and heard from rural electric utilities and from many others, and we all want to make sure that ratepayers are not detrimentally impacted, but the answer is not to cut the process short.

That is why developers are actually working with the EPA through a public input process, which includes rural electric utilities and others, an unprecedented reach of outreach opportunities that the EPA is doing, including in my district.

They are saying that they want to amend this proposed rule to make it work better. If a majority of this body doesn't like the final result, then it is time to talk about how we want to amend it and how this body would rather deal with emissions and carbon reduction.

There are plenty of other opportunities. Several years ago, this body considered a cap-and-trade program. I am a cosponsor of a bill with Mr. DELANEY that would implement a carbon tax and would use the income from that to reduce the corporate tax rate and reduce the tax burden on American businesses.

There are plenty of good ideas out there, but let's at least see what the administration and the EPA come up with and then respond to its final proposal with meaningful legislation to address our carbon emissions.

Passing this bill now would prematurely undermine the EPA's collaborative effort, instead of encouraging them to involve multiple stakeholders in reducing carbon emissions. Under current law, the EPA is required to develop and implement a Federal plan for any State that fails to submit its own State plan.

This means that the passage of this bill would overturn that existing requirement in the Clean Air Act as it pertains to the clean power plan, which means the State would find itself in a place in which, if it fails to utilize the flexibility this rule provides, it might have a plan that they have not been part of forming.

I urge my colleagues to reflect on a position that not only disregards science but that runs in opposition to business, to the religious community, and to our national and global security. Congress can constructively weigh in on reducing carbon emissions, and I encourage this body to do so.

There are a number of great bills that would provide a statutory mechanism to reduce our carbon emissions. Instead of going that route, this body is saying that we don't even want to see what the President comes up with or what the EPA comes up with. We want to invalidate it before they even finalize it. We want to invalidate the hard work of listening to rural electric utilities; of listening to ratepayer groups; and, instead, throw it all out because, somehow, politicians in Washington know better. That is simply not the right answer, and the American people will not stand for it.

Let's talk about the other bill that the Republicans are bringing forth under this rule instead of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank—the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

First of all, I always try to talk about what is good in a bill. I do want to commend the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for including the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program, or PILT.

As a Representative of a district that is 62 percent owned by the Federal Government and, therefore, untaxable by our local taxing jurisdictions, I know how important it is to ensure the sustainability of our county programs, particularly those that affect our Federal lands; but much of the remainder of the bill and the reasoning for my opposition to it is the drastic approach it takes to nearly every other environmental, energy, and animal welfare issue facing our Nation.

The bill fails to deal with the issue of fire sharing, which is a mechanism utilized that takes money from the Forest Service and gives it to emergency response systems in the wake of wildfires. This limits the Forest Service's resources and capabilities that could be used for the protection of the watershed and for the insurance of access and accountability of maintenance on Forest Service lands, especially those like some in my district that are affected by forest fires.

This bill sets backward priorities for the Bureau of Land Management, funding the continuation and expansion of oil and gas permitting when it doesn't facilitate the zoning of solar or wind projects as my bipartisan bill with Mr. GOSAR would do.

The National Park Service, facing a backlog of over $11 billion, is drastically cut under this bill. The bill also fails to address the fact that offshore oil and gas operations require an inspection fee while onshore wells do not.

This bill fails to address the looming expiration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which helps American citizens, businesses, homeowners, and communities protect important lands and resources.

It also includes, as Mr. GRIJALVA pointed out, a number of policy riders, any one of which would be grounds for a veto by the President of the United States. It fails to adequately fund the Environmental Protection Agency, and it circumvents its ability to enforce and ensure protections granted to critical species under the Endangered Species Act.

This bill needs a lot of work. I suggest we reject it, send it back to the Appropriations Committee, and let them come up with a more meaningful effort to fund our Department of the Interior, a goal that all of us share.

I also urge my colleagues to reject the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, a bill that seeks to proactively invalidate the process of listening, as the Environmental Protection Agency has done, to many stakeholders across my district and across this country.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that, with 1 day remaining, we can move to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, protect over 130,000 American jobs, help American small businesses compete in an increasingly global economy, and grow our export-related economy in Colorado and across the Nation.

I encourage my colleagues to reject the previous question and reject the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

It was 6 years ago this week. I don't know if many people remember the activities on the House floor 6 years ago this week, but in June of 2009, right before we left for the July 4 recess, the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, brought forward to this floor a bill.

The bill was called Waxman-Markey. It was the cap-and-trade bill. The bill had come through our Committee on Energy and Commerce. I thought it was a dead duck when it left there, but that bill was pushed through to the floor at the end of June 2009.

Madam Speaker, I don't know that I need to remind you that, in 2009, right after the 2008 election, the Republicans were deeply in the minority. People talked about the fact that the Republicans were so far in the minority that 40 years in the wilderness actually sounded like the best case scenario for House Republicans; but something happened, and it began in that last week of June 2009.

Now, a lot of people will credit the change in the House majority to the President's healthcare law—and, indeed, it was ill-advised; and, indeed, it did upset a lot of people very quickly—but prior to that, even before we began having the big debates on the Affordable Care Act—the big debates on what became ObamaCare—the then-Speaker of the House brought to the floor of this House Waxman-Markey.

When people started to look at it, Waxman-Markey, we started to get phone calls. People said: ''I can't sell my house unless the Department of Energy certifies it as reaching certain levels of energy efficiency. How am I supposed to be able to do that? That is not a free society. That is not a free country when I am prohibited from selling the one possession that I had used to accumulate dollars in my estate over my entire life, and I can't sell it without permission from the Department of Energy.''

People were legitimately asking questions about what this cap-and-trade bill will do.

Madam Speaker, I have got to tell you that there are times in this body when there is one of those moments when the incandescent lightbulb goes off. One of those was last night. We were sitting in the Rules Committee, and we were hearing testimony from two Members from Kentucky, one in the majority and one in the minority.

The one in the majority is bringing the bill that we have before us, H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act. Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky was explaining what the bill would do and the protections the bill would provide. The other Member from Kentucky, a member of the minority, said, because of the failure of the legislative process, the President was required to act, and this is part of the President's Climate Action Plan.

What the H? A failure of the legislative process?

Madam Speaker, I would submit that the legislative process functioned as intended when Speaker PELOSI brought Waxman-Markey to the floor of this House and this House passed that bill. We went back to our districts that weekend, and I will tell you what we caught.

We caught unmitigated holy ''you know what'' because people were so incensed at the freedoms that Waxman-Markey and the cap-and-trade program would take away from them.

When the gentleman last night said it was a failure of the legislative process and that the President had to act, it was exactly the performance of the legislative process that delivered us from a very bad proposition.

What happened after that? Because the country was in such a convulsion about what the House had done, the visceral and immediate reaction of the people of the United States was: ''Hold the phone; we don't want what they are doing.''

The Senate, which was fully invested in passing a cap-and-trade bill—you had Senators who thought cap-and-trade was the be-all and end-all, and that was the reason they were in the United States Senate—didn't bring it up. It never came up for a vote.

Here was a situation in which the Democrats had—I don't remember what—a 55-seat majority on us here in the House of Representatives and a 60-vote—filibuster-proof—majority over in the Senate, and they couldn't get this done. They couldn't get this done because the people said: ''No. No. Don't do this to me.''

The legislative process worked. The Senate said, ''I haven't got the courage to do this right before the 2010 election,'' and the proposition died at the end of the session that concluded on December 31, 2010. I would just submit that that is a good thing.

Here we have before us a bill today to provide, in some measure, some of the protections about things that people were worried about 6 years ago, but it is precisely because we were where we were 6 years ago that we are now considering a bill that will hold back some of the rulemaking authority from the Environmental Protection Agency.

Madam Speaker, under today's rule, we are providing for the consideration of two important bills, bills that prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from doing irreversible damage to our economy through dozens of ill-advised regulations that Administrator McCarthy is looking to push on the American people before President Obama leaves the White House in January 2017.

The bills are thoughtful responses to one of the most egregious agencies in the administration, and I look forward to a full debate for that reason.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 333 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 181, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

YEAS—243

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

NAYS—181

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

NOT VOTING—9

Clyburn
Courtney
Delaney
Hanna
Hinojosa
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Sarbanes

□ 1408

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. NEUGEBAUER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall No. 379. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 333—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2042—Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015 and H.R. 2822—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

54TH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BARTON. Madam Speaker, I rise with an extremely heavy heart to, once again, have to congratulate my good friend MIKE DOYLE, the manager of the Democratic baseball team, for another victory. It is sad, but true. Sad, but true.

On June 11, the Republicans and the Democrats played the Annual Congressional Baseball Game. It was a spirited game, but for the seventh year in a row, Mr. DOYLE's team won. I don't know how to say that.

I will say that our team is back. MARK WALKER, our MVP from North Carolina, pitched a good game. He struck out CEDRIC RICHMOND, which I think is probably the first time CEDRIC has not gotten a hit.

We had new blood: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and several others. Of course, we had our stalwarts: JOHN SHIMKUS; KEVIN BRADY; our whip, STEVE SCALISE.

So we played a good game, but the Democrats deserved to win. They beat us, 5–20.

I will say that it was a pretty low blow to have the President of the United States come and interrupt the game, take away our momentum right when we had a big rally.

I am very proud of the Republican team, but I do want to congratulate MIKE DOYLE and the Democrats.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. First off, I want to thank my good friend, JOE BARTON. JOE, you know, you used the tools that are at your disposal.

This was a great game. It was good. I think all the fans were treated to a very competitive game this year. We had almost 10,000 people attend the game this year.

As we all know, the real winners here are our charities. This game helps raise money for the Washington Boys & Girls Clubs, the Washington Literacy Council, and the Nationals Dream Foundation. I am happy to report, after expenses, we were able to write checks in excess of $100,000 to each of the three charities. So those are the big winners of the game.

This was a hard-fought game. In the last 3 years that we have played this game, our team has made only one error. We made that this game, but I think the difference in the score was that we made the plays in the field.

Both pitchers were outstanding. Your new pitcher, MARK, we weren't used to that knuckle ball and some of those curves. He kept us off balance, and he pitched a brilliant game. I believe you guys actually had one more hit than we did. You had six and we had five.

CEDRIC RICHMOND, coming off of shoulder surgery, pitched a gutsy game for seven innings. And I should also mention that, after striking out, he hit a double over the center fielder's head, just to throw that in.

I want to also note JOE DONNELLY, our first baseman, made some unbelievable plays at first base that, I think, saved the game for us.

And then, as always, anytime I ask LINDA SÁNCHEZ to put a batting helmet on, she gets a hit. So those three individuals share our team MVPs.

Also, there are lots of ways to contribute, and ERIC SWALWELL stole three bases for us and scored. He did it all on the base pads, and he deserves some notice for that, too.

JOE, I just want to say it was a great game. I want to thank you for how hard your team fought, and we look forward to a competitive game next year.

We know some day, you know, the shoe will be on the other foot. But for the past 7 years, we are kind of enjoying this. So God bless.

Mr. BARTON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank leadership on both sides: our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER; our majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY; and our whip, STEVE SCALISE, who played in the game. On their side, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. CLYBURN were all there. So both leadership supported the game.

It was a good game. We did raise a lot of money for charity.

But I will put you on notice, MIKE DOYLE, the shoe is going to be on the other foot next year. Be ready.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Talk is cheap, JOE. Bring it on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 178, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—244

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

NOES—178

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

NOT VOTING—11

Capps
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Courtney
Hanna
Hinojosa
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Sarbanes

□ 1422

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 380. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on H. Res. 333—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2042—Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015 and H.R. 2822—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.

RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2042.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 333 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2042.

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

□ 1424

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today addresses EPA's proposed clean power plan for existing power plants under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration has made a decision that they are not going to work with Congress, and in order to accomplish his public policy goals, he has indicated that he is going to use executive orders and regulations.

Now, this proposed regulation focuses on power plants. That is why it is called the existing coal plant rule. But because of this regulation, once it becomes final, it is only the first step in the administration's plan to regulate other areas of our economy, including sources such as refineries, industrial boilers, cement plants, pulp and paper mills, and steel mills.

Since its proposal in June 2014, the Subcommittee on Energy and Power has held five hearings on the proposed rule, where we heard from EPA, FERC, entities within the States, legal experts, and industry stakeholders and manufacturers.

Now, when Mrs. McCarthy comes to Congress, she always says that this proposed rule gives maximum flexibility to the States, but what she does not say is that EPA, and EPA alone, sets the emissions standard for every State, and there is no flexibility in that.

Even Harvard Law School Professor Laurence Tribe, who taught President Obama constitutional law at Harvard, testified at one of the hearings that "EPA's proposal raises grave constitutional questions, exceeds EPA's statutory authority, and violates the Clean Air Act."

The hearings also identified implementation challenges, risks to electric reliability, and significantly higher energy costs under the rule.

For example, economist Eugene Trisko estimated that, for 31 geographically diverse States, electricity rates under the rule could increase by an average of 15 percent, with peak year increases of 22 percent during the period 2017–2031.

State officials also appeared, expressing the same concerns. And I might say, this rule is so complicated that, generally, EPA allows States 3 years to develop their State implementation plans. But under this proposed rule, which we know will be final soon, they are giving States 16 months, which is going to be extremely difficult for them to meet.

So the States are not only filing lawsuits, as are other entities, to try to slow this process down, but they are coming to Congress and saying, you know, Congress didn't pass this regulation, Congress has not asked for this, but the administration, unilaterally, is imposing it upon the American people, and so they are asking us to give them some more time.

So this legislation does specifically that. It does two things: One, it delays the time for the States to submit their implementation plans until after the courts have rendered a decision on whether or not the rule is legal. And then, if it is found to be legal, the State Governors have an option, after consulting with their economic development people, the EPA people, the Attorney General, and other authorities in the States. They have the option, if they find that it significantly and adversely affects their electricity prices and the reliability of electricity, they can opt out of the program.

□ 1430

This bill is simple. It simply gives States more time. We are not repealing this power grab of a regulation, but simply responding to requests from the States and other entities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Ratepayer Protection Act, and I want to commend Representative ED WHITFIELD for his leadership on this important issue.

We all agree that it is vital that we protect our environment today and for future generations. At the same time, though, we must ensure that we are acting within the law, as well as safeguarding American jobs and the economy.

I have serious concerns that the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed clean power rule will be a vast and unprecedented regulatory overreach, resulting in high energy costs; loss of jobs; and a disruption in the states' ability to generate, transmit, distribute, and use electricity.

As the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) noted earlier, no less than the renowned Harvard Law School professor Laurence Tribe has testified that "the EPA lacks the statutory and constitutional authority to adopt its plan." He described the proposed clean power plan as a "power grab" from the three branches of government.

I am especially concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the impact that the EPA's proposed rule will have on Georgia ratepayers. The State of Georgia already has reduced CO_2 emissions by 33 percent between 2005 and 2012 but will have no credit for these reductions. Under the proposed regulation, Georgia would be required to reduce emissions by an additional 44 percent, the sixth largest reduction of any State.

Georgia also will receive no credit towards achieving EPA's mandated State goal for the two nuclear plants that are being constructed.

Ratepayers in Georgia served by Georgia Power, MEAG, and the Electric Membership Corporation would face hundreds of dollars in higher energy bills, which would be especially devastating to rural households in the Second Congressional District, which I represent.

I believe that this legislation takes a commonsense approach that the issue that allows for the completion of judicial review before States are required to comply with the clean power plan.

In addition, the Ratepayer Protection Act provides for a safe harbor if a Governor determines that the proposed rule's implementation will have an adverse impact on ratepayers or on the reliability of this electrical system.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to ensure that ratepayers as well as our Nation's economy are protected from an overzealous EPA.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in opposition to this legislation.

The bill before us is dangerous, unnecessary, and premature. It undermines the cornerstone of the administration's plan to tackle unchecked climate change, and the President has made clear that he will veto this legislation.

Yesterday, we passed a bipartisan bill amending the Toxic Substances Control Act. That is the type of legislation that we should be spending our time on, not messaging bills aimed at gutting draft EPA rules.

As we sit here today, climate change continues to reshape our world. According to NOAA, 2014 was the warmest year ever recorded, and 9 of the 10 hottest years have occurred since 2000, and that trend shows no sign of slowing down.

We know this warming is due to carbon pollution from fossil fuels accumulating in the atmosphere, trapping more heat, and changing our climate.

Last week, the Pope highlighted our worldwide moral obligation to address climate change. This week, EPA released a report which confirms what many in the country are already experiencing, that failing to address climate change will have enormous financial costs.

Just look at the skyrocketing costs of fighting wildfires, the mounting costs to farmers of losing their crops and cattle to more frequent and severe droughts, the enormous costs of rebuilding infrastructure swept away by more intense storms or threatened by steadily rising seas.

Ignoring these costs won't make them go away; and the longer we wait to act, the more we allow the risks to compound and accumulate, the more costly it will be to solve the problem.

In fact, the projected costs of climate change impacts dwarf any projected short-term costs associated with transitioning to a clean energy economy, which is happening already.

Mr. Chairman, EPA has proposed a workable plan to reduce emissions of carbon pollution from power plants, which are the largest uncontrolled source of manmade greenhouse gases in the United States.

The clean power plan outlines a path to cleaner air, better health, a safer climate, and a stronger economy. The proposed rule also gives States a lot of flexibility to choose how to achieve their emission reduction goals, which are State specific and cost effective. This is a moderate and reasonable approach and falls well within the legal authority and responsibility of the EPA to address carbon pollution from power plants.

This bill we are considering today would dismiss all of this progress and would cripple the efforts of the EPA to move forward in the fight against climate change. Effectively, this bill would amend the Clean Air Act in a harmful and dangerous fashion.

This bill establishes an unprecedented extension for every clean power plan deadline until all litigation is concluded. This blanket extension would be given to all polluters, incentivizing opponents of the rule to run the clock on frivolous litigation, simply to put off having to reduce their carbon emissions.

The bill also allows a Governor to say: ''The requirements of the clean power plan don't apply to me.'' Under the bill, a Governor can opt out of a Federal plan, giving certain States a free ride to pollute without any consequences. It is one thing to encourage States to just say no, but to let a Governor declare that his State is not subject to the Federal Clean Air Act at all? Mr. Chairman, I think that just goes too far.

As I have said before, EPA's proposed clean power plan is both modest and flexible and will help us tackle our urgent need to reduce our carbon emissions. Just saying no, as this bill would have us do, and condemning future generations is simply not an option. I strongly oppose the bill and urge a ''no'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Ratepayer Protection Act, which is a critical piece of legislation that helps protect our Nation's consumers and businesses from skyrocketing electricity costs.

Last year, the EPA proposed a new set of regulations on existing power plants which will dramatically effect our economy if implemented.

The Obama administration has been doing its best to convince the American people that these new standards would achieve great progress for our Nation, calling the proposal the clean power plan. Despite the illusions of good intentions, the devil is in the details of this proposed rule.

What the administration does not want us to know is that these standards would wreak havoc on our economy and inflict enormous costs on the American consumer. According to the National Economic Research Associates, these regulations would increase electricity prices in my home State of Georgia by 12 percent.

While this would be a problem for any State, it is especially alarming for me, given that Georgia already has the tenth highest average electricity bill in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, right now, the temperature in my State is 95 degrees. My constituents depend on affordable electricity to stay cool all summer long, and the administration's assault on our Nation's power plants is totally unacceptable.

What is more, the average American household already spends about $15,000 a year to comply with Federal regulations. It has been radical proposals like these which have caused our economy to stagnate throughout this administration.

Even the EPA admits that the rule will cost our economy more than $7 billion a year by the year 2030. Washington bureaucrats may be able to afford this assault on our economy, but my constituents cannot.

The EPA also promotes these regulations with a promise that they would cut 30 percent of carbon pollution by the year 2030. The inconvenient truth is my State has already reduced its carbon emissions by 33 percent from 2005 to 2012.

Why is the administration pursuing these unrealistic regulations when Georgia and other States have already dramatically reduced their pollution levels?

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 2042, would halt the rule's compliance deadlines until litigation on the rule has been completed. This bill would also allow the Governor of any State to opt out of the rule's requirements if their State's electricity rates would increase significantly, as they would in my home State.

This commonsense piece of legislation would help to bring the U.S. environmental policy back into the real world and allow us to remain economically competitive.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of our subcommittee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the fine ranking member of the full committee, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chair, I applaud the Obama administration for its veto threat of this abhorrent legislation that we are now considering, this just say no bill, which would effectively give Governors the power to sabotage EPA's proposed clean power plan by allowing them to opt out of the Federal requirements of the plan based on arbitrary and ambiguous determinations.

Mr. Chair, when implemented, the clean power plan will allow the EPA to cut common pollution from some of the Nation's oldest, dirtiest, and most inefficient power plants.

We know, Mr. Chair, that these same power plants account for the largest share of greenhouse gases from stationary sources in the country, and they are responsible for about one-third of the total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions.

Currently, Mr. Chair, there are no Federal limits on the amount of carbon pollution that these very same power plants are allowed to emit. The clean power plan would decrease power sector carbon emissions by 30 percent from 2005 levels by the year 2030.

However, Mr. Chair, this bill is an attempt to abort EPA's efforts before

they even have the chance to take hold, despite the fact that the clean power plan gives States great flexibility when implementing the rule, based on their existing utility infrastructure and policies.

Mr. Chair, the proposed clean power plan could not be more timely, as we are experiencing more and more frequent extreme weather events due to climate change, with disastrous effects being felt in our economy and in our communities all across our Nation.

In fact, no region in America has been safe from the impacts of climate change, with nearly annual record wildfires and heat waves in the West and the Southwest, perennial flooding along the coasts, and damaging and costly droughts and crop loss in the Plains and the Midwestern portions of our Nation.

Mr. Chair, when implemented, the clean power plan would help to reduce carbon pollution by hundreds of millions of tons, decreasing particle pollution, such as sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides by hundreds of thousands of tons annually.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, the clean power plan would help protect the health of our most vulnerable citizens, our children, older Americans, and low-income and minority communities.

Mr. Chair, not only do the vast majority of the American people believe that climate change is a serious problem and that the government—our government, this Federal Government, we in this Congress—should take action to address it and take it now, but also, the overwhelming majority of our Nation's doctors believe so, also.

□ 1445

Earlier this year, the American Thoracic Society found that, by a huge margin, most doctors believe that climate change is already negatively impacting their patients' health.

Fully 77 percent of responding doctors reported that increases in air pollution caused by climate change is making their patients' illnesses even more severe, a trend, I might add, Mr. Chairman, that they expect will steadily increase in the future.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, these findings are in line with a similar study conducted by the National Medical Association last year which found that older Americans, low-income communities, and the sick will all be disproportionately impacted by climate change if we fail to act.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just a political issue. This is not just a partisan issue. This is also a moral issue. Just last week, in a landmark encyclical, Pope Francis himself warned of the grave implications of climate change when he stated:

> Climate change is a global problem with grave implications: environmental, social, economic, political, and for the distribution of goods. It represents one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day.
>
> There is an urgent need to develop policies so that, in the next few years, the emission of carbon dioxide and other highly polluting gases can be drastically reduced.

I urge all of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to heed the warning of our scientists, of our doctors, and one of the world's foremost moral authorities, the Pope himself.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that, obviously, you can't have a discussion about this regulation without climate change, and frequently, we hear that climate change is responsible for every extreme weather condition.

I would point out that The Economist magazine, in its May 5 issue, stated that it is impossible to say categorically that climate change has caused any individual storm, flood, drought, heat wave, tornado, or hurricane. Scientists agree that it is impossible to say that.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one other comment. The President of the United States believes that climate change is the number one issue facing mankind.

All of us recognize that the climate has been changing since the beginning of time, but where we fundamentally disagree with the President is we think there are other, more pressing issues dealing with poverty, creating jobs, economic growth, access to clean water, access to health care, and fighting diseases like pancreatic cancer. We think those are more urgent.

But this President has got 61 individual government programs and is spending $23 billion a year on climate change in addition to trying to push regulations like this without any involvement of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding and for your leadership on this issue. Let me pick up where the gentleman left off relating to the comments made by the opposition to climate change's role in extreme weather conditions.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of years ago, there was a weather condition that many people out here refer to as the polar vortex; in North Dakota, we call that winter, but I think what a lot of people don't know is that, during that cold snap, they don't know how very susceptible and fragile our system of transmitting and distributing electricity was, largely because we don't have the base load generation that we once had largely because of this attack on base load fuels like coal, and that is really what we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I spent 10 years prior to coming to Congress as one of those energy regulators, one of those people in the State agency the Governor would consult as per this law, the Governor would consult before determining whether they should opt out of the clean power plan.

It was my responsibility to make sure North Dakotans had reliable electricity, that a grid system and a distribution system was reliable and could deliver on a regular basis, as needed, electricity and that the rates remained as they are still today in North Dakota, among the very lowest in this country.

I also had regulation over the coal industry. I am also very proud of the fact that, while North Dakota is a major coal-producing State that generates over 4,000 megawatts of electricity at the mine mouth and distributes it throughout a robust transmission and distribution system that generates lots of low-cost electricity, it also creates lots and lots of good-paying, important jobs.

The chairman also in response referenced the importance that Republicans are placing on other things besides climate change, things like job creation. Well, the clean power plan is a jobs killer, and it makes us less competitive in the global marketplace.

It is really, in many respects, a unilateral disarmament of the American economy at a time when the only really great thing going on in the American economy is energy development.

A rule like the clean power plan goes exactly against the one robust and positive in the American economy, and that is energy development.

Let's get back to the issue of the constitutionality, the judicial question. Our bill simply provides an opportunity for a judicial review, something that the President and the EPA should have done before doing this rule, finishing this rule, and putting this rule out.

I find, frankly, the Ratepayer Protection Act to be a rather modest response to the overreach and the zeal of the EPA and this administration.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman again for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2042. The so-called Ratepayer Protection Act does nothing to protect any of us. In fact, it does just the opposite.

This bill would simply continue this majority's policy of sticking their head in the sand and doing nothing to address the serious problems of climate change. The Pope has said that climate change is a reality. It is impacting our lives every day. It is impacting our economy, and it is only going to get worse.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted almost daily with new evidence that climate change is leading to increased

health risks, threatening our environment, and costing our economy billions of dollars. Studies have shown that climate change can lead and does lead to higher rates of asthma, reduces crop yields, acidifies our oceans, and increases the risk for harmful algal blooms.

More severe droughts are threatening drinking and agriculture water supplies in many locations, while warmer climates are increasing the severity and frequency of storms in others. A recent study also showed that climate change could undo many of the improvements that we have seen in human well-being and life expectancy over the last half century. The power sector is the largest source of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, accounting for nearly one-third of the U.S. total.

Mr. Chairman, while we will continue to depend on fossil fuels for some time, we can and we must do more to limit their impacts on our climate. The clean power plan does just that by setting carbon reduction goals for each State and allowing States to implement customized plans to meet those goals.

The clean power plan will help maintain an affordable, reliable energy system while cutting pollution and protecting public health and the environment now and for future generations; yet H.R. 2042 would derail the clean power plan and all the health and economic benefits that will come with it. The bill is full of excuses to support inaction, but does nothing to solve the problem.

Mr. Chairman, this inaction on climate change is putting our constituents and our future generations at risk. It is long past time to acknowledge the causes of climate change and to tackle the issue head on. It is time for us to work together to address this problem, not to pass legislation that continues to ignore it.

For these reasons and so many others, I strongly oppose H.R. 2042, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it as well.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015.

The EPA's clean power plan has raised a number of justifiable concerns. However, while I would like to find a solution to the issues raised by today's bill, I don't believe the present bill is the correct solution. For more than a decade, the focus of environmental debate has been on greenhouse gas emissions. In that time, we have passed two comprehensive bills, while the EPA has promulgated dozens of rules.

Now, I am not raising Cain with the EPA. The Agency, backed by the Supreme Court, has the authority to regulate greenhouse gases, including carbon. The Agency, however, has a different approach to regulating than I think many Members of Congress on both sides would prefer.

I acknowledge that global climate change issues are difficult, and the legislation would require a compromise, but this bill doesn't accomplish that. Congress should create a regulatory framework for the 21st century economy and environment. We should recognize that human activity has impacted the climate, but that does not mean regulating sectors of our economy out of existence.

Regardless of the public outreach conducted by the Agency, regulatory overreach can occur. I don't think allowing each successive administration to prescribe policies that affect so much of our way of life is a correct course of action.

We need to recognize our industries, and more importantly, our workers need time to adjust to the new environmental realities and implement changes, both technological and educational.

Mr. Chairman, I know many of our colleagues agree that our job as legislators is to ensure each of our constituencies are equally represented. I prefer we sit down and craft a bill that addresses the many challenges we face not only domestically, but as a world leader.

Unfortunately, the present bill doesn't address those issues I have laid out in a balanced and complete way. Allowing for endless legal challenges or partisan political decisions is not the proper way to handle an issue that affects the entire scope of the environment and the economy.

Today's bill is only a part of the challenge, the part that is directly in front of us, and I don't agree with that approach. I would like the opportunity to sit down with my colleagues to draft a fair and comprehensive legislation that reasonably balances the interests of all parties rather than a sector-by-sector approach that balances none.

I want to make sure that the folks back home get what they need, and I think it is an opportunity to bring all sides together. I have heard certainly from many groups they all want the same thing, but they want certainty.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we want to be certain that their companies will be profitable, that their livelihoods will be protected, and their grandchildren have a clean environment. We can accomplish these goals not with endless delay or agency decree.

I want to thank my colleague, Chairman WHITFIELD, for addressing part of the problem, but let's work together to solve the whole problem.

For this reason, I oppose the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, how many minutes are remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), one of the original cosponsors of this legislation, who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, earlier, we heard the gentleman from Illinois say that this was a just say no bill. You bet it is. That is exactly what it is.

It is the just say no bill—no to a weaker electric grid; no to fewer jobs, particularly in manufacturing and also in the coal and energy industries; no to regulations that do little to help the environment, but do a lot to raise your electric rates.

When we are talking about protecting the ratepayer—that is who we are talking about, the average man and woman in this country, the families that are out there struggling, trying to make ends meet in an economy that is flat—this bill says no, we are not going to pass a bill on to you for little gain in the environment, but to raise your electric rates tremendously. The American families cannot afford it.

Mr. Chairman, as an example, we heard from a former regulator earlier, but the Virginia State Corporation Commission—and that is the organization in Virginia—appointed judges who make the decisions on what you are going to pay for power in Virginia based on what is an appropriate amount.

They said that customers in Virginia will likely pay significantly more for their electricity.

□ 1500

The incremental cost of compliance for one utility alone—Dominion Virginia Power—would likely be between $5.5 billion and $6 billion on a net present value basis. That is just for one of the companies providing power.

Let me give you an idea, Mr. Chairman, of exactly what that means to the people of Virginia. In my district, I have 29 geopolitical subdivisions, 29 different jurisdictions. Only two of those jurisdictions get their power from Dominion Virginia Power. Now, remember, Dominion Virginia Power is going to cost the ratepayers $5.5 billion to $6 billion, but that doesn't cover the whole State and doesn't cover very much in my district at all.

And, accordingly, again going back to the statements of the Virginia State Corporation Commission, they say that, contrary to the claim that rates will go up but that bills will go down, experience and costs in Virginia make it extremely unlikely that either electric rates or bills in Virginia will go down as a result of the proposed regulations.

So this is a very important measure. One of our prior speakers said that we should take the time to craft some kind of a compromise. This bill puts everything on hold until court cases can be decided and let Governors come in and say: Well, wait a minute. We can't make this happen in our State—or in our Commonwealth, as the case would be with Virginia. That is important.

And maybe if we get this bill passed, we can sit down and find some way to compromise between the regulators at the EPA and the interests of the ratepayers. But because they are going to come out with this rule sometime later this summer, and the States have roughly 13 months thereafter to come up with their plan to meet the regulations, we do not have the ability to give that time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, this is the climate change denial bill. Don't be fooled by its name. Ignoring the impact of climate change will heap huge costs on taxpayers. This bill is a disservice to America. And in addition to being very costly to consumers, it shirks our responsibility for addressing the costly impacts of the changing climate.

The bill we are considering today shows that the Republicans' plan is to just say no and to let our children and grandchildren suffer the consequences of the changing climate without doing anything meaningful to protect them. This position is indefensible, and it will prove very costly, indeed.

Today's bill would essentially amend the Clean Air Act to give a free pass to States that refuse to comply with the requirements of the clean power plan. Unless we work together to meet the modern challenge of the changing climate, this is going to be very expensive for our friends back home, especially in States like mine—Florida.

Here are some of the huge costs we are looking at already: rising property insurance rates and flood insurance rates because of extreme weather events; Federal emergency aid that we have to pay out for things like Superstorm Sandy and other storms, tornadoes, electrical storms, tropical storms, drought, fire, and extreme heat.

In addition to property insurance and flood insurance, property taxes are going to go up because our local communities are going to be saddled with the cost of repairing storm water infrastructure and addressing drinking water. This is going to be very expensive. In Florida, we already see saltwater intrusion into our drinking water aquifers because of rising tides.

There is a terrible drought in California. These are going to require very expensive solutions unless we tackle it on the front end.

And I am fearful that there will be economic harm to coastal communities like mine in the Tampa Bay area where we will have to pay more to renourish our beaches and take care of the lifeblood of our economy, which is tourism, fishing, for a beautiful, healthy economy.

I recommend a ''no'' vote on this bill.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. I appreciate it very much.

This bill is about commonsense safeguards to ensure my constituents are protected from the EPA's overreach and higher energy prices.

The EPA's proposal under this rule has drawn widespread concern. It places a heavier burden on Florida than other States, despite the fact that Florida has reduced its carbon emissions by 20 percent since 2005.

Congress must act now to protect the everyday American who faces the potential threat of unreliable services and ballooning electricity costs.

With the economy growing at a feeble pace, my constituents cannot afford to have their power bill increase. We should be working to support new technologies to safely harness America's energy boom, not saddle our constituents with regulations that will increase their cost of living.

Let's focus on an all-the-above energy strategy, unleashing America's domestic, renewable, and nonrenewable resources to reduce the costs of groceries and the costs for heating and cooling your home.

This bill will allow each State to have their own opportunity to assess the proposed plan for their State. Thirty-two States have made legal objections to this rule; 34 States have objected to EPA's rushed timeline.

I am glad that we are taking action here today in a bipartisan fashion. I commend Chairman WHITFIELD, Representative GRIFFITH, Representative BISHOP, and Representative PETERSON for their bipartisan work on the Ratepayer Protection Act. Please vote for this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a misguided attempt to hold back change and progress.

Climate change is a problem. We must deal with it. The clean power plan is an important step in that direction.

It is very disappointing to hear such a ''can't do'' attitude. We have always been a nation that tackles big problems rather than denying them.

Many States have already achieved significant reductions of greenhouse gas emissions through regional carbon trading, renewable portfolio standards, energy efficient programming, and investments in clean energy.

My home State has made great strides. And if there is a flaw in the proposed rule, it is that the proposal asked States that have already done a lot to reduce their emissions and modernize their electric grids to do even more.

By contrast, the requirements on the States that have resisted change and have done far less, are asked only to get started. This bill invites some States to continue to avoid doing their fair share to address the serious environmental and economic threat posed by climate change.

New York State will continue to work on this problem, as will a number of other States that have already taken the steps that I mentioned earlier, but it would be nice if our neighbors also helped to address the problem that we all had a role in creating.

This bill should be defeated. It certainly will not go far in the Senate, and it would not get signed by our President. Its consideration is, indeed, a waste of time. We should be using our time to find real solutions to the problems we all face. This bill offers no solutions, just another way to avoid addressing our problems.

With that, I urge defeat of H.R. 2042.

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

We have heard a lot of discussions today about how important it is with a clean energy plan to address CO_2 emissions in the U.S. You would think that this clean energy plan is going to make a tremendous difference.

I would just like to point out that the Energy Information Administration recently reported that U.S. energy-related CO_2 emissions will remain flat through 2040 and below their 2005 levels without the clean energy plan. So this clean energy plan is being elevated to do some dramatic good. The fact is the U.S. is already doing more than most countries. And I would point out that, in the coming decades, more than two-thirds of the world's energy-related CO_2 emissions will come from the developing countries of the world.

So we are being penalized in America, although we have already made great strides. That is why we are trying to give States more time to address this very complex regulation.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of Chairman WHITFIELD's legislation, H.R. 2041, the Ratepayer Protection Act.

This rule, the clean power plan, by the EPA is an unprecedented rule, one that has the potential to devastate Ohio's coal industry. That is the very same industry that employs thousands of people throughout eastern and southeastern Ohio and provides homes and businesses with affordable, reliable electricity.

The Ratepayer Protection Act will stop this devastation. Almost 70 percent of Ohio's electricity today—70 percent of Ohio's electricity—is currently

provided by coal. Moreover, coal miners already have a difficult and stressful job as it is. And now, because of the EPA's clean power plan, they will have to worry about whether or not they will even have a job when they show up for work.

The Ratepayer Protection Act is an essential check on the EPA's extreme emission standards. It allows Governors to use common sense to opt their State out of the rule should they determine that it will negatively affect its ratepayers or grid reliability.

The legislation also extends the rule's compliance dates, pending judicial review. That is just common sense, Mr. Chairman, because shouldn't our States have a say in our energy future? Especially when you consider that over 32 States have already raised legal objections to the rule, and 34 have objected to the EPA's rush regulatory timelines.

EPA's carbon emission regulations have already made it economically unfeasible to build a new coal-fired power plant in America. We cannot afford to shut down existing plants and this very important industry as well.

I support the legislation, and I urge my colleagues to.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, first, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

I also rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2042.

No one wants to see new rules and regulations just for the fun of it, and we should not take this EPA rule lightly. But here is why we must let this rule move forward: one, climate change is real; two, it is caused by greenhouse gases that are released from human activities; and three, it has already been changing the world as we know it.

Pope Francis, in his encyclical, ''Laudato Si,'' or, ''Praise Be to You,'' points out that ''reducing greenhouse gases requires honesty, courage, and responsibility, above all on the part of those countries which are more powerful and pollute the most.''

The Pope is right. We need to be honest about climate change, we need to be courageous and face the future, and we need to take responsibility for our carbon pollution.

That is exactly why we need to work with the EPA, with States, with our great research centers, and with our energy sector to increase efficiency and to transition to cleaner fuels and renewable energy sources.

The clean power plan and the authority granted by the Clean Air Act is the vehicle we have right now to cut greenhouse gas emissions and to clean up polluted air. But my colleagues are telling States they should just say no and completely opt out of doing their part and subject this rule, which, by the way, we have not even seen it in its final place, to years and years of delay.

□ 1515

This is not honest. It is not courageous. It is not a responsible way to deal with greenhouse gas pollution.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the irresponsible and shortsighted Ratepayer Protection Act.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire on the remaining time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act. This bill would protect States and families from EPA regulatory overreach and significant spikes in electricity costs.

Last June, the EPA proposed a rule for existing power plants known as the clean power plan. This rule would mandate new carbon reduction goals for each State, effectively changing the way electricity is generated, distributed, and consumed in the United States.

The economic impact of this rule is very troubling. It could mean increased electricity costs and reduced reliability for consumers. In fact, under the clean power plan, electricity rates would increase by an average of 15 percent in a majority of States.

This bill would protect ratepayers and exempt States from complying with the rule until all judicial reviews are complete. It would also allow Governors to opt out of compliance with the rule if there would be a significant impact on states' ratepayers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I find this whole conversation somewhat surreal because, in my community in Portland, Oregon, the city is unveiling a new climate action plan to reduce local carbon emissions even more.

We are already below 1999 levels on a per capita basis, but our community has committed, in going forward, to a clean energy future in order to do our part.

It is jarring that, at the same time, we would consider on the floor of the House rolling back the modest, balanced approach that the administration has undertaken with the carbon rule—a carbon rule that is not yet finalized, a carbon rule that is dedicated to working with local States to try and fine-tune it to make sure that it works right and with more public input. Nonetheless, even though it is a little late in coming, the United States must step up.

We have a major responsibility as we are the largest contributor to carbon pollution in the world. We are number two now behind China. We have a responsibility to do our part, but we have a responsibility to do our part not just in terms of global leadership and in trying to change this tremendously destructive trajectory we are on with carbon pollution—as we will, no doubt, hear from the Pope in 3 months in this Chamber—but it is part of what is going to happen with other countries in the world.

If the richest, most powerful nation in the world can't step up to do its part, how can we expect to exert global leadership and prevent catastrophic events elsewhere?

The notion that somehow this is going to be an economic catastrophe is balderdash. The reason the coal industry is in trouble is that coal is dirty, inefficient, and it is more expensive than natural gas. It is not a foundation for our energy future. Being able to move to a low carbon future is a bedrock for economic prosperity in the future.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We just heard from the gentlewoman from California, a State that has proven to be an international leader. Its economy is going great guns. It is reducing its carbon footprint, its carbon use.

People confuse the price of energy with the cost of energy, and what has happened in States like California, which have been creative in terms of energy conservation and in pricing it properly, is that use goes down.

Some of the people with the lowest rates waste the most energy. They actually spend more. Part of what we did with climate legislation, as the gentleman from New Jersey well knows, actually would have reduced the cost for most people.

We don't want to be on the wrong side of history on this because it will have a devastating effect. The administration's modest proposal ought to be supported. We ought not to pretend that we can shatter it and piecemeal it out for the States to undercut it. We ought not to pretend that this is not a real problem that deserves our attention going forward.

To waste time today with something that would turn the clock back and that won't pass the Senate—if it did, it would be vetoed—is sad. We ought to be working together on a low carbon future to be able to make it work right for each and every community.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my friend from Kentucky, the chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, for yielding and for bringing forward the Ratepayer Protection Act.

Mr. Chairman, this bill goes directly to the heart of these radical regulations, which are coming out of agencies

like the EPA, that are killing jobs in America. When you look at this regulation, this proposal by the EPA that this bill addresses, the EPA is proposing to bring forward more radical regulations that are going to increase the cost of household electricity for every family in this country. The estimates show you will see an over 12 percent increase in household electricity rates if the EPA is allowed to move forward.

When you look at what this legislation does, at least it stands up and protects hard-working taxpayers who are tired of all of these regulations—one after the other—coming forward, not through legislation passed by Congress—in open, public settings like this that you can watch on C–SPAN—but coming forward through unelected bureaucrats at the EPA who want to carry out their own agenda.

They can't pass it through Congress, so they try to just ram it through in regulations that aren't backed up by science but that would, in fact, actually, lead to more jobs being shipped out of this country.

Where would those jobs go, Mr. Chairman? They would go to places like China and India and Brazil and to other countries that don't have the environmental standards that we have. You will actually see more carbon emitted if the EPA is successful in moving forward with regulations like this that this bill is addressing.

I want to commend the chairman for bringing this forward. I think you are going to see a large, bipartisan vote in support of this legislation because people across the country are saying enough is enough.

If the proposal is so good by the EPA, why not move it through Congress? Why not have public hearings on C–SPAN and present the facts and point out and defend the increases that families are going to have in their household electricity rates?

They want to hide, Mr. Chairman. They want to hide and try to just sneak this through with the regulation and not have any public vote on the bill.

Here you have a bill, a bill that says let's slow this process down, that says let's actually give States the ability to opt out if they realize just how devastating it will be not only to the states' economies, but to the taxpayers in each State.

In my State of Louisiana, this proposal by the EPA that we are trying to stop would yield about a 13 percent increase in people's household electricity rates. We are already paying too much. The costs of things are already too high because of regulations coming out of Washington not imposed by Congress, but imposed by unelected bureaucrats.

Enough is enough. Let's rein in these unelected bureaucrats, and let's bring some common sense back to the process of getting our economy back on track. I urge the approval of this legislation, which is so important to getting our economy moving again.

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

It bothers me a great deal when I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle acting as if we don't already have a Clean Air Act in place. The fact of the matter is the Clean Air Act was passed by both Democrats and Republicans back in 1970.

It has been amended and changed several times since then, but the EPA is simply acting on a law that was passed by the Congress. There is no such thing here that the EPA is somehow doing something that they shouldn't be doing, which is what is being suggested by some of my colleagues on the Republican side and, I guess, is the basis for this legislation.

The EPA is regulating based on laws that were passed by Congress—that is what an agency does—but many of my colleagues on the Republican side continue to raise the false specter of job losses and high economic costs in order to try to block the President and the EPA from implementing the clean power plan to curb power plant carbon pollution.

I just want to say again, in going back to the original Clean Air Act, the history of the Clean Air Act shows that they are wrong, that we can have both a clean environment and a strong economy.

This is an argument that industry has used every time the Clean Air Act has been strengthened. Every time new regulations come out that are trying to address the problems with clean air and that are trying to make the air healthier for all Americans, we hear industry argue that somehow there are going to be job losses or that there are going to be huge rate increases.

When Congress debated the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, the oil industry said that the technology to meet these standards simply does not exist today, and they predicted major supply disruptions, and chemical companies said the law would cause severe economic and social disruption. None of these gloom-and-doom predictions came true. Instead, our air got cleaner, and our economy flourished.

The history of the Clean Air Act shows that the United States can reduce carbon pollution while creating jobs and strengthening the economy. Since its adoption in 1970, the Clean Air Act has reduced key air pollutants by two-thirds while the economy has tripled in size. The Clean Air Act has also made the United States a world leader in pollution control technology, generating hundreds of billions of dollars for U.S. companies and creating millions of jobs.

I want to stress that I think we are at a critical crossroads here. If we continue to ignore the science, we will cause catastrophic climate change and saddle our economy with soaring bills for disaster relief; but, if we invest in the clean energy technologies of the future, we can protect our environment and grow our economy.

This idea of juxtaposing jobs and the economy versus the environment is simply not true. The history of the Clean Air Act shows that it is not true.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, once again, I ask how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

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

The other question that I keep hearing from the other side of the aisle is that, somehow, they just ignore the public health aspects of this. Obviously, we are concerned about climate change, but it is also the question of public health.

There are consequences to inaction. In other words, if this bill were to pass and if the clean power plan were not to go into effect, there are consequences.

The EPA estimates that, in 2030, the clean power plan will avoid up to 3,300 heart attacks, prevent 150,000 asthma attacks in children, lead to 2,800 fewer hospital admissions, and avert 490,000 missed work or schooldays each year.

These benefits are worth an estimated $93 billion per year, Mr. Chairman. These are human health benefits that could be delayed or, perhaps, permanently lost if this bill takes effect. The health benefits potentially blocked by the bill are especially important for the most vulnerable among us, our babies, our kids, our seniors, and those with asthma.

The legislation grants a blanket extension for all clean power plan compliant States until all opportunities for legal challenges have been exhausted, and this unprecedented suspension of critical clean air regulations would occur regardless of a lawsuit's merits or its likelihood of success. What the Republicans are doing with this bill is denying the health benefits that come from the clean power plan.

I just want to close, Mr. Chairman, by reminding everyone that the President has said he will veto this legislation, so this effort with the legislation is totally in vain, as it probably won't pass the Senate.

The President would veto it, and there are no votes to override his veto. Let me just read what the President says in his statement when he says he will veto the bill.

□ 1530

He says:

> The bill is premature and unnecessary. It is premature because the clean power plan has yet to be finalized; it is unnecessary because EPA has made clear its commitment to address concerns raised during the public comment period (including concerns related to cost and reliability) when issuing the final clean power plan. The effect of the bill would, therefore, be a wholly unnecessary

postponement of reductions of harmful air pollution.

The bill is unprecedented. The administration is not aware of any instance when Congress has enacted legislation to stay implementation of a clean air standard before judicial review. To do so here, before the rule is even final, would be an unprecedented interference with EPA's efforts to fulfill its duties under the Clean Air Act.

Once again, my colleagues on the Republican side have said that this is only a proposed rule. Why are they passing legislation to deal with a rule that hasn't even been finalized?

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The reason we are acting is because the 5 years that I have been chairman of this subcommittee, we have had many hearings on proposed rules and regulations coming out of EPA, and only one time did they actually sit down with the affected parties and try to work out a real compromise, and that was on the cement rule.

Other than that, they have made it very clear they intend to move forward with this regulation. Lawsuits have been filed, but the courts have said it is not right yet. So if we don't take action, it is going to become final, and then you go to court, and then it takes years.

So we are simply saying let's pass this legislation to delay the implementation until the court makes a decision on whether or not it is legal. We have real reason to believe that it is not legal because never have they ever attempted to regulate an existing source under section 111(d) except in very minute circumstances.

Now, I agree that since the original Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, our economy has improved. We have had a lot more jobs. But the Global Markets Institute last month issued a report—it is an arm of Goldman Sachs, a respected institution—and they pointed out that in the Obama administration, since 2009, the number of small businesses in America are 600,000 less today than in 2009; 6 million fewer jobs today than in 2009. They also went on to say that the reason for this is the overzealous issue of regulations in this administration.

That is why the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, representing thousands of small-business men and women around the country has endorsed this legislation. That is why the African American Chamber of Commerce has written a letter explaining the detrimental impacts of this regulation. That is why over 30-some States have come to us and asked us to give them more time.

As I said in the beginning, this is a complex rule. It certainly applies to more than just coal, because it is the first time that EPA has ever attempted to go outside the source of the emission to reduce the emission. So we are not talking about only coal-powered electricity plants, but the EPA sets the standard for every State, the emission cap, and then they say you go fix it. So the States are going to be forced to go to other industries, to maybe look at building materials in homes, to adopt renewable mandates to meet these very stringent standards.

So it is a complex rule. EPA usually gives States 3 years to come up with their State implementation plan, but in this instance, they are giving them 13 months, which is unheard of.

This legislation is very simple. Let's delay the State implementation plans until the courts render a decision. I urge our Members to support this commonsense legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, today we fight to keep electricity affordable with the Ratepayer Protection Act, a bill that protects folks all across the country from the potential rate increases and reliability risks that experts predict will occur under the EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan. I applaud my colleague ED WHITFIELD for his efforts on this important bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

In my home state of Michigan, the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity estimates that the EPA's proposed plan would increase electricity prices by 12%. The last thing families in Michigan and across the country can afford right now are higher bills just as they are finally feeling as if they have turned the corner following the extended economic downturn.

Legal experts, including President Obama's own law professor, Laurence Tribe have testified that the proposal raises grave constitutional questions, exceeds EPA's statutory authority, and violates the Clean Air Act. In fact, Professor Tribe equated the administration's action to "burning the Constitution."

Low-income households and those on fixed incomes get hit the hardest when electric bills go up. In Michigan, there are nearly 2 million lower-income and middle-income families—representing 52% of the state's households. Unfortunately, the costs of this proposed rule would fall disproportionately on the most vulnerable.

Small businesses would also face increased electricity costs that could harm their bottom line. And every extra dollar that goes toward higher energy cost is money that can't be spent on new hiring.

For manufacturers, affordable energy is imperative to stay competitive in a global market. That is why the Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, and many other representatives of job-creating businesses have sounded the alarm on the serious threat posed by the administration's plan.

I would also note that higher costs are not the only menace looming on the horizon—what's worse than expensive electricity is no electricity at all. But that is a real possibility. The North American Electric Reliability Corporation and others have warned that the EPA's proposed plan poses a serious threat to electric reliability as power sources are forced offline.

The Ratepayer Protection Act is a thoughtful and straightforward answer to the potential rate shocks and blackouts. The legislation would allow for the completion of judicial review of any rule before requiring states to implement it, and if a governor of a state finds that the rule poses a significant threat to electricity affordability and reliability they would have the power to suspend compliance with the administration's plan.

The Ratepayer Protection Act does not repeal the Clean Power Plan, it merely adds several reasonable safeguards to it. Regulatory overreach has defined this administration and it is time we all stood up to protect affordable energy. Vote yes in support of every American ratepayer and lower bills.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2042

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 ''Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. EXTENDING COMPLIANCE DATES OF RULES ADDRESSING CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS FROM EXISTING POWER PLANTS PENDING JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) EXTENSION OF COMPLIANCE DATES.—

(1) EXTENSION.—Each compliance date of any final rule described in subsection (b) is deemed to be extended by the time period equal to the time period described in subsection (c).

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''compliance date''—

(A) means, with respect to any requirement of a final rule described in subsection (b), the date by which any State, local, or tribal government or other person is first required to comply; and

(B) includes the date by which State plans are required to be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency under any such final rule.

(b) FINAL RULES DESCRIBED.—A final rule described in this subsection is any final rule to address carbon dioxide emissions from existing sources that are fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)), including any final rule that succeeds—

(1) the proposed rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' published at 79 Fed. Reg. 34830 (June 18, 2014); or

(2) the supplemental proposed rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: EGUs in Indian Country and U.S. Territories; Multi-Jurisdictional Partnerships'' published at 79 Fed. Reg. 65482 (November 4, 2014).

(c) PERIOD DESCRIBED.—The time period described in this subsection is the period of days that—

(1) begins on the date that is 60 days after the day on which notice of promulgation of a final rule described in subsection (b) appears in the Federal Register; and

(2) ends on the date on which judgment becomes final, and no longer subject to further appeal or review, in all actions (including actions that are filed pursuant to section 307 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7607))—

(A) that are filed during the 60 days described in paragraph (1); and

(B) that seek review of any aspect of such rule.

SEC. 3. RATEPAYER PROTECTION.

(a) EFFECTS OF PLANS.—No State shall be required to adopt or submit a State plan, and no

State or entity within a State shall become subject to a Federal plan, pursuant to any final rule described in section 2(b), if the Governor of such State makes a determination, and notifies the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, that implementation of the State or Federal plan would—

(1) have a significant adverse effect on the State's residential, commercial, or industrial ratepayers, taking into account—

(A) rate increases that would be necessary to implement, or are associated with, the State or Federal plan; and

(B) other rate increases that have been or are anticipated to be necessary to implement, or are associated with, other Federal or State environmental requirements; or

(2) have a significant adverse effect on the reliability of the State's electricity system, taking into account the effects on the State's—

(A) existing and planned generation and retirements;

(B) existing and planned transmission and distribution infrastructure; and

(C) projected electricity demands.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In making a determination under subsection (a), the Governor of a State shall consult with—

(1) the public utility commission or public service commission of the State;

(2) the environmental protection, public health, and economic development departments or agencies of the State; and

(3) the Electric Reliability Organization (as defined in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o)).

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–177. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–177.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate subsection (b) as subsection (c)):

(b) ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATION REGARDING COSTS OF RESPONDING TO HUMAN-CAUSED CLIMATE CHANGE.—For a Governor's determination to have the effect described in subsection (a), such determination shall include a certification that—

(1) electricity generating units are sources of carbon pollution that contribute to human-induced climate change; and

(2) the State or Federal plan to reduce carbon emissions from electric utility generating units would promote national security, economic growth, and public health by addressing human-induced climate change through the increased use of clean energy, energy efficiency, and reductions in carbon pollution.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment includes language identical to an amendment recently offered by Senator BENNET and approved during the Senate budget process. It is simple enough. In order to opt out, a Governor must certify that the State or Federal plan would ''promote national security, economic growth and public health by addressing human induced climate change through the increased use of clean energy, energy efficiency and reductions in carbon pollution.''

This clear and concise language passed the Senate in the budget bill with the support of seven Republican Senators along with all the Democratic Senators. Republican Senators like DEAN HELLER, MARK KIRK, and ROB PORTMAN voted for this language, as did the chair of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, who is from Alaska, where the impacts of climate change are undeniable.

Let me just start by quoting pro-coal Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia: ''There is no question that climate change is real and that billions of people have impacted the world's climate. This amendment supports investment in clean energy technology, including advanced fossil energy, and supports energy efficiency, which reduces carbon while saving customers money. We can protect the environment for future generations while ensuring that we have affordable and reliable energy sources today.''

That is a quote from Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should be clear about where Members of this esteemed committee stand on the reality of human-induced climate change and whether or not it needs to be addressed. Senators have had to stand up and be counted, so we here in the House should do the same.

Some on the Republican side of the aisle have said that they are not climate deniers. Well, if that is the case, then this should be a very easy vote for them, in my opinion. But it wouldn't surprise me if some or all on the Republican side oppose this amendment. In the Committee on Energy and Commerce, it was voted down twice: first in the subcommittee, and then in the full committee along party lines.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. This amendment still allows the Governor to opt out of the Federal plan. It doesn't really change the substance of the bill. This amendment is for anyone who believes in human-induced climate change, regardless of their views on various approaches to deal with the problem. You can vote for my amendment and, if you must, still oppose the clean power plan. But if you vote against my amendment, it can only mean, in my opinion, that you are against any solution to climate change.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I want to say that I have the utmost respect for my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who is the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. He is always thoroughly prepared and does a great job, but I respectfully must disagree with him on this amendment.

Just reading the amendment, there doesn't seem to be that much wrong with it, and really there is not that much wrong with it; but I would point out that this amendment suggests that the Federal Government is not taking action about climate change. The fact is, we have 18 Federal agencies administering 61 separate programs on climate change, and since 2008, we have spent over $77 billion addressing it. That is not even including the regulations coming out of EPA. Last year alone, the Federal Government spent $23 billion on climate change.

I would just point out that this bill is about responding to States who are asking us for help. They need more time to address this very complex regulation that will be coming out of EPA very soon. We can't have a debate about it without talking about climate change. But as I said earlier, everyone recognizes the climate has been changing since the beginning of time. I read an article the other day, in the 13th century, they had grape vineyards in northern England. That is not true today.

Where we differ with the President is that the President has made it very clear that he thinks climate change is the number one issue facing mankind. We recognize that it is a problem, but we think there are other more pressing issues out there and that this administration seems to be obsessed with climate change.

We think creating jobs, economic growth, clean water, health care, and trying to solve pancreatic cancer are more important. We have countries in Africa, representatives in Africa and Bangladesh telling us we are more concerned about just having electricity, just having enough food. So that is the big difference between us and the President.

Like I said, we are simply trying to give States more time, giving them the option to opt out if they need to. We want the courts to render a decision that this is legal before they have to start spending the resources and the money to respond to it. For that reason, I would respectfully disagree with this amendment and ask that our Members vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield myself the remainder of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say once again that, again, I respect my colleague from Kentucky a great deal, but I don't see how this amendment even says that climate change is a priority. It is simply saying that it should be addressed in the context of any Governor's effort to opt out. Now, I don't think that Governors should be opting out, but at least if they decide to do so, then they should be able to certify the reference to these various issues, including public health and climate change.

Again, we talk about climate change. I understand what the gentleman is saying, but in terms of priorities, keep in mind that public health is a priority. The gentleman mentioned pancreatic cancer. I was thinking that the group that are advocates for trying to cure pancreatic cancer probably came to see him yesterday as they came to see me. We don't even know what the cause of it is. It may very well be that there are environmental causes in the air that lead to pancreatic cancer. So I think that it does need to be a priority. Climate change does need to be a priority.

But again, you can vote for this amendment without saying that climate change is your biggest priority. We are simply saying that when a Governor decides to opt out, which I don't think they should, that they have to say that they certify that they have looked at the public health, that they have looked at climate change, that they have looked at increased use of clean energy and other issues. I see no reason why anyone on either side of the aisle shouldn't support the amendment for that reason.

I yield back the balance of my time and urge passage of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

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

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

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

□ 1545

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–177.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate subsection (b) as subsection (c)):

(b) ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATION REGARDING COSTS OF RESPONDING TO HUMAN-CAUSED CLIMATE CHANGE.—For a Governor's determination to have the effect described in subsection (a), such determination shall include a certification that the inapplicability of a State or Federal plan described in such subsection will not have a significant adverse effect on costs associated with a State's plan to respond to extreme weather events associated with human-caused climate change, taking into account any costs necessary to—

(1) adapt or respond to increased sea level rise or flooding;

(2) prepare for or respond to more frequent and intense storms;

(3) fight or otherwise respond to more frequent and intense wildfires; and

(4) adapt or respond to increased drought.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, which I prefer to call the ''Just Say No'' bill, would effectively give Governors the power to opt out of the Federal requirements of the EPA's proposed clean power plan if they decide that complying with the plan would have an adverse effect on either rates or reliability.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the language allowing a Governor to opt out is ambiguous and does not take into account other costs that States are already paying due to the impacts of climate change.

So, Mr. Chairman, in order to address this issue, I am offering a straightforward amendment that simply states that a Governor must certify that, within his or her State, any ratepayer increases associated with implementing a State or Federal plan would be greater than any costs associated with responding to extreme weather conditions associated with human-caused climate change.

Mr. Chairman, this would include the costs associated with cleaning up after mass flooding, intense wildfires, more frequent and intense storms, as well as the costs associated with loss of crops and livestock due to increased drought.

Mr. Chairman, as any State that has had to deal with the aftermath of any of these destructive extreme weather events can attest, Americans are already shouldering the costs of climate change—and these costs are getting worse and worse. In fact, according to the National Climate Assessment, if we do not seriously invest in addressing climate change impacts now, we can expect to see more expensive and costly future damages associated with almost every facet of our society, from negative health impacts, to stressing our infrastructure and water system, to harming our national security, up to and including hurting our overall long-term economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, just 2 days ago, on Monday, the EPA, in collaboration with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Pacific Northwest National Lab, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, released a peer-reviewed study detailing the costs if we fail to address climate change. This report stated that failure to act could cost 12,000 lives from extreme temperatures and 57,000 lives from poor air quality in the year 2100, as well as cost the country hundreds of billions of dollars each and every year.

The analysis also looked at the impact of climate change on health, electricity, infrastructure, water resources, agriculture, forestry, and the ecosystem. It found that if we acted to reduce emissions, we could avert loss of life, reduce the number of droughts and floods, and save up to $34 billion in power system costs in the year 2050 alone.

So, Mr. Chairman, with all of these dire warnings coming from both the experts as well as from Mother Nature herself, we cannot allow Governors to ''just say no'' to reducing harmful pollutants from their States and simply put their heads in the sand.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that Governors are held accountable for their failure to act to reduce harmful pollutants that impact the overall public good.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, with great respect to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), whom I have had the privilege of sitting through 5 years, it seems like, of hearings almost every day, while I have the greatest respect for him, I do rise in opposition to this amendment.

His amendment would basically say that State Governors must certify that the cost to the ratepayers under EPA's 111(d) rule would exceed the costs associated with responding to extreme weather events.

I point out once again that in The Economist magazine just this May, a few weeks ago, they were quoting scientists who were saying it is impossible to say categorically that climate change has caused any individual storm, flood, drought, heat wave, tornado, hurricane, or any other adverse weather effect. So that correlation has simply not been established scientifically.

This amendment would require State Governors to make a certification on something that they cannot do, even the EPA itself will not and cannot do, which is to show any direct benefit on climate events from their rule.

EPA has said in their own testimony that this rule, this regulation, will not have a significant impact on climate events in the U.S. As a matter of fact, in April testimony before Congress, Acting Assistant Administrator McCabe indicated that EPA could not predict the impact of the rule on any of its climate indicators. So they are adopting this rule as simply following up on the President's Georgetown speech in which he laid out his climate plan.

But I would like to point out that America is addressing climate change. I would say once again, we have 61 government programs involved. We have 18 Federal agencies involved. We spent a total of $77 billion since 2008. We are doing all sorts of things.

This bill is simply to give States enough time to respond to this very complex regulation until after the courts have rendered a decision.

And so, with that, I would respectfully request Members to oppose the Rush amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114–177.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2 of the bill, add the following:

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The Congress encourages the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in promulgating, implementing, or enforcing any final rule described in subsection (b), to specifically address how the megawatt hours discharged from a pumped hydroelectric storage system will be incorporated into State and Federal implementation plans adopted pursuant to any such final rule.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, for bringing this important bill to the floor to empower States to protect consumers from higher electric rates and to ensure grid reliability. In fact, when I was in the State legislature back in Michigan, I served as the vice chair of our Energy and Technology Committee and spent a lot of time and work on grid reliability and cost issues.

Under the clean power plan, the EPA would set mandatory carbon dioxide emission levels for each State and require that they submit State plans to meet their EPA-established ''goals.''

While I have many concerns about the proposed rule, I am offering this amendment to highlight how the EPA's approach to calculating emissions actually discourages the kind of emission reductions that it is intended to promote.

Here is how. The EPA's compliance formula does not include a way to calculate the benefits of clean energy storage. Michigan is a prime example of the importance of energy storage via the Ludington Pumped Storage reservoir in west Michigan, in the Second District.

Ludington Pumped Storage was the largest pumped storage hydroelectric facility in the world when it was constructed. I remember as a young man, my dad was in construction, and we would do Sunday drives an hour and a half north just to see progress on this. It is an 842-acre reservoir that is 2½ miles long and holds 27 billion gallons of water. In the last couple of years, it now includes a wind farm with 56 turbines that are generating an additional 100 megawatts. Ludington can generate up to 1,872 megawatts, which is enough electricity to serve a community of 1.4 million residential customers.

Here is how the pump storage works. At night, when electric rates are low—and oftentimes the wind is blowing in west Michigan, and those turbines are going—Ludington's reversible turbines down at the lake level pump water up the 363-foot hill from Lake Michigan to the reservoir. Then, during the day, when electric demand is high, the reservoir releases water to flow downhill and it turns the turbines to make carbon-free electricity. And that is very, very helpful, obviously especially in the summertime when we have peak times.

In fact, when I was in the State legislature, I was standing next to those turbines and they got the call that they needed peak electricity because a substation had gone down in southeast Michigan. Literally, within 10 minutes, those turbines were spinning and producing electricity and putting it back out on the grid, thereby saving a whole lot of expenses they were going to look at in needing to go out on the MISO system to purchase that electricity.

In addition to it being carbon-free, there are no other emissions being pumped from the storage generation either.

Ironically, the proposed rule would penalize States like Michigan and Virginia that have prudently invested in energy storage technology because the emissions and megawatt hours from plants used to charge the system are included in the EPA's equation. However, the megawatt hours discharged from the storage system are not. Thus, according to the EPA, a State's emissions intensity actually increases if they utilize clean energy storage. That is the exact opposite of what I hope is the EPA's goal of this rule.

This amendment simply encourages the EPA to explicitly authorize States to include clean energy storage in their compliance plans.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment and the underlying bill so that States can best protect their residents from the significant economic and reliability impact the proposed rule could have.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), my colleague.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

He has his photo of the hydroelectric pump storage facility. His is from the right. I have a picture from the left. It is a different view, but it is the same facility.

This is really important. I support this amendment. With electricity demands varying, as Mr. HUIZENGA said, throughout peak and nonpeak times, Michigan companies produce and store reserve energy in this facility for future use when demand is high, which provides, as was said, energy literally at a moment's notice, which is critical for grid stability and also critical to keep prices low for our consumers.

This technology allows our companies to respond quickly when demand exceeds base load capacity, especially during extreme weather events such as heat waves and polar vortexes.

The EPA has repeatedly recognized the need for large-scale storage facilities like Ludington's and how pumped hydroelectric storage can fill this role, but the EPA's proposed rule compliance formula does not include a way to calculate the benefits of pumped hydroelectric storage.

□ 1600

With this amendment, we would like to encourage the EPA to address specifically how pumped hydroelectric storage will be counted in Michigan and other States, so the consumers will have access. This is important for Michigan.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am not going to oppose the amendment, but I would like to speak to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. First, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I am not going to take the time, maybe give it back to the two gentlemen whom I joined on this amendment as well.

This is one of those things that is common sense—at least, we believe in. Our people back home, they don't understand this in dealing with some regulation on why we are trying to encourage this clean resource and this energy and pumping the hydroelectric and not getting the credit for it.

I have had to deal with this on the core issues on some others where we are actually trying to do what is right for the environment and also trying to

do for sustainable and renewable energy.

So I just wanted to say thanks for this amendment. I think we are working toward the right way, and I think this sense of Congress to say ''study this'' is the positive way we look at this and we work forward toward using all the resources and all the energy sources that we have and using those in a very productive way.

I just wanted to put my support to this and look forward to this amendment being approved. I join with my two other cosponsors on this as well.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for raising the issue and the gentleman from Georgia.

It does illustrate some of the shortcomings of this proposed regulation because, instead of encouraging clean renewable energy, it, in effect, is discouraging it because they are not getting credit for it. That is another problem.

For that reason, we would be happy to accept this amendment and include it as part of this bill. Thank you all very much for bringing it to our attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114–177.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 2.

Redesignate section 3 as section 2 and amend such section (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

SEC. 2. RATEPAYER PROTECTION.

(a) EFFECTS OF PLANS.—In developing a State or Federal plan pursuant to any final rule described in subsection (c), a State or the Administrator shall—

(1) consult with the State's public utility commission or public service commission, and the Electric Reliability Organization; and

(2) to the extent available, consider any independent reliability analysis prepared by such entities during development of such plan.

(b) INDEPENDENT RELIABILITY ANALYSIS.—In preparing an independent reliability analysis for purposes of subsection (a), a State's public utility commission or public service commission, and the Electric Reliability Organization, shall evaluate the anticipated effects of implementation and enforcement of the final rule on—

(1) regional electric reliability and resource adequacy;

(2) operation of wholesale electricity markets within the region involved;

(3) existing and planned transmission and distribution infrastructure; and

(4) projected electricity demands.

(c) FINAL RULES DESCRIBED.—A final rule described in this subsection is any final rule to address carbon dioxide emissions from existing sources that are fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)), including any final rule that succeeds—

(1) the proposed rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' published at 79 Fed. Reg. 34830 (June 18, 2014); or

(2) the supplemental proposed rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: EDUs in Indian Country and U.S. Territories; Multi-Jurisdictional Partnerships'' published at 79 Fed. Reg 65482 (November 4, 2014).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''Electric Reliability Organization'' has the meaning given to such term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(a)).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend my colleague from Kentucky on his efforts to protect consumers and ratepayers. I share that goal. However, we also need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and we can protect customers, consumers, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions simultaneously.

My amendment is intended as a compromise that is practical and would both protect consumers and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

I worked in the energy industry for two decades before coming to Congress. I worked with the utilities sector, with the national laboratories, and with other stakeholders. I know these issues. I have been on the ground. So I can appreciate the need for a secure, reliable electric grid. I clearly understand the need for certainty and flexibility.

That is one of the reasons I cofounded the bipartisan Grid Innovation Caucus, to help address the pressing issues affecting our Nation's electric grid. We are focusing on hardening the grid, protecting against cyber threats, responsiveness to extreme weather events, and ensuring grid reliability and resiliency.

H.R. 2042 will stop the EPA's proposed clean power plan and proposed ozone standard from taking effect. This would sharply limit our Nation's ability to address climate change and the growing negative consequences it has on public health and our economy.

To address this, my amendment will make two changes:

First, it strikes section 2 of the bill, which prevents any rule from taking place until all litigation is complete. That provision would add considerable uncertainty to the entire process and introduce a significant precedent into the Federal rulemaking process. If a delay is appropriate, let's introduce a simple delay.

Second, my amendment replaces the ability of States to opt out of the plan with the requirement that the State public utility commissions or public service commissions, as well as the appropriate electric reliability organization, issue reliability analyses on any State or Federal plan. In this bill's current form, allowing States to opt out of the Federal law would create a significant barrier to Federal authority.

The analysis that my amendment calls for must include effects on regional electric reliability and resource adequacy, operation of wholesale electric markets, transmission and distribution infrastructure, and projected electricity demands.

Federal agencies have varied expertise and missions and not all are equipped to properly assess potential impacts that a rule may have on a particular industry. Consequently, we need collaboration at all levels.

In a letter to the EPA earlier this year, FERC stated that working together with the EPA, ISOs, RTOs, and the States will be essential as plans are developed. FERC wrote that, ''its rate jurisdiction, at times, has effects on reliability issues. But, reliability also depends on factors beyond the Commission's jurisdiction, such as State authority over local distribution and integrated resource planning.''

So I think it is an overstatement to claim that the clean power plan or the ozone standard would be the sole cause of impacts on rates or reliability.

My amendment mirrors FERC's comments and ensures that an independent analysis is conducted by experts who deal with the grid on a daily basis because the EPA is not an expert on grid reliability.

If we want to add safeguards to add transparency and accountability, we need to ensure that States and regions have their voices heard. A practical way to accomplish that is by having the PUC and ISO submit a reliability report to the EPA.

Grid reliability is a bipartisan issue. If my amendment is adopted, it will help move the ball forward on this important issue. If not, H.R. 2042 will just be another messaging bill that the President will almost certainly veto. I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Once again, I would like to thank Mr. MCNERNEY for this amendment. I have certainly enjoyed working with him on our committee. He certainly understands energy.

I must say that I have to respectfully disagree with him on this amendment. His amendment would basically strike the substantive part of our bill. As I have said in the beginning, this proposed regulation is so far outside the bounds of anything EPA has ever attempted before because these plants are already regulated under section 112. It specifically states if they are regulated there, they can't be regulated under 111(d).

So we are trying to respond to the States. EPA, we expect, is going to

give them 13 months to comply. There have been many lawsuits already filed. There are going to be more lawsuits filed.

Because it is so costly, so complex, and they are under such time constraints, we simply want to delay the State implementation plans until after the courts have made a decision.

Also, his amendment would eliminate the Governor's finding of a significantly adverse impact on electricity rates and reliability and simply say that they have got to come up with this State implementation plan by working with utility commissioners and NERC, which they will be doing anyway. So if our bill is vetoed, that is where they are going to be anyway.

So I would respectfully oppose this amendment as certainly defeating what we are trying to do. With great respect to Mr. MCNERNEY, I would oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the chairman's thoughtful remarks and his concern about the effects of the clean power plan.

My recommendation is that, if a delay is required, let's just introduce a specific delay, 1 year or 2 years. Introducing a bill that requires all the judicial matters to be settled before a plan can come into effect is just too vague. It doesn't make sense. I think it will do a lot more damage.

What we are asking for is that the States and the local authorities produce a reliability plan so that they will understand the effects of the clean power plan. It is really a compromise position. If we want to move forward, then, let's adopt a compromise. If we want to make a message bill, let's move forward with the existing plan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114–177.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF HYDROPOWER AS RENEWABLE ENERGY.

In issuing, implementing, and enforcing any final rule described in section 2(b), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall treat hydropower as renewable energy.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the good gentleman from Kentucky for his work on this bill.

I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, and urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

This amendment, which I am proud to introduce with my friend and colleague from the State of Washington, Congresswoman JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, would very simply direct the Environmental Protection Agency to consider hydropower as a renewable energy source when issuing, implementing, and enforcing any final rule regarding carbon dioxide emissions from existing power plants under the Clean Air Act.

EPA's misguided proposed clean power plan, which the Agency announced in June of 2014, attempts to regulate and reduce the amount of carbon emitted from the power sector by setting emission guidelines for each individual State. Under the proposed rule, my home State of Washington would be responsible for an unattainable 72 percent reduction in its carbon emissions by the year 2030.

To put this into context, the State of Iowa would be required to reduce carbon emissions by 16 percent, the State of Kentucky by 18 percent, and the State of North Dakota by 11 percent. I believe the proposed clean power plan would have devastating consequences for each and every State, as well as for the country at large, which is why I am proud to cosponsor and support H.R. 2042.

Mr. Chairman, the requirements placed on Washington by this misguided rule are simply unachievable. It will hurt our families and our small businesses by raising the cost of electricity, and it will cost our economy billions of dollars just to comply.

My amendment would seek to provide a reality check to EPA and highlight the effect this regulation would have on such States as Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and South Dakota, which are blessed with abundant sources of hydropower, a nonemitting energy source. However, under the EPA's plan, hydropower is not treated as a renewable energy source, despite the fact that the Obama administration has recently been touting the potential of hydropower as part of its all-the-above energy strategy.

In fact, Mr. Chair, last April, Secretary Moniz discussed the importance of hydropower and described it as a renewable in an address to the National Hydropower Association. In his remarks, the Secretary stated: ''We have to pick up the covers off of this hidden renewable that is right in front of our eyes and continues to have significant potential.''

Yet, despite this public praise for hydropower and recognition of it as a renewable, the EPA decided to push a plan that explicitly neglects hydropower as a renewable in favor of other sources, such as wind and solar.

□ 1615

Additionally, the EPA's plan uses the year 2012 as its baseline for each State's carbon reduction goals, and this will also negatively impact my home State and others in the Northwest.

In 2012, Oregon and Washington experienced unusually high levels of rainfall, unfortunately, unlike this year, which led to a sharp increase in hydropower production; and, therefore, we used less energy from fossil fuel sources.

As a result, the proposed rule seriously underestimates the average amount of carbon used by my State in its power production which, in reality, is much higher than the EPA 2012 baseline. Because hydropower is not viewed as a renewable, we will have to utilize impractical amounts of other renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar, to meet the EPA's goals.

Mr. Chair, the effects of this decision in States with large amounts of existing hydroelectric power, such as mine, Oregon, South Dakota, and Idaho, are significantly disadvantaged under the rule and will not get credit for their existing hydroelectric generation and infrastructure.

However, my amendment would address this issue by directing EPA to simply recognize hydropower as a renewable energy source. This would in no way restrict the goals of H.R. 2042, which I fully support, nor would it negatively affect other nonhydropower States. It just highlights the misguided rule put forth by the Agency.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the Newhouse-Herrera Beutler amendment and the underlying bill, and I urge the amendment's adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the Newhouse amendment seeks to legislatively adjust an element of the EPA's clean power plan, but the amendment does nothing to fix the problems in the rest of the bill, which was actually designed to cripple the EPA's ability to curb emissions from power plants and allows Governors to thumb their noses at the Clean Air Act.

The Newhouse amendment would make more sense if it were a comment submitted to the EPA on the proposed rule, rather than being attached to legislation that would gut the clean power plan altogether.

In fact, the EPA is actively considering this issue already. The proposed clean power plan would have allowed new and incremental hydropower to count towards compliance with the

rule, but it did not consider existing hydropower in either goal setting or for compliance.

EPA received many comments on including hydropower in setting the clean power plan's goals and treating hydropower as an eligible measure to lower CO_2 emissions.

EPA has engaged in outreach to numerous stakeholders about hydropower, renewable energy, and other low- and zero-emitting sources of power to better understand issues raised in their comments; and it is giving careful consideration to all comments received.

There are varying views on this topic, and it should be left, in my opinion, to the rulemaking process to sort out the best approach.

Since EPA is actively considering the comments received on hydropower, the amendment is not necessary, and in fact, it could be counterproductive. Ultimately, approval of the Newhouse amendment would do nothing to change the fundamental flaws of the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–177 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 245, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

AYES—181

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

NOES—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
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
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Clyburn
Hanna
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Pelosi
Sarbanes

□ 1649

Mrs. WALORSKI, Messrs. MULLIN, WALKER, BARLETTA, RYAN of Wisconsin, POE of Texas, CHAFFETZ, HUELSKAMP, Mses. GRANGER and SEWELL of Alabama changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. CROWLEY, HUFFMAN, Mesdames LAWRENCE and TORRES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during roll-call vote No. 381. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the Pallone Amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 243, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—182

Adams
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—243

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

NOT VOTING—8

Clyburn
Hanna
Kelly (MS)
Larson (CT)
Napolitano
Payne
Pelosi
Sarbanes

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1655

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 382. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the Rush of Illinois Amendment #2.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, on June 24, 2015—I was not present for rollcall vote 382. If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted: "yay" on rollcall vote 382.

Stated against:

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 382 I inadvertently voted "yes", when I wanted to vote "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 250, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—177

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

NOES—250

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
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
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Clyburn
Hanna
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Sarbanes

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1701

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 383. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the McNerney of California Amendment No. 4.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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, pursuant to House Resolution 333, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. ROBY was allowed to speak out of order.)

SEVENTH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues this afternoon to remind all that today is a very special day. Today is the Seventh Annual Congressional Women's Softball Game that we play for the Young Survival Coalition. Each of us is playing either in memory of or in honor of a survivor.

No one in this room is untouched by cancer, so I would just encourage all of my colleagues to join us tonight. The first pitch is at 7 o'clock at the Watkins Recreation Center.

Members can bring all of their staffs and their interns and their friends and their families. It will be a great event.

Beat cancer, and beat the press.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we are really so gratified to have been able to have spent the last 3 months practicing every morning at 7 a.m.

Our team—I just keep repeating that over and over, and maybe it will come true—is bipartisan. It is an opportunity every year for us to come together and bridge the divide around a cause that is so meaningful and important for so many women all across America.

I thank all of you every year for your support and for the turnout and for the love and affection that we have for one another in that we are able to put aside our differences. As a breast cancer survivor myself—diagnosed at 41—I just can't thank my colleagues enough for their time.

I will close by saying that the Member team is the defending champion; and, tonight, we will keep the trophy. Go, Members. Beat the press. Beat cancer.

Please join us at 420 12th Street Southeast, at the Watkins Recreation Center. The first pitch is at 7 p.m. It is a great game. Come by. Eat hot dogs. Cheer us on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, this will be a 5-minute vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 180, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—247

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
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)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—180

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Clyburn
Hanna
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Sarbanes

□ 1719

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 384 on H.R. 2042, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 384. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on passage of H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concurs in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2146) ''An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced pursuant to section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy:

The Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), designee of the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), designee of the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House. The form of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas on December 20, 1860, South Carolina became the first State to secede from the Union;

Whereas on January 9, 1861, Mississippi seceded from the Union, stating in its ''Declaration of Immediate Causes'' that ''[olur position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery—the greatest material interest of the world.'';

Whereas on February 9, 1861, the Confederate States of America was formed with a group of 11 States as a purported sovereign nation and with Jefferson Davis of Mississippi as its president;

Whereas on March 11, 1861, the Confederate States of America adopted its own constitution;

Whereas on April 12, 1861, the Confederate States of America fired shots upon Fort Sumter in Charleston, South Carolina, effectively beginning the Civil War;

Whereas the United States did not recognize the Confederate States of America as a sovereign nation, but rather as a rebel insurrection, and took to military battle to bring the rogue states back into the Union;

Whereas on April 9, 1865, General Robert E. Lee surrendered to General Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House in Virginia, effectively, ending the Civil War and preserving the Union;

Whereas during the Civil War, the Confederate States of America used the Navy Jack, Battle Flag, and other imagery as a symbols of the Confederate armed forces;

Whereas since the end of the Civil War, the Navy Jack, Confederate battle flag, and other imagery of the Confederacy have been appropriated by groups as a symbols of hate, terror, intolerance, and as supportive of the institution of slavery;

Whereas groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacist groups utilize Confederate imagery to frighten, terrorize, and cause harm to groups of people toward whom they have hateful intent, including African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Jewish Americans;

Whereas many State and Federal political leaders, including United States Senators Thad Cochran and Roger Wicker, along with Mississippi House Speaker Philip Gunn and other State leaders, have spoken out and advocated for the removal of the imagery of the Confederacy on Mississippi's state flag;

Whereas many Members of Congress, including Speaker John Boehner, support the removal of the Confederate flag from the grounds of South Carolina's capitol;

Whereas Speaker John Boehner released a statement on the issue saying, ''I commend Governor Nikki Haley and other South Carolina leaders in their effort to remove the Confederate flag from Statehouse grounds. In his second inaugural address 150 years ago, and a month before his assassination, President Abraham Lincoln ended his speech with these powerful words, which are as meaningful today as when they were spoken on the East Front of the Capitol on March 4, 1865: '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.' '';

Whereas the House of Representatives has several State flags with imagery of the Confederacy throughout its main structures and House office buildings;

Whereas it is an uncontroverted fact that symbols of the Confederacy offend and insult many members of the general public who use the hallways of Congress each day;

Whereas Congress has never permanently recognized in its hallways the symbols of sovereign nations with whom it has gone to war or rogue entities such as the Confederate States of America;

Whereas continuing to display a symbol of hatred, oppression, and insurrection that nearly tore our Union apart and that is known to offend many groups throughout the country would irreparably damage the reputation of this august institution and offend the very dignity of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas this impairment of the dignity of the House and its Members constitutes a violation under rule IX of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall remove any State flag containing any portion of the Confederate battle flag, other than a flag displayed by the office of a Member of the House, from any area within the House wing of the Capitol or any House office building, and shall donate any such flag to the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Mississippi will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER SONNY KIM

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, last week, Cincinnati lost a hero in blue. A 27-year veteran of the Cincinnati Police Department, Officer Sonny Kim lived a life of service to his family, his department, and his city.

We mourn for a life cut short while serving in the line of duty. Officer Kim is remembered as a model police officer, husband, and father, an officer with 22 commendations during his decorated career. His lasting memory stands as a testament to the best of our community and society.

Mr. Speaker, police officers deal with people every day, usually people at their very worst, and they do so selflessly and tirelessly, but we must never take that service for granted.

We mourn with Officer Kim's wife, his sons, and his sisters and brothers who served alongside him.

Rest in peace, Officer Kim. Your good deeds will not be forgotten.

□ 1730

REMEMBERING WILLIAM WHITE

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, recently, we lost William White to cancer, but his contributions to his community and dedication to his friends and family will not be forgotten. His life is yet another example of the American Dream realized.

Born in 1930, in Brooklyn, Bill started out selling printing presses in New York. Eventually, he would join forces with his brother Tom to build some of New York City's most impressive restaurants.

While he was well known for his success in business, Bill was also an important member of his community in Point Lookout, New York. There, he established the chamber of commerce and was an active member of the Point Lookout Civic Association. He was a true example that we can all find a way to serve and give something back to this great Nation.

He met his wife of almost 60 years, Patricia, at a dance near West Point in 1955. He and Pat traveled the world, always excited to explore culture and cuisine on their next great adventure.

They had one child, Bill, who works in philanthropy and has helped raise hundreds of millions of dollars for our Nation's veterans. I know that Bill was very proud of his son. His legacy of service, carried on by his son, has meant that thousands of veterans—our Nation's heroes—have received help they otherwise would not have received.

While this is a painful time for all who knew Bill, I know his family and friends can be proud of the life he lived and his dedication to his family and his country.

SONORAN CORRIDOR

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, the number one priority I hear from my constituents is creating more jobs and economic opportunity in southern Arizona, and this week, I introduced legislation, along with my Arizona colleagues, to do just that.

Southern Arizona already plays a vital role in our Nation's trade partnership with Mexico through its proximity to the border and key interstate systems, but more can be done to take advantage of these invaluable assets.

Right now, trucks driving north on Interstate 19 from the Mariposa Port of Entry at Nogales must travel on congested city routes before meeting Interstate 10 to travel east. This impedes the flow of traffic and wastes valuable time and money.

A connection between the two highways south of Tucson would reduce this congestion, help attract businesses to southern Arizona, and expand trade connectivity for the southwestern United States and Mexico.

My bill, the Sonoran Corridor Interstate Development Act, would designate this proposed connection a high-priority corridor on the National Highway System. It has the support of the entire Arizona delegation.

Its passage is in the best interest of southern Arizona, our State, and our country; and I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this important project forward.

AURORA POLICE OFFICER DAVID BEMER

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in the last year, we have seen far too many examples of conflict and violence in our communities. While we cannot forget or ignore these tragedies, it is important that we recognize the good that is happening throughout our country every day.

I would like to take a moment to share with you one example. While out on patrol, Aurora, Illinois, Police Officer David Bemer stopped when he saw a group of teens in the street. Some of the kids said they were alarmed, not knowing why he was stopping or what might happen next.

They explained that they were all part of a dance group called Simply Destinee and were practicing in the alley because their dance studio had lost electrical power. What happened next was something that we would all love to see much more of.

Officer Bemer got out of his car and danced with the kids. The video from this apparently went viral, highlighting exactly the kind of community engagement that we would love to see more of.

This is what happens when police officers like those in my district get to know their communities and communities get to know their police officers.

It is only when we work together—police officers, side by side with members of the community—that we make real and lasting progress.

Mr. Speaker, that leaves a smile on my face.

CONGRATULATING WAYZATA HIGH SCHOOL BOYS TRACK AND FIELD

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Wayzata High School boys track and field team on winning the Minnesota State championship.

After coming up just short the last 2 years, the Trojans were boosted by strong performances from distance runners Jaret Carpenter and Connor Olson. In addition, Wayzata was led by Wesley Jackson's second-place finish in the long jump, Tyler Didier's third-place finish in the 400-meter dash, and a number of strong relay teams. It absolutely was a complete team effort.

These athletes spend practice after practice pushing themselves and each other to reach their personal bests. In addition, every single one of these student athletes still manage to meet and excel at other school, family, and social obligations.

Mr. Speaker, the families, teachers, friends, and entire community are very proud of these high school champs.

Congratulations to Coach Aaron Berndt and the Wayzata High School boys track and field team on a job well done.

ISIS PROMOTES SLAVERY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, according to news reports, ISIS is holding competitions at mosques to celebrate Ramadan. Here is the challenge: memorize the Koran. The prize—get this—is a young female sex slave.

As a father and a grandfather, I am repulsed by the fact that young women—just kids—are being handed out like door prizes in a Koran contest. Second and third place apparently receive the same reward, kidnapped young teenage girls.

This competition is advertised on flyers and marketed to young males. The arrogance, barbarity, and brutality of this terrorist enterprise has no limits. ISIS pillages, rapes, and kills their way across the Middle East. They brazenly broadcast decapitations, slowly drown people in cages, and burn captors alive.

ISIS is an enemy of all states. Its terrorist reign of religious genocide threatens all humanity in a path of murderous anarchy. The world must ban together to destroy these subhuman radical jihadists.

Justice demands these killers be held accountable for their crimes against all peoples of the world, including little girls.

And that is just the way it is.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Florida International University on the celebration of their 50th anniversary earlier this week on June 22.

This great accomplishment gives all Floridians an opportunity to recognize this special institution and all who have contributed to FIU's success throughout the years should be proud.

FIU is located in Florida's 26th Congressional District, where over 17,000 of my constituents are enrolled as students and an additional 2,400 graduated last year. In my time serving south Florida in Congress, I have witnessed this university's passion for helping students seek higher education to better themselves while giving back to our community.

Mr. Speaker, south Florida is a place where people from all over the world come seeking opportunity and success; many find it at FIU.

On the occasion of FIU's 50th anniversary, I salute all those who have dedicated their careers to improving the lives of scholars. I know many proud graduates who today are leaders in our community.

Once again, congratulations. I know that the next 50 years will bring even greater success and achievement.

Go Panthers.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. As we do almost every week, my colleagues and I are here on the floor this evening to urge the people's House to take up the issues that matter to the people.

This week, we are still reeling from the tragedy in South Carolina. My colleagues and I are urging Members on both sides of the aisle to take a look at an issue we have consistently and painfully avoided for years, what we are doing to prevent gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Second Amendment and Americans' rights to reasonable, responsible gun ownership; but it is time for us in America to admit we have a problem.

When I see more than two dozen people shot in one weekend in my hometown of Detroit, when I see the face of a deranged and hate-fueled young man—a man who should have never had a gun but was able to destroy the lives of nine amazing people who welcomed him into their church in South Carolina—I know it is time for America to embrace commonsense gun control.

In the span of about 24 hours, 27 people were shot and 3 were killed in Detroit, Michigan. It is a city that I represent, along with my esteemed colleague Congressman JOHN CONYERS. The FBI and the Detroit Police Department confirm that, in the city of Detroit, overall crime is down; yet gun deaths are on the rise.

Ninety percent of Americans who were polled want universal background checks for gun purchases. That is 90 percent. What are we waiting for?

There is not a Member of Congress who has not been touched by gun violence. That includes one of our own, a colleague that was highly respected, Gabby Giffords.

How many more deaths must families and communities endure? How many more funerals must we attend? How many children must be orphaned? How many parents must suffer the unspeakable heartbreak of losing a child?

There is no question that we must act, and we must act now. How many times must we watch on national news what uncontrolled gun violence can do to our country?

That action must focus on three principles: establish universal background checks; eliminate the gun show loopholes that allow a person to walk in, pick up a gun, and walk out the door; and enforce our existing gun control laws.

We have seen countries all over the globe who are not experiencing the gun violence that we have here in America, and their citizens have the right to own guns.

It is time for us to awaken from a sleep of the past and address this issue and address it now.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for taking the time to join us and sharing that important message. I join her in her sentiments.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding as we continue this important conversation.

Every day in America, we navigate the threat of gun violence. From metal detectors in public buildings to shooting safety drills at schools and movie theaters, guns affect how we live and whether we live at all; yet, when gun violence intruded into the most sacred of places, piercing the peace of prayer at Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, it stirred a sickening sadness within us.

□ 1745

It was a searing reminder that there is no corner of our country that offers a haven for us when guns end up in the wrong hands.

We are here today because of Charleston, to remember the lives of the nine souls who were lost. It is a ritual we have on automatic repeat, again and again, massacre after massacre, as an end run around real gun reform.

We have the conviction covered. What we have lacked in Congress is the courage to do the right thing. The Charleston 9 are victims of this lack of courage, as are the 30,000 Americans who die each year from gun violence.

For the first time in history, this year, gun deaths are on pace to be the leading cause of death of Americans aged 15–24. We are losing a generation of young Americans to guns. The future of our Nation is, quite literally, at stake.

All across America, children are growing up in fear. Kids play tag indoors. Mothers second-guess on letting their children walk to school. Some studies suggest that repeated exposure to shootings in some communities is akin to the trauma suffered by soldiers in war zones.

We as a nation have accepted gun violence as a fact of life. But we are better than this.

In the Kelly Report on Gun Violence in America, I outlined a number of effective strategies to stop the bloodshed, which includes expanding gun background checks.

I implore my colleagues to listen to your conscience and the conscience of the country you represent and work with me to chart a new course for a safer America. There is overwhelming public support for commonsense gun reform. Responsible gun owners support responsible gun laws. We can strike a sensible balance on gun reform that protects our Second Amendment rights while also ensuring the basic human right of all Americans to live free from gun violence.

How many more massacres must we endure? How many more innocent people will we allow to be murdered on our watch?

The time has come for Congress to have the courage of our convictions, to honor through action by expanding background checks to keep these depraved killers from getting their hands on guns, and the other gun safety laws that we have talked about in the past.

We have the power to stop the next Charleston, Newtown, and Aurora so that no other American city becomes synonymous with gun tragedy. We have the moral imperative to stop an epidemic that claims more casualties than war and disease, combined.

Congress must put saving American lives at the top of our agenda. We owe it to the Charleston 9 and to all who have fallen before them, as we owe it to a generation of young people at risk of meeting a similar fate.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks, and I associate myself with the concerns raised through them.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy right now. I never thought that I would be in Washington representing the people of the 12th District in the State of New Jersey, but never in my wildest imagination did I think that I would be on the floor of this body mourning the nine Americans murdered for the color of their skin in the midst of worship, at a church that was part of the fight for our civil rights.

In what has become a disturbingly routine order of events, we watch, horrified, as the helicopter circles a church, a movie theater, a college campus, or a school. A breaking news headline parades across the screen, keeping track of the developing details. The next day, we debate the mental stability or motive of the shooter. We ask where they purchased the weapon. We ponder the merits of changing our Nation's laws to keep more Americans safe. And then, inevitably, we do nothing, and the cycle repeats.

The rate of mass shootings has steadily risen since 2000. President Barack Obama has himself addressed the Nation for at least a dozen of these incidents since the beginning of his first term. We are the only developed nation in the world that has this problem, and we need to wake up and ask ourselves why.

We are told that more guns will keep us safe. We are told that requiring background checks for every purchase, with no exceptions, is too intrusive. We are told that our constitutional right to bear arms should cover every weapon, from a simple handgun to a machine gun, whose only purpose is to cause massive and irreparable harm.

Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight because we know that these statements are, at the very least, misleading and, more likely, outright falsehoods.

We stand together on behalf of the millions of Americans who agree that the shooting in Tucson, Arizona, that wounded one of our own should have been our last; that the lives lost in Aurora, Colorado, should have been the last; that the babies we lost in Newtown, Connecticut, should have moved us to change the ease with which we allow access to firearms.

We are asking our colleagues on both sides of the aisle whether they are willing to make this newest addition to a painful list the very last. I hope when we close our remarks this evening that every one of us will see the need for change.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to a fellow freshman, who has introduced legislation today that would keep firearms out of the hands of criminals, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, every day, 88 Americans are killed by guns. The gun homicide rate in the U.S. is 20 times higher than other developed nations. How long before enough is enough?

Today, I am introducing the Keeping Guns from Criminals Act, commonsense gun violence prevention legislation that will close a loophole in current Federal law, that allows straw purchasers and gun traffickers to funnel firearms to felons, juveniles and other restricted purchasers, with little to no risk of being prosecuted.

While Federal law clearly prohibits the sale of a gun to a felon or other persons deemed not eligible to possess a firearm, the standard required to prosecute violators is so high that law enforcement is rarely able to bring charges. Only if the prosecutor can prove the seller knew the buyer was prohibited from purchasing a gun are they able to successfully prosecute. So unenforceable is the current statute that, on average, only 75 such prosecutions occur every year.

My bill would make it easier to prosecute these bad actors by making the sale of a firearm a strict liability. It is a crime, and the onus is on the seller to know whether the buyer is in the prohibited class of customers. No longer would a gun trafficker or irresponsible gun seller be able to claim they didn't know a purchaser was a criminal or had a restraining order against them or was on a terrorist watch list. No longer would we be tying the hands of law enforcement and preventing them from enforcing laws to protect our children. No longer would a prosecutor have to prove the intention or knowledge of wrongdoing required under current law.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt, one of the arguments against this bill will be a complaint that a background check places an onerous burden upon the seller. But consider this: the seller and prospective buyer need only go to one of the many Federal Firearms Licensees, or FFL, who provide a private property transfer with a background check for only about $30.

And consider that there are 130,000 FFLs in the United States. That is roughly nine times as many McDonald's as there are.

Mr. Speaker, everyone, even the National Rifle Association, agrees that we have a responsibility to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals. This legislation is a step in that direction, and I encourage my colleagues to please support it.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, Dylann Roof walked into Emanuel AME and stole the lives of nine innocent Americans. In the days since, somehow we have lost track of the real problems. We keep talking about a flag, a flag that is a symbol of many our Nation's most glaring problems, but it is only a symbol.

I don't want to get too far off track, but I do want to make something perfectly clear. Symbols may matter, but they don't matter as much as the actions of police who consistently treat black men and women with clear and biased disregard. Symbols don't matter

as much as the mandatory sentencing laws that have propped up a prison industry with hundreds of thousands of Black men. Symbols don't matter as much as the predatory loan structures that put Black homeowners underwater and decimated the Black middle class, practices that banks were never truly held accountable for.

So, alongside those calls to take down the flag, I would appreciate calls to acknowledge that persistent racism is not the only problem here. Pervasive and unnecessary gun violence is also one of our Nation's most pronounced flaws.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I fully support the permanent removal of the Confederate flag. It represents one the darkest stains on our Nation's history. It represents baseless hate, disrespect for the civil rights and freedoms this Nation was founded upon, and enduring mistreatment in communities of color.

But if we are really about the business of ending discrimination once and for all, we need to enact policies that will counteract everything that that flag represents: job training that ensures all of our communities are qualified for the jobs of the future; education that lets our students succeed, regardless of where they live; and affordable housing that exists outside of the urban centers, in the communities that can offer folks the jobs they need to get on their feet and to climb to the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her consistent leadership and, particularly, her friendship, her passion for her district, and her commitment to policies that will lift all of us together as Americans.

This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I have had an opportunity to speak on the floor of the House since the moving and horrific tragedy that occurred in Charleston, South Carolina, to be able to first publicly express my deepest sympathy to the families that now mourn.

I think this may be the longest period of time that I have had a chance to speak. My recollection may be that I offered sympathies last week.

But to take a moment to explore the heinousness of the acts of the perpetrator who knocked on a door that was not closed, entered a sanctuary that did not reject him, walked down some stairs to a historic basement that reminds all of us of our church basements across the Nation, being that houses of worship, in particular, African American churches, will have their Sunday or Sabbath school in areas that are basements, particularly along the northern and eastern coasts.

We know that Sunday or Sabbath school is particular to all of our many denominations in the Protestant faith, and every one of us understands that weekly Bible study that, through the traditions of our lives, we have seen our families and grandmothers and grandfathers, aunts and uncles, and those of us who joined in Bible study. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a Bible study is a phenomenon of the American church, the Protestant Church, where people gather to study and to understand the Word.

I said in a memorial service in Houston, it is a time of joy, a time of pain, a time of explaining one's self, and a time of redemption. And you feel good, for you join with your fellow travelers, and in a weary week, midweek, you come and restore yourself.

I can imagine that during the time that this evildoer was there, there was a lot of laughing or asking questions about the Scripture; might have been some joyful, argumentative interpretation, where Bible study participants give their perception or their interpretation. I know this because, if you have gone, you know what Bible study is all about.

In the course of that, the evildoer, filled with the sickness—and I hesitate to say ''cancer.'' Cancer is something that people do not voluntarily seek, but we know that cancer can eat at a body and kill someone.

So the cancerous racism that this individual possessed and internalized and, in fact, duped himself and took the medicine and continued to fill himself with a deadly concoction that was going to do nothing but kill him, but before it killed him, he felt compelled to kill someone else.

The money that he received for the celebrating of his 21st year, very young years—I guess what breaks my heart is how, in those young years, he could become so hateful. For as I said, he came into a place that did not reject him. He went down the stairs in a place where people were rejoicing.

□ 1800

And he, at the conclusion, after sitting next to Reverend Doctor Senator Pinckney, took out a gun and methodically killed those wonderful families—mothers and grandfathers and grandmothers and a son and father—without a pain.

He took a gun that none of us would raise to any Member on this floor or none of us in our houses of worship would raise to any forlorn traveler, any weary person that would come into our place of worship, whether a mosque, a Catholic parish, a synagogue, a Hindu temple, or any form of Protestant church, big or small.

Houston prides itself on having many, many denominations. In fact, we are now in the middle of Ramadan. Houston has many, many places of worship. I wouldn't venture to say I have been to all all over the world, but I have been to all in the city of Houston, my own congressional district, and each place, in their own faith, have welcomed people in.

We only see where there are evildoers that people would blow up temples, mosques, synagogues, and churches. This person didn't blow it up a distance away. He methodically did this. And a mother had to watch a son try to rescue those, protect them.

Heroes shown. The stories have not all been told, but we know that there were heroes in the midst. In fact, they all are heroes.

So I come for two reasons. I come to indicate that much of what we heard here today is true, that for us to do honor to those who died in this disastrous massacre, murderous, blood flowing from the church, that it will have to be our actions. It will have to be what we do about education and criminal justice reform.

I almost want to stop myself for the broken recordness of this because we will only do it in unity. We will only do it after we put aside contentious votes and we begin to say, What will heal America? We will not heal—and we have said this before—on the issue of cancerous racism unless we admit that it exists.

Many of us will present to this Congress a resolution that calls upon the recognition that there are some symbols of hate that we cannot deny. We will frame it in America's unity, as has been noted already earlier today, Governors and State representatives and others of good thought. Mitt Romney, for example, joined with President Obama's tweet that it is the right thing to do, to take down that rebel symbol that has been used to run onto the plantations of yesteryear with individuals clothed in white clothing, providing fear, intimidation, and evildoing.

Certainly we know the threats that Dr. King received during his life, or Medgar Evers during his life, who was murdered on his front porch, were all circling around people not talking about slavery. They were talking about desegregation and their opposition to desegregation and their support of upholding segregation.

This symbol of evil is not far from our life of 2015. Many of us lived through it and saw the disaster of such. Many of us saw the killing of civil rights workers, bound in hatred and not wanting to change what did not unify America but divided America.

So the guns that I have addressed now for the period of time that I have been here—I passed one of the few gun ordinances in a lawmaking body, the city council, which most people don't realize that some city governments give lawmaking legislative authority to their elected representatives. Houston, a noncity manager government, does that.

And I remember that ordinance, amongst the mayor and city council persons, packed the chambers. People with revolutionary outfits, gun enthusiasts, the NRA, all opposing a simple gun ordinance that said that, if a parent allowed a child to get a gun in their hand and a horrific incident happened, a shooting or the child shot themselves, the parent would be held

responsible. It was some semblance of not taking a gun away, but trying to instill responsibility with guns.

When we talk about this on the floor of the House, why all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, does it become that we are against the Second Amendment and the National Rifle Association, and that this is going to be the undermining of this powerful organization if we even utter the words ''gun responsibility''? Why?

Why in Newtown?

I thought I had seen enough, heard enough when 20 little babies in a corner, no less, 6 adults murdered in a murderous fashion from someone who absolutely did not deserve a gun for whatever the reason, as they took their own life, or someone who now stands on trial in Colorado who decided that a night out with a dad and his daughter in a theater—something that Americans know is part of our American culture. We are just moviegoers. We make the movie industry.

In the old days, in those outdoor drive-ins that many remember were some of the best times with your family—and thank God they didn't cost a lot—or the sophisticated high-tech theaters of today, it is still the same. Dads and little girls are going to theaters together. And this criminally minded person, evildoer, decided to kill 12 or, to our very distinguished colleague, the Congresswoman from Arizona, who was maintaining the dignity of her office, was shot down in the street by a gun, killed a Federal judge and many others, a 9-year-old girl, her staff, whose memory that we continue to mourn.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would offer to say that I joined with Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN to indicate that the issue of gun responsibility legislation is not even overdue. We are crying out for relief. The violence that is used with handguns and AK–47s and automatic weapons is unspeakable.

We need to close the gun show loophole that allows people to go and get guns at gun shows. The name of my good friend Carolyn McCarthy and John Dingell, they worked together and had compromises. We could not get them on the floor of the House.

We need to go even further. We need to be able to assure that where this evildoer brought the gun, his exposure to the criminal justice system should have disallowed him from purchase until he was completely vetted. Some say that he would have stolen one or gotten one out of the back of a pickup truck, but maybe, Mr. Speaker, he would not have been able to go on that fateful night down those stairs through that open door to kill those blessed souls who were studying the word of the Lord.

So it is a challenge now. I know that those of us in the Congressional Progressive Caucus are Americans. I know that those who adhere to the Tea Party philosophy are Americans. To our various conservative caucuses that are in the Conference, our Republican friends, to the various caucuses that are in the Democratic Caucus, all are Americans. All felt the pain of the murderous act. In fact, it is almost like we are living in a cocoon. It is not over yet, as these families bury their loved ones.

But I think it is upon us—it is an onerous responsibility—to confront this whole question of racism, as the President has charged us to do, and not do it with another round of conversation, but confronting the fact that we can begin by removing symbols and doing something proactively on changing lives.

Then it is upon us to take on this gun responsibility question, to call the NRA to a table of reconciliation, to master a legislative agenda and an omnibus initiative that doesn't have anyone hiding under tables, that there will be no indictment of whether you are for or against. But we hope the majority would move this legislation forward to change the way young people, people who are on the edge, people who shouldn't have guns get guns and kill people. It is time for this Congress to pass the legislation. It is time for the President to be able to sign the legislation.

Let me thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her genuine courtesy extended this evening to allow me to both mourn and condemn racism that has been the plight of many of our people in this country and to, as well, remind us that we are derelict in our duty if we do not pass real serious gun responsibility legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last weekend we were faced with another example of what damage results from easy access to guns. The violence that took place in Charleston, South Carolina last week is something that is not new to our nation but is something that we can and must come together to prevent from happening in the future.

As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the Ranking Member of its subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and the author of H.R. 65, "Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act, I am in support of our Congress coming together to find solutions to the issue of gun violence, through gun law reform and active engagement of our communities to get to the heart of these problems.

Today, homicide is the second leading cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24 years old.

Even more disturbing is the fact that homicide is the leading cause of death for African Americans between ages io and 24, and the second leading cause of death for Hispanic Americans.

The leading weapon of choice used to kill those victims was a firearm. (82.8% were killed with a firearm.)

Many guns are in the wrong hands, and end up being the highly efficient tools of criminals and mass murderers.

Every 30 minutes, a child or teenager in America is injured by a gun.

Every 3 hours and 15 minutes, a child or teenager loses their life to a firearm.

In 2010, 82 children under 5 years of age lost their lives due to guns.

To put that number in perspective, 58 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty that year.

While preventing the deaths of so many young people should be our highest priority, we also need to address the broader culture of violence that pervades our society.

The Members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus recognize the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing the problem of gun violence in America.

Guns and the harm perpetrated by them impact every American and the events at Sandy Hook and Aurora only underscore how random gun violence events can be; but it is important to appreciate that regular gun violence has a particularly devastating impact on the communities we represent.

We must use the tragedy in Charleston, which took the lives of nine innocent church members, as an opportunity to take action to improve the lives of all Americans.

We need to reform current gun laws and implementing change that will prevent these types of events in the future.

As the Founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and as a senior Member of the Judiciary Committee, I have listened far too often to the tragic testimony of individuals who have survived or lost loved ones as a result of gun violence.

We respect the Second Amendment, but we understand that supporting universal background checks for all gun sales is not inconsistent with supporting responsible gun ownership. With rights come responsibilities.

And responsible gun ownership requires at a minimum that guns in the home be stored safely out of reach of unsupervised children and making sure that guns are not transferred to non law abiding citizens or the mentally ill.

My bill, H.R. 65 "The Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2013", would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, gun violence has reached epidemic proportions.

We must pass responsible gun violence prevention legislation like H.R. 65 and require universal background checks for all gun sales.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas. She has always been a source of information and history. She has always tied our history into our current situation as she has always been someone who has motivated us to think sincerely about the issues of the day and how we can become part of the solution.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to reiterate that I associate myself with every recommendation that this gentlewoman has put forth here. I do indeed believe that we need some sensible gun control legislation. I have even introduced legislation that makes it more difficult to secure ammunition. I do think that that is a very important component of creating a safer environment in this country for all citizens.

I think also that we need to take a serious look at what this type of domestic terrorism is doing and whether or not we are devoting the type of resources that are necessary to ensure that our people are as safe as they can be.

I think that we are very involved and very concerned and very proactive in looking at potential lone wolves, jihadists, ISIS recruitment activities, and things of that ilk, but I question whether or not we are sufficiently engaging in oversight, interventions, and creating tools in order to look at the sites that kind of generate the willingness of people such as Mr. Roof and his desire to do what he did.

So I hope that in consort with what Mr. THOMPSON had earlier released that we are willing to hold hearings on the issue of domestic terrorism. I hope that we are willing to look at policies and procedures that create opportunities and jobs and safer communities and good public education.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence. I yield the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from New Jersey, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN, for organizing this very important special order.

Mr. Speaker, we have a right to safety and to reasonably expect that we will be free from gun violence in our homes, schools, places of worship, workplaces, and communities. Unfortunately, we are not safe. As I said on the House floor the morning after the devastating murders in Charleston, "there are no more sanctuaries in the United States from gun violence."

There is no question that we are not doing enough. We see the evidence in the news every day. Across the country, guns are the number two killer of children under 19 years of age. After Charleston, Newtown, the DC Navy Yard, Aurora, Fort Hood, Virginia Tech—the list goes on—it is clear that we need a comprehensive approach to preventing gun violence.

Just like my colleagues, I have heard from hundreds of my constituents urging me to support commonsense policies that would help save lives from this senseless violence. I have cosponsored legislation to strengthen background checks, improve mental health services, ensure criminals and dangerous individuals cannot purchase guns or ammunition, ban military-style assault weapons, and prohibit large capacity magazines, and yet, none of these commonsense policies have even received a vote on the House floor.

I refuse to stop fighting for this cause as long as 30,000 Americans needlessly die because of guns every year.

In 2013, West Webster firefighter Ted Scardino came to Washington to give testimony on gun trafficking prevention. On the previous Christmas Eve, when Ted responded to a fire in the early morning hours along the shores of Lake Ontario, he had no way of knowing that a gunman had set the fire as part of a murderous plot that would leave him as well as fellow firefighter Joseph Hofstetter injured, and take the lives of two more firefighters, Mike Chiapperini and Tomasz Kaczowka.

The gunman in this case was already a convicted killer. He was not able to legally purchase a gun himself, but was able to easily obtain one after recruiting a young woman who lived nearby. He took her to a sporting goods store where he picked out a Bushmaster semiautomatic rifle and a shotgun, and just like that a convicted killer had armed himself with military-style guns that he would use to murder two innocent public servants, wound two more, and upend the close-knit community of Webster, NY.

I am deeply embarrassed that this body cannot manage to pass—or even vote on—legislation that would protect our families, friends, and fellow citizens Tragedy after tragedy happens, and yet we do not act. I am terrified at the thought of what it will take to finally bring this body to action.

INNOVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to draw the attention of my colleagues and, yes, the American people to a legislative threat to the safety and well-being of the American people.

We dodged a bullet in the last session of Congress about this very same issue that I will be discussing this evening. But today, again, we are in serious jeopardy of having an important right of the American people neutered from them, taken away from them by a power play here in Washington, D.C., being conducted by multinational corporations who have done everything they can to impact on this system while the American people do not know that there is an attempted move against their constitutional rights.

Alerted by an aggressive yet an unsuccessful attempt to stop this rigorous and rancorous legislation in the House, the Senate was inundated last year about a similar bill that was supposed to be reform, and it was very similar to the one that I will be discussing today.

□ 1815

There was so much opposition to that bill in the Senate that they simply refused to bring it up to the floor for consideration. The bill had already passed the House; and as I say, today, a similar bill now is making its way through the House and will be on the floor, and it is a great threat to the freedom, security, and well-being of the American people.

What was that issue that was rammed through the House and once it was exposed that the Senate turned it back? Well, it has been an ongoing fight over 20 years, a classic case of crony capitalism that plagues our country. The big guys are trying to diminish the rights of the little guys in order to make more money—surprise, surprise.

In this case, however, what we are talking about, they will not only make more money and take that from the little guys, but it will undermine America's prosperity and security in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not opposed to the profit motive, but first and foremost, we need to ensure that powerful forces don't change the economic rules in order to enrich themselves.

Unseen by most Americans who are not paying attention, but are paying attention to the important things in their lives: their children, their families, their jobs, their schools, and their churches; but they have been basically unaware that there is an attempt by mega-multinational corporations to undermine and, yes, destroy a constitutional right of our citizens—this in order to fill their pockets at the expense of the American people who don't really understand and even know this power play is going on.

I am referring to an attack on the fundamental constitutional right of the American people to own what they have created. This is a right that has been written into the law at the Constitutional Convention—it is in our Constitution—that is under attack in a clandestine legal maneuver that would neuter America's inventors the protection that they were granted by the Constitution and permit powerful multinational corporations to steal what rightfully belongs to American inventors as granted to them as a right in the Constitution.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, ordinary Americans, of course, are not as able to get their voices heard at times here in Congress and big corporations are. They have whole stables of lobbyists. Tonight, we need to mobilize the American people and have them make sure that they contact their Member of Congress.

I will alert my fellow colleagues to make sure that they pay attention to what is happening in this piece of legislation that is now being rammed through Congress.

It isn't just about, of course, dispossessing. This issue isn't just dispossessing individual inventors. It is a power grab that, if they are successful in undermining the constitutional rights of inventors to own for a given period of time what they have created, this change in our constitutional law will undermine the prosperity that we have enjoyed as Americans.

The less than forthright attack on our patent system will undermine the economic well-being of our working people who depend on the United States to be technologically superior in order so that they can outcompete other peoples in other countries who come from poor societies who work just as hard, but don't have the technological advantage that we Americans have.

Mr. Speaker, the American working people have always had the advantage that they can be more productive because our country permitted the technological development of the means of production that made our workers the most productive in the world.

People are working hard all over the world, but it was the people of the United States who coupled that with

freedom and coupled that with technology, and it uplifted everyone. Our Founding Fathers believed that technology, freedom, and, yes, the profit motive was the formula that would uplift humankind. They wrote into our Constitution a guarantee of the property rights of inventors and authors.

It is the only place in the body of our Constitution where the word ''right'' is used, in article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States:

> The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

This provision has served America well. It has led to a general prosperity and national security, and it has permitted average people in our country to live decent lives and to have good jobs; but instead, now, we are putting all of that at risk because some multinational corporations want to steal the technology that has been developed by our little guys, our small inventors.

Our small and independent inventors are where the new ideas come from. These big meganational corporations have huge bureaucracies that are not the source of the great discoveries that we have had over the last two centuries.

Americans work hard, as I say, but so do all the other people in the world. It is technology that makes the difference. Our technology has multiplied results of that hard work. Yes, that is the secret of our success, technology and freedom.

That was put in place not just because we talk about it, but because we wrote that into our law, our basic fundamental law, the Constitution, and we have developed from that moment the strongest patent system in the world, and that is what has made all the difference.

Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were men who believed in technology, believed in liberty and freedom, and believed that we could uplift every human being, not just the elite in our society; thus they made sure that, in our Constitution, we had this provision that we set our course toward uplifting all people through technology, hard work, freedom, and the profit motive.

Yet, today, multinational corporations run by Americans—and maybe by some multinational corporations that just have Americans working for them—want to diminish the patent protection our Founding Fathers put in place, want to diminish the patent protection that has served us so well, and over the years, we fought and turned back several efforts to weaken the patent system.

The American people are unaware of this. They are unaware that, for the last 20 years, there has been this attempt—and they call it harmonizing our patent system with the rest of the world, when we have the strongest system, and they were trying to weaken it.

How does the rest of the world respect the rights of the little guy? They don't. In fact, our patent system has said that if a man or a woman—an inventor—applies for a patent overseas that, after 18 months, anybody who applies for a patent over there has a different situation than our patent applicants.

An inventor who applies for a patent in the United States knows that his patent application will be totally confidential until the moment he is issued the patent. When that patent is issued, then it can be published, but he then has the legal power to protect his patent rights for a given period of time. Traditionally, that has been 17 years of guaranteed protection.

Well, that is not the way the rest of the world works. The rest of the world wants 18 months. Eighteen months after you apply for a patent, they publish it for the whole world to see, even if the patent has not been issued; thus any inventor in that case, everything that he or she has invented and all of the research is now made available to one's competitors. That destroys incentive, and in fact, that was the goal 20 years ago that MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio and I were able to stop that provision from being put in the law.

Mr. Speaker, because of what they were trying to do in harmonizing this law, was that every American today—think about it—every American inventor today, anybody who didn't get their patent in 18 months, it would be published to the world, and we would have a massive stealing of our technology and undercutting of our technological superiority.

I might add the other thing they were trying to accomplish was they said—and overseas, they don't have this guarantee—and that is, if you apply for a patent, if it takes you 10 years to get your patent, you still have 17 years of guaranteed patent protection from the time it is issued.

Overseas, they start the clock ticking at 20 years when you file. If you file for a patent and it takes you, let's say, 10 years to get your patent, in the United States, you would have 17 years of protection. Overseas, you end up with 10, sometimes 5 years of protection.

Mr. Speaker, we have the strongest system in the world. It has worked for us. Now, we have people over the last 20 years who have tried everything they could to undermine it. We won those early fights against the two provisions I just described.

Well, after a few years of this, of course, MARCY KAPTUR, a strong coalition, and I managed to thwart those efforts, but today, we see another—another—effort to try to undermine and diminish the patent protection that we have been fighting to preserve for these last 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, 3½ years ago, the House passed the America Invents Act which we warned fundamentally diminished the patent system, weakening its protection for ordinary citizens.

The negative impact of that bill—and that is just 3½ years ago—the negative impact is overwhelming. We changed, for example, the fundamental idea in that bill, one of the ideas that was changed, from our country's founding, it was always the first person to invent something and can prove they invented it, they will get the patent.

Well, they have changed it to the first not to invent, they changed that to the first one to file for a patent is going to get the patent, so that smaller and independent inventors who can't afford to go over and over again and every new twist of their invention get a separate patent for, these small inventors have been facing major corporations that then immediately will go in and file for patent after patent after patent because they can afford it.

Mr. Speaker, what they have done now is these corporations are flooding the Patent Office with applications. Of course, there are not more people working in the Patent Office; thus they are feeling a dramatic reduction in their ability to get the job done because they are being flooded with patent application because we have changed the basic rules of the game, and it has worked against technological development in our country.

The onslaught, as I said, of course, is aimed at neutering the rights of the small inventor. We have barely turned back this latest attempt which, last year, we passed through the House and went to the Senate, but when the Senators, of course, got a message from their own colleges and universities as to what this would do and the damage that it would do to the universities, we were able to stop it and stop the effort in the Senate.

Now, we have the American Innovation Act that has been presented here. This is yet the most recent onslaught. Over a 20-year battle of trying to protect the interests of the little guy, now we have the American Innovation Act.

Let me just suggest that these big megacorporations over the years, who have stepped up with these proposals that would diminish the right of the small inventor, didn't say: We are trying to diminish the rights of the small inventor.

That is not what was being sold to the Members of Congress. Instead, what was sold in the first onslaught 20 years ago was the submarine patent. That is why we have got to eliminate the ability for people to have a patent application that is secret until it is granted. That is why, at 20 years from filing, you don't have any more patent protection.

Well, that was a derogatory term that was used to confuse the public in order to try to secure their goal of diminishing the right of all inventors, especially small inventors. They are insisting, of course, now that there is another threat and that we should pay attention to this other threat that has emerged that should motivate us to, again, diminish the rights of American

inventors to protect their own patent because, supposedly, patent law is being abused by the so-called patent trolls.

□ 1830

Now, what are patent trolls? Let me note that we all understand that there are frivolous lawsuits that take place throughout the American system. We have a system of justice. You can sue someone if that person has damaged you. Yet there are frivolous lawsuits. Lawyers will do that. And we know that that is something we have got to deal with. Judges need to be stronger in that case. But they exist.

And yes, there are frivolous lawsuits that are presented by lawyers over patent right infringement. And sometimes these frivolous lawsuits—and many times—are just based on phony claims that they claim they have the right in the patent to this and they sue some businessman hoping he will just pay off. That is indeed a problem. It is not a major problem in the sense that it is a minor part of all of the litigation that goes on.

Almost all the patent litigation that goes on, and most of the lawyers who are involved in this who are called patent trolls, are involved with legitimate claims against people who have infringed on the patent rights of especially small inventors. They are basically getting involved with the small inventor who does not have the resources to basically defend his patent against some large mega-multinational corporation. But, of course, big corporations would have us believe that what we are really talking about are frivolous lawsuits against them.

No, there are many, many positive lawsuits that are totally justified. The vast majority of all lawsuits that come into play against these major corporations are based on a legitimate claim by someone who owns a legitimate patent who these big companies have just tried to rip off.

And so what they are trying to do now is what? They are trying to make it more difficult for those little guys, even with any type of help from what they call a patent troll, to be able to actually bring their case of infringement against large corporations.

What this basically is saying is we have got to change our justice system. We have got to change the rules of the game for every lawsuit because some people have been manipulating the law and having frivolous lawsuits.

I don't think that that is what we want in America. We don't want to take away the right, the legitimate right, to go and defend yourself in court because some people use the courts in a frivolous or a manipulative manner.

If the small inventor doesn't have the resources, for example, to enforce his or her own patent, and if they have been granted this patent legitimately by the Federal Government that they own this technology that they have developed, then there is nothing wrong with the fact that someone could come along and help them enforce it when a mega-multinational corporation is basically stealing their rights.

I have consulted with a number of outside individual inventors and groups. They have affirmed to me that the legislation now being proposed in H.R. 9, the bill that was already passed through the Judiciary Committee, that that bill disadvantages the little guy against deep-pocketed corporations. And, in fact, every provision in the name of stopping patent trolls is a provision that would undermine the efforts of people who own legitimate patents and have legitimate patent claims, and undermine their ability to enforce those claims.

So, basically, we are saying, and what is being said about patent trolls, yes, there are frivolous lawsuits and trolls sometimes are involved with frivolous lawsuits; but, by and large, that does not mean that the overwhelming number of lawsuits are not legitimate and they should have every right to call on someone to help them in their effort, basically, to defend their patent rights.

Proponents of this legislation are covering the fact that what we really have here is a bill on H.R. 9 that makes it easier for big corporations to steal the technology secrets of the little guys. They would have us believe that all lawsuits are frivolous and the frivolous lawsuits are throughout our system. And instead of focusing just on frivolous lawsuits, they want us to have an overall diminishing of the rights to our inventors to enforce their patents and make it more difficult for them to do so.

So tonight I draw the attention of the American people to H.R. 9. The Innovation Act, as I say, was introduced by Chairman GOODLATTE and was passed through just a week ago or 2 weeks ago in the Judiciary Committee.

In the last Congress, the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on this bill and witnesses at that hearing included Director Kappos and others. That was when we were discussing the America Invents Act. And people said: Let's go slow on this. Why are we trying to push this through in such a hurried manner?

Well, they are trying to push it through in a hurried manner because, once people understand the implications of diminishing the right of people to protect their patents, they are going to find it has dramatic changes to the American way of life.

For example, our universities now have discovered that if, indeed, H.R. 9 passes, that it will have a huge impact on the viability of their own scientific research and their own patents that they own by these various universities. It will diminish the value of patents across the board if we say that it is going to be more difficult to fight infringers and more costly for someone to fight someone who is infringing on that patent.

So, according to sponsors of H.R. 9, this is, as I say, an attempt to control the trolls but, in fact, it is going to control the universities. It is going to control other companies other than these big companies that, as I say, are multinational companies. They are mainly in the electronics industry. Those people may want to take away some of these patent rights and let them sue, but that is not true in many others. You have got pharmaceuticals and biotech and many other industries that will be impacted in a horrible way because of H.R. 9.

Now, what we need to do is make sure that the American people speak to their Member of Congress and talk to them about we do not want to make it more difficult for people who have developed new technologies to defend their technologies against infringers. We don't want to make it more difficult for people who are the innovators to innovate, to come up with the new ideas, to basically make sure that America is on the cutting edge and leading the way.

And if we have harmonized with the rest of the world, as has been their goal for a long time—and, I might add, one of the things that we have to be very concerned about when we look at the trade bill that is being shoved through Congress is whether or not it will contain a provision that I helped defeat 20 years ago, which I just mentioned, that will make sure that our patent applications are published after 18 months.

Now, I have been told that that is in the trade bill, and there have been all sorts of denials and some people are coming to me whispering, yes, it is in there. Well, we know we are operating under secrecy. We have been operating under secrecy here, so it is impossible for me to tell the public I know absolutely because I read it. Because had I read about this in that bill, I wouldn't be permitted to talk about it.

But that is another one of those things that you have got to be very careful. What are you going to pass in this trade bill? It might be exactly what I am talking about, which is a diminishing of the patent rights of the little guy. And who is pushing that? Megacorporations, multinational corporations, the same guys who are pushing this trade bill on us and not letting us even know what is in the trade bill, which we are supposed to give up our right for an up-or-down vote not even knowing what is in that bill.

So what we need to do is make sure we go through all of those items in this bill, H.R. 9. And people have to understand that every one of those provisions in this bill are aimed at making it more difficult for the small inventor to go up against a major corporation who is infringing on that inventor's creation.

So how come we have got bills now that we can be bringing to the floor and that are aimed at helping the big guy steal from the little guy? This is not what America is all about. This

isn't what our Founding Fathers had in mind.

The results of H.R. 9 will be increased patent infringement, meaning the little guys will have more and more of what they are developing stolen from them and, thus, there will be less incentive for the geniuses in our society to use that genius to create the new technologies that keep us safe—safe. It is our technological edge that keeps us safe, that makes us prosperous.

We can't be prosperous unless we are the innovators, unless we are the guys with the new ideas rather than the people who are just copying other people. Our working people will not have a decent standard of living. This will reduce the legal remedies for those who have been infringed upon.

It will reduce investment into small businesses that are aimed at technological development. Why would anybody want to invest with a small inventor or a small company that is developing technology if you are going to make it more and more difficult for that investor to get that money back if someone is stealing that technology?

And, of course, it will do irreparable damage to our research universities, our inventors, our entrepreneurs, our economy, and our Nation.

Every part of the so-called reform is detrimental to the patent owners, and especially individual innovators will be damaged. Every provision bolsters the patent thieves, the infringers, at the expense of the legal owners. All this done, covered by the idea, well, we have got to get at the trolls.

I would like to share with you and with my colleagues just the story of exactly how that word ''troll'' came up.

There is a head of a major corporation who changed his mind on this bill, who years ago was part of the clique pushing this sort of diminishing of patent rights. He told me that he sat in a room with other corporate executives to come up with the strategy: How are we going to get the American people to support legislation that actually hurts the little guy and helps the big guy steal from the little guy? How are we going to do that?

Well, we need a straw man. We need something to get attention that is going to make it look like that is really the goal is to take care of that evil, sinister person over there. They went around the circle trying to come up with a name that was so sinister that would help them accomplish their mission. This is how cynical these people are who are offering this argument about trolls. And finally, the guy who was talking to me said: I suggested ''patent pirate,'' but by the time it got around, ''patent troll'' sounded so much more sinister, they decided they would accept that.

Well, this is absolutely absurd. The fact is that if we are going to beat this onslaught of the big guys against the little guys, we little guys have got to stick together. We have got to make sure that we notify our Members of Congress and talk to other Members. We have got to pay attention because this is just another example of when we are not paying attention, we lose our freedom. We lose our freedom. Our rights are diminished.

You can count on the fact, with the diminished rights of our inventors, wages in this country will go down. Our competitiveness will go down. We will not be secure. We will not be prosperous. This is an important issue, yet they are trying to get this by with as little debate and as little attention as possible.

Now, how important is this? Well, it has always been important to our country. If we didn't have this patent protection that I am talking about, our country would be totally different.

Let me suggest this. If you look back and see what our Founding Fathers had in mind, they wanted the little guys to be protected and have legal rights. This is what our country was all about. And the innovation and the rights of ownership, this was our innovation. This is what Benjamin Franklin talked about and put into our Constitution, and that has worked so well for us.

□ 1845

If we cut off the little guys and if we make sure that they are not going to profit from their hard work and their struggle, we will not have the new technologies. We will not be the leader in technology in the world, and we will fall behind, and every one of us will be hurt by this.

One only needs to see how important technology was to our society. One only needs to take a look here in the Halls of Congress. There is a statue here in the Capitol of Philo Farnsworth.

Now, who the heck knows who Philo Farnsworth was? They have done a special on him on education TV, I understand, on the History Channel. Philo Farnsworth was someone who really was important to our country, and there is a statue to Philo Farnsworth right here in the Capitol.

He was a farmer in Utah, a man who was educated in engineering, but who had very little resources. In fact, he was a farmer. He set out between farming to try to find out and discover a technological secret that had perplexed some of the most powerful and financial interests in our country.

RCA at that time—this was back at the turn of the century in 1910 and 1920—was under a man named David Sarnoff. He was America's premier executive at the premier technology company of the United States, a company that had vast resources and was deeply involved with trying to find out how to invent a picture tube.

They knew what the radio tube was, but they didn't know how to make images on it. How could they make that radio tube show images? This is what they really were looking for, and they had invested so much in it. It was a huge challenge—an historic challenge—that RCA dumped millions of dollars of research into. However, they didn't discover it.

The one who discovered the secret of the picture tube—and it has had so much impact on the American way of life since everything we have—cell phones, computers, you name it—is based on a picture tube—was Philo Farnsworth.

This independent inventor, this farmer from Utah, discovered the secret. He wrote RCA, naively believing that this big corporation would honor his discovery and permit him to at least have the benefit of being recognized as the person who made this discovery.

Then RCA, when they got the letter from Philo Farnsworth, sent a representative to the laboratory there in Utah, which was in his barn, I believe. When he described to these top engineers from RCA what he had found, the scientists from RCA went away, saying: Oh, yes. We will be back in touch with you.

Of course, they never did get back in touch once they learned of his secret, the thing that Philo knew was his. He ends up reading an announcement in a magazine of how RCA had made this major breakthrough, this discovery, except Philo knew. He was the one who had discovered it, and he was the one who had transmitted that information to RCA. This became one of the great jury and great legal battles of the 20th century.

Philo Farnsworth, an individual person—not a wealthy person, the little guy—was up against the most powerful American corporation of the day, RCA, which had one of the strongest and toughest leaders. This corporate leader, David Sarnoff, had a whole stable full of tough, well-paid lawyers, all of whom vowed not to give one penny to Philo Farnsworth and not to recognize him because RCA deserved to get the credit and the money.

Philo Farnsworth was able to mobilize support behind his claim. People invested in Philo Farnsworth's claim, and it went all the way to the Supreme Court. He was able to have people invest in his lawsuit. Slowly but surely, they made their way through the court system—as I say, all the way to the Supreme Court.

God bless the United States of America. A poor, single man—an individual farmer—came up against one of the most powerful corporations in America at the time because he had invented something.

The Supreme Court decided with Philo Farnsworth over this brutally powerful corporation in America. RCA was beaten by an individual farmer, but he had people who had invested in him. Had the same laws they are trying to promote now in H.R. 9 been in place, Philo Farnsworth and the other little guys who have invented things like this throughout our country's history would have been betrayed. There would have been nothing he could have done because H.R. 9 would have prevented

him from having had people invest in his lawsuit.

That is what H.R. 9 does. It says, if a big corporation has stolen from you and if somebody has invested in helping you with your invention, they then become liable if you have to sue to get your money.

If something happens where the big guys win—even if you are right and they win because they have better lawyers—anybody who invests in you has to pay part of the legal fees of these big corporations, which are millions of dollars of legal fees.

No one is going to want to invest in a little guy like that. The Philo Farnsworths would be left out in the cold. The nature of our system would have been totally different than what it is today if we were to have had the provisions of H.R. 9, which they are trying to foist on us now.

Let me give you another example. Black Americans happen to be some of the most inventive people in the United States. A lot of people don't know that. If you look back in the history of the Patent Office, as I have been looking, what you will find is, while Black Americans were being discriminated against in general throughout our whole system, the Patent Office was the one place that they had equal rights to come up with their ideas and to say, ''This is what I have discovered.''

Because of that, we have many great Black inventors. Maybe that is the reason former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS, is taking my side in this debate on H.R. 9. He is opposed to that.

We have a Black inventor, for example, who was the guy who invented the machine that permitted us to mass produce shoes. Before that time, Americans had one pair of shoes. We started to mass produce them because this Black American, struggling on his own because he was discriminated against like all Black Americans were in that day, managed to get his patent accepted, and he changed not only himself, but the whole country had shoes after that. Isn't that wonderful?

That is what happens when you have freedom for the little guy and not just for the big guys. They come up with the new ideas. They can uplift everybody and make sure everybody's feet feel better. We are on the verge of losing that now. We are on the verge of losing that.

When I go out in the hallway of Congress here, I see a statue to Philo Farnsworth. That is where it is. It is the statue of this Utah farmer who invented the picture tube and who had to take on the biggest company and the biggest corporate powers in the world, and he won. I will tell you that there is his statue there and that there is no statue to David Sarnoff, the corporate leader who tried to beat him down and steal his technology.

I do not care how rich and powerful he was; we respect the little guy in this country. We want the little guys to be able to have rights that are protected by our Constitution. That is why our Founding Fathers put it in the Constitution.

Many of these megacorporations, especially electronic corporations, don't care one bit about the well-being of the American people because they are multinational corporations now.

We want to make sure our people maintain their rights, that we keep being the leaders of innovation, and that we are able to outcompete the world and not just take all of our jobs overseas and give them to cheap labor. We want to make sure that Americans benefit because this is what America is all about. It is where the little guy has the same rights legally, and they are protected.

That is what this fight is all about when it comes to H.R. 9. People need to talk to their congressmen, and the congressmen need to talk to each other about what this is really all about. It is easy to yawn when someone says: ''I am going to discuss patent rights.''

''Oh, yeah, patent law. How boring.''

It is not boring. It is going to make all the difference as to whether our country stays safe because we have to have the technological edge to be safe in the world we are getting into now. Our people are not going to have decent housing or a decent standard of living because the wealth that is produced isn't produced just by hard work, it is produced by technological efficiency, and we have to be on the cutting edge, or we will be outcompeted by people overseas. This is going to determine what America is going to be like.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 9. Let's talk to the universities. Let's talk to the other industries that are being hurt dramatically by this. Just talk to the inventors. Let the inventors know.

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

LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the leadership for allowing this time on the floor to take up H. Res. 329. H. Res. 329 encourages the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month.

I bring this to the floor, Mr. Speaker, because I have had some experiences in life that have caused me to understand why it is important that we do this. Someone might ask, Mr. Speaker: Why would you, AL GREEN—a person who is not gay, a person who is considered straight—bring a resolution to the floor, a resolution to celebrate and recognize some of the most notable events in the movement of the LGBTQ community?

Let me explain why. I am a son of the South. More specifically, I am a son of the segregated South. I grew up at a time when my friends and neighbors denied me rights that the Constitution of the United States of America accorded me.

I was forced to go through backdoors. I was forced to drink from colored water fountains. I was forced to ride at the back of the bus. I was a son of the segregated South, and as a son of the segregated South, I learned early in life what invidious discrimination was like.

I learned what it smelled like because I had to go to filthy toilet facilities. I learned what it looked like because I saw the Klan burn crosses. I learned what it sounded like because I was called names that we no longer use in polite society. I am a son of the segregated South, and I know what discrimination looks like, feels like, smells like; I know what it hurts like.

I know of the people who lost their lives in the effort to try to bring about justice and equality for all. Medgar Evers lost his life, and Myrlie Evers still suffers to this day because she lost her husband in a worthy cause, in a cause for justice.

I know what it is like, and I know that, notwithstanding my circumstance as a straight guy, I didn't get here by myself. There were people who lived and died so that I could have the blessings that I have. Schwerner, Goodman, and Chaney died. Schwerner and Goodman were not Black. John Shillady died in Austin, Texas, fighting for the rights of Black people. John Shillady was not Black. Of the people who formed the NAACP in an effort to stop lynchings, which were almost commonplace, a good many of them were not Black.

I have been the beneficiary of the efforts of people who do not look like me, of people who had blessings such that they could have gone on with their lives. There was no reason other than they wanted ''justice for all'' for them to take up my cause.

I believe that, when you are blessed, there is a reason for it. You are blessed so that you may be a blessing to others. You have such that you may help those who have less or who have not. Hence, I find myself standing on the floor tonight of the Congress of the United States of America, proud to sponsor a resolution to encourage the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month.

This resolution celebrates and recognizes some of the most notable events of the LGBTQ movement.

□ 1900

What I would like to do is explain what this resolution actually does, H. Res. 329. H. Res. 329 celebrates the accomplishments of Houston mayor Annise Parker, the first lesbian elected as mayor of Houston, Texas.

I am proud that it does because not only was she elected mayor of Houston, Texas, before she was mayor, she served as the city's controller for 6

years; and before serving in this capacity, she served on city council for 6 years. She has earned the right to be recognized, and I am proud to have her recognized in H. Res. 329.

It celebrates the hard work that the transgender community has done to spread awareness about tolerance and inclusion and encouraging the community to keep on working toward broader inclusion. We live in a society that has within its Pledge of Allegiance the words ''liberty and justice for all.''

I salute the flag of the United States of America, and I am proud to do so because I am a proud American. Liberty and justice for all, that means that we have to encourage liberty and justice for those who are in the transgender community and encourage them to keep on fighting for liberty and justice.

This resolution recognizes the protesters who stood for human rights and dignity at Stonewall Inn on June 28, 1968, as some of the pioneers of the movement. It celebrates the gay rights organizations in major cities in the aftermath of the Stonewall uprising.

After Stonewall, there was an uprising in a very positive way that took place. People realized that there was something they could do and should do to make sure that justice and equality were more than words for those who are members of the LGBTQ community.

This resolution highlights the importance of the American Psychiatric Association removing homosexuality from its list of mental illnesses in December of 1973. There is a recognition in the medical community that we should not have and that we must undo what has been done by labeling people as mentally ill because they were being the persons that God created them to be.

We have a saying in my community that God didn't create any junk, and people who are homosexuals are not junk; they are not persons with a mental illness; they are people who deserve the dignity and respect of all human beings and the dignity and respect that we accord other human beings, and I stand here tonight as a friend of the community to make it known that there are people who are willing to stand alone and fight for the rights of others, notwithstanding any consequences that may be put upon them.

This resolution recognizes Elaine Noble as the first LGBT candidate elected to a State legislature in 1974 and Barney Frank as the first Representative to come out as an openly gay Member of Congress in 1987. I had the preeminent privilege of knowing the Honorable Barney Frank.

I served on the Committee on Financial Services when he was the chairperson of that committee. He was a person committed to human rights for all, to human dignity for all. I am proud to stand here tonight and say that he has become an honorary member of the persons who are sponsoring this resolution.

By the way, there are many persons in Congress who are sponsoring this resolution, and I want to thank all of them for signing on to it. The Honorable Barney Frank is no longer in Congress. That is why he is listed as an honorary sponsor or cosponsor of the resolution.

This resolution highlights the importance of the Civil Service Commission eliminating the ban on hiring homosexuals in most Federal jobs in 1975. It seems unimaginable and unthinkable that we had to have a civil rights commission to eliminate the ban on hiring persons because of their sexual preference, because of their sexual orientation. It just seems unimaginable, but it had to happen, and it did.

The resolution celebrates Harvey Milk making national news when he was sworn in as an openly gay member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on January 8, 1978. I remember when it happened. It was really big news in this country. Quite frankly, it took courage for him to do this, and the kind of courage that he showed, that he exemplified, has merited his being mentioned in this resolution, H. Res. 329.

It praises the thousands of activists who participated in the National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights to demand equal civil rights in 1979 and the National March on Washington to demand that President Reagan address the AIDS crisis in 1987.

There were some people who, because they thought that the disease impacted a certain segment of society, did not readily respond with the hand of help that was available. I am grateful that President Reagan did take up this cause to help with the fight against AIDS.

AIDS can impact anyone in our society, and I am proud that our government has spent money on this disease to help eliminate it, but we haven't spent enough, and we haven't done enough. I think we can do more, and we should do more.

The resolution highlights the importance of the 1980 Democratic National Convention, where Democrats took a stance in support of gay rights. I am proud of my party. I happen to be a Democrat, but this is not a partisan effort, and the Democratic Party took that stance at a time when it wasn't popular to take the stance.

It has become popular now, to a certain extent and to a certain degree, to support gay rights and the rights of gay people, but in 1980, it was not nearly as popular as it is today, and the party took the step forward and in so doing brought a lot of others along with us.

The resolution highlights the importance of the Supreme Court ruling in Romer v. Evans in May of 1996, which found a Colorado constitutional amendment preventing the enactment of protection for gays and lesbians unconstitutional.

It is important that we challenge laws that prevent people from having equality of opportunity from receiving the same access to all that society has to offer as other people, and I am honored that the Colorado amendment preventing the enactment of protections for gays and lesbians was found unconstitutional.

It celebrates Vermont becoming the first State to legally recognize civil unions between gay and lesbian couples in 2000; and, my, have we come a long ways since 2000. We have come a long way because a good many people in this country now understand that the laws ought to apply equally to all, that the 14th Amendment is not for some, it is for all.

The judges who interpret these laws, who are indicating that these laws should apply appropriately to the LGBTQ community, these judges are not all gay judges. These are judges who are sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America, and they are doing it because they know that it is the right thing to do.

The Supreme Court will be taking up the case of gay marriage—in fact, is taking it up and will make a ruling sometime in the very near future. My hope is that the Supreme Court will honor the 14th Amendment and will allow the Constitution of the United States to apply to the members of the LGBTQ community to the same extent that it applies to people in other communities.

The law should be blind to who you are; it ought to give you justice because you happen to be a person that is a subject of the Constitution. It ought not peek to see if you are of a different hue or of a different sexual orientation. It ought to weigh equally all people and mete out justice to all the same.

This resolution recognizes the importance of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which was signed into law on October 28, 2009, by President Obama, as it expanded the Federal hate crime laws to include crimes motivated by a victim's actual or perceived gender, sexual orientation, or disability. People ought not be assaulted because of who they are.

What this does is it recognizes that, if you assault a police officer because you know that person is a police officer, then the crime that you will be charged with is enhanced, the punishment is enhanced. You will be punished more severely because you have assaulted a peace officer. This is a law in the State of Texas.

Well, if you assault a person because of who that person happens to be and because you don't happen to like that person because of the person's gender, because of the person's ethnicity, color, there ought to be a special punishment for you because you have gone out of your way to hurt somebody that you don't know in a good many circumstances and you want to do it simply because you don't like the way the

person looks or you don't like the person's perceived sexual orientation. The law has been changed, and it punishes you if you decide that you are going to commit this type of crime.

This resolution celebrates 2012 as the first year in which all 50 States had at least one LGBTQ elected official. All 50 States have now at least one person who is a part of the LGBTQ community holding public trust. People have come to understand that it is not the color of skin, it is not sexual orientation; it is the character within a person that determines whether or not a person ought to hold public trust, whether or not a person ought to be respected appropriately. It is the character, not the way the person is perceived in terms of color or sexual orientation.

This resolution celebrates Senator TAMMY BALDWIN being sworn in as the first openly gay United States Senator in January of 2013, and she has served her country well and merits this sort of recognition.

The resolution highlights the importance of the Supreme Court ruling in the United States v. Windsor on June 26, 2013, which found that section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act, DOMA, found it unconstitutional and determined that the Federal Government cannot discriminate against married lesbian and gay couples for the purpose of determining Federal benefits and protections.

This is the Supreme Court of the United States of America, the same Supreme Court with conservative and liberal Justices on it. We don't have to agree with everything the Supreme Court does, but I thank God I live in a country where we respect the decisions. We can differ with them. Even the Justices themselves differ about various opinions, but they respect the rulings of the Court. This Supreme Court has made such a ruling as it relates to the Defense of Marriage Act.

This resolution celebrates the 37 States and the District of Columbia where it is now legal for same-sex couples to get married. Literally, more than half of the States in the United States of America now permit same-sex couples to get married—more than half of the States.

This means that this country is moving toward, without a ruling from the Supreme Court, the notion that same-sex couples should be allowed to not only love each other, but to marry each other, to have the same benefits that heterosexual couples have when they marry.

□ 1915

Marriage is a great institution. I celebrate the institution of marriage. But the law, under the 14th Amendment, seems to indicate that we cannot prevent people who are of the same sex and who love each other from having the same opportunities that benefit from the institution of marriage that other people who are heterosexual have the opportunity of benefiting from.

So the States that have decided that they would do this should be recognized. By the way, many of these States recognize same-sex marriage because of judges in those States who have made rulings, because of legislatures in those States who have legislated, and because of people in those States who have voted.

There are 37 States. The States include Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut. They are all States that recognize same-sex marriage. Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, and Idaho are States that recognize same-sex marriage. Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Minnesota all recognize same-sex marriage. Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Ohio all recognize same-sex marriage. Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin are all States in the United States of America that recognize same-sex marriage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present the resolution. And I am honored to do so because I know the importance of having people who were not of African ancestry who supported causes that made it possible for me to be here.

I have a debt that I owe. I hope that tonight I have made a down payment on the retirement of that debt. Because somebody suffered so that I could have the opportunity to stand in the Congress of the United States of America and make this floor speech. No one could have—or would have—predicted at my birth that I would have the opportunity to be a Member of the Congress of the United States of America.

For me to be here, somebody had to find out what a 90-pound German Shepherd bites like; somebody had to found out what a high-pressure water hose stings like; somebody had to find out what going to jail feels like; somebody had to find out what losing someone that you love dearly to a cause hurts like.

I am not here because I am so smart. I am here because there are people who were willing to make great sacrifices so that I could have the opportunities that I have. And because I have them, I have a debt that I owe. And I am here tonight to say that I am proud to stand with the LGBTQ community to help bring about the kind of justice for this community that I have enjoyed.

Now let me be perspicuously clear about one thing. I am not saying that we have reached the panacea as it relates to the African American community. There is still great work to be done as evidenced by what happened in Charleston, South Carolina. There is still work to be done and still heavy lifting to do. But I am also very proud of some things that happened there.

I happened to be in a position to be at the bond hearing that took place, and as I listened, I could not believe my ears when I heard a mother say, ''You took my son''—took her hero, ''but I forgive you. I forgive you.'' Time and time again, persons said, ''I forgive you.''

I had tears well in my eyes because it takes a special person to say ''I forgive you'' so close to the event that is being forgiven or that the forgiveness addresses. It takes a special person.

And I want to compliment the families of the persons who lost their lives in church. My God, in church, lost their lives in church. I want to commend those families for having what Dr. Martin Luther King called the strength to love. The strength to love. He wrote the book, ''Strength to Love.'' It is a collection of his sermons. And he makes it known to us in that book that it is not easy to love your enemy. It is not easy to forgive those who would persecute you. But he also makes it known in the book ''Strength to Love'' that that is what love is all about: loving those who would do ugly things to you, who would be spiteful, who would be evil.

I think that the family members in Charleston who have shown the strength to love are a supreme, superb, sterling example to the rest of this country of what we must do if we are to continue to live together such that we will have a future that will be void of the kind of behavior—the ugly, dastardly deed, if you will—that took place in that church.

Dr. King reminded us also that we have a duty—an obligation, if you will—to learn to live together as brothers and sisters. We must learn to live together as brothers and sisters. Because if we don't learn to live together as brothers and sisters, we will perish together as fools.

I thank the people of South Carolina for exhibiting the ultimate in the strength to love, and I thank God that I have been blessed. I pray that God will continue to give me the strength to be a blessing to others.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FAITH THROUGH THE BIBLE

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, I enjoy hearing my friend from Texas, a former judge down in Houston, talk about love. I do love him as a Christian brother. We can disagree and still love each other.

I have been surprised in recent years to find some of those of us who believe in the Book that used to be read here. It was a pretty common practice on the floor of the House on Sundays down in Statuary Hall, and even in this room, back when church services were held in the former House Chamber.

It was attended by the man that first coined the phrase, ''separation of church and State.'' It is not in the Constitution. It was in his letter to the

Danbury Baptists. He came to a nondenominational Christian worship service down the hall. Of course, Thomas Jefferson would even bring the Marine Band and have them play hymns. Because although he made clear he believed in separation of church and State, and used that phrase, he didn't see any problem with singing hymns and having the Marine Band play the hymns to accompany right here in the U.S. Capitol.

I have been surprised in recent years at how prominent the Bible was in our founding, so much so that toward the end of June 1787, the Constitutional Convention was at wits' end, having a great deal of trouble, and Randolph from Virginia made a motion that they all convene together on the Nation's birthday and worship God together in services under the auspices of the Bible. They came back and were able to reach a conclusion that we call the Constitution. People like Alexander Hamilton said that clearly the finger of God was in that, and it all came into place after they worshipped the Lord and used the Bible in worship there in 1787.

But it is amazing now, after the Bible was such a prominent part of our founding throughout our history, now those of us that believe what is in the Bible are the ones who are now discriminated against. I have suffered it right here in this town, not to the extent of being harmed physically, of course. Physical threats are not uncommon, but they were there when I was a judge as well.

So I am just going to read without comment the Book that has been read in this Capitol throughout our history, Romans 1:16:

For I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in the righteousness of God is revealed from faith for faith, as it is written ''The righteous shall live by faith.''

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppressed the truth and unrighteousness, because that which is known about God is evident within them, for God made it evident to them. For since the creation of the world, His invisible attributes, His eternal power, divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made so that they are without excuse.

For even though they knew God, they did not honor Him as God or give thanks, but they became futile in their speculations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image in the form of corruptible man and of birds, four-footed animals, crawling creatures.

Therefore, God gave them over in the lust of their hearts to impurity that their bodies might be dishonored among them, for they exchanged the truth of God for a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.

For this reason, God gave them over to degrading passions. For their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural; and in the same way, also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire for one another, men with men committing indecent acts.

Because I believe the Scripture—love those who don't, love those because we have all sinned one way or another—there is no room to hate anybody that has sinned, because we all have. We have all fallen short.

But I am sure my office, Mr. Speaker, will be getting nasty, angry, bitter calls, as we often do when we refer to the Bible that helped give us our founding.

□ 1930

But that is what the Bible said, and I am deeply concerned that we have Supreme Court Justices, two of whom who have actually participated in same-sex weddings, thereby showing how biased and partial they are in favor of such things, against the dignity and history of marriage in the country, marriage in the Bible.

It has been said many times here over our history, Moses said it came from God, that Moses, depicted right up above the center door, that a man shall leave his father and mother and a woman leave her home and the two will become one flesh.

When Jesus was asked about marriage, he repeated it: For a man shall leave his father and mother, and a woman leave her home, and the two will become one flesh. And Jesus added: What God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

So we have two Justices that have already indicated they believe otherwise than the law of Moses and Jesus, and they have shown themselves to be anything but impartial.

So, under the law, 28 United States Code 455, it is mandatory, they shall disqualify themselves. And if it turns out that they sit in judgment on a case in which they are clearly disqualified and a part of the majority, that cannot possibly be a legitimate law change, judges substituting their law for the law that this country has utilized throughout its history.

Yes, courts all over the country have substituted their judgment for State constitutions and laws. And for those who don't believe the Bible, you have got nothing to worry about. But the indications are, in Romans 1, God's protective hand will be withdrawn when we continue to abandon the Nation's founding.

Thank God churches fought for, so many were involved in, the movement to make the Constitution mean just what it said. We really shouldn't have had to have a 14th Amendment. Everybody should have been equal under the law. But it took an amendment, took a civil rights movement, to apply it across the board.

Now we have judges that will be oligarchs, as they have been, and they will be making decisions, rather than elected officials, and we will see how much longer the Nation lasts.

There is no hate, just a broken heart in me, but I will be accused of being hatemonger this, hatemonger that. That is not the case.

I would like to congratulate our own leadership, Mr. Speaker. This is The Hill: ''Obama Poised for Huge Win on Trade.''

I would like to congratulate our Speaker, our Republican leadership, for pushing through the trade deal, leader MCCONNELL, down the hall. The President could not have gotten this ability to fast-track, to make deals that we won't know about, without the Republican leadership making that happen for him. Of course, nobody that I know of on the Republican side ran promising that we would get such ability for President Obama, but congratulations go there.

Some people say I am not quick enough to congratulate my own Republican leadership. I mean, I have congratulated our Speaker before when he was chairman of the Education Committee. As President Bush cited in his book, our now-Speaker was very important, very instrumental in getting No Child Left Behind pushed through.

Of course, when we won the majority in November 2010, got it back that December, deals were worked out that cost the country a lot of spending, raised the debt a great deal. Since then, although we continue to promise that we are going to do something about the debt, we continue to give the President almost a blank check.

But congratulations on all these. Congratulations on enabling the President to make these kind of deals. Then we will see if this law, TPA, is finally one the President abides by and gives us notice, timely, as he hasn't done in so many other areas, like Guantanamo and releasing people from Guantanamo.

But we have an article here, I guess, congratulations then would go to the Commander-in-Chief. Because I don't know that this would be the lion lying down with the lamb, if this lamb is the Iranian military-backed forces.

But this article from Bloomberg, June 22, Josh Rogin and Eli Lake, says:

The U.S. military and Iranian-backed Shiite militias are getting closer and closer in Iraq, even sharing a base, while Iran uses those militias to expand its influence in Iraq and fight alongside the Bashar al-Assad regime in neighboring Syria.

Two senior administration officials confirmed to us the U.S. soldiers and Shiite militia groups are both using the Taqaddum military base in Anbar, the same Iraqi base where President Obama is sending an additional 450 U.S. military personnel to help train the local forces fighting against the Islamic State. Some of the Iran-backed Shiite militias at the base have killed American soldiers in the past.

Some inside the Obama administration fear that sharing the base puts U.S. soldiers at risk. The U.S. intelligence community has reported back to Washington that representatives of some of the more extreme militias have been spying on U.S. operations at Taqaddum, one senior administration official told us. That could be calamitous if the fragile relationship between the U.S. military and the Shiite militia comes apart and Iran-backed forces decide to again target U.S. troops.

American critics of this growing cooperation between the U.S. military and the Iranian-backed militias call it a betrayal of the U.S. personnel who fought against the militias during the 10-year U.S. occupation of Iraq.

''It's an insult to the families of the American soldiers that were wounded and killed in battles in which the Shia militias were the enemy,'' Senate Armed Services Chairman JOHN MCCAIN told us. ''Now, providing arms to them and supporting them, it's very hard for those families to understand.''

The U.S. is not directly training Shiite units of what are known as the Popular Mobilization Forces, which include tens of thousands of Iraqis who have volunteered to fight against the Islamic State as well as thousands of hardened militants who ultimately answer to militia leaders loyal to Tehran. But the U.S. is flying close air support missions for those forces.

The U.S. gives weapons directly only to the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi Security Forces, but the lines between them and the militias are blurry. U.S. weapons often fall into the hands of militias, like Iraqi Hezbollah. Sometimes the military cooperation is even more explicit. Commanders of some of the hard-line militias sit in on U.S. military briefings on operations that were meant for the government-controlled Iraqi Security Forces, a senior administration official said.

This collaboration with terrorist groups that have killed Americans was seen as unavoidable as the U.S. marshaled Iraqis against the Islamic State, but could prove counterproductive to U.S. interests in the long term, this official said.

The militias comprise largely Shiite volunteers and are headed by the leader of the Iraqi Hezbollah, Abu Mahdi al-Muhandis. He was sanctioned in 2009 by the Treasury Department for destabilizing Iraq. Al-Muhandis is a close associate of Qasem Suleimani, the Iranian Quds Force commander, who has snapped selfies with the militia leader at key battles.

Other militias that have participated in the fighting against the Islamic State include the League of the Righteous which, in 2007, carried out a brutal roadside execution of five U.S. soldiers near Karbala. The group to this day boasts of its killing of U.S. soldiers. In an interview in February, a spokesman for the militia defended the killings and said his militia had killed many more American soldiers.

Members of these groups have also been deployed by Iran to defend the Assad regime in neighboring Syria. James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, confirmed in a June 3 letter to seven Republican Senators, which we obtained, that ''Iran and Hezbollah have also leveraged allied Iraqi Shia militant and terrorist groups, which receive training in Iran, to participate in the pro-Assad operations.''

The militias also stand accused of gross human rights abuses and battlefield atrocities in Sunni areas where they have fought. The State Department heavily criticized Iran's support for the Iraqi militias and those militias' behavior in its annual report on worldwide terrorism, released last week.

Further down:

With the deadline approaching for a nuclear deal that would place up to $150 billion in the hands of Iran, the U.S. is now openly acknowledging in its annual report on international terrorism that Iran is supporting a foreign legion, comprising Afghans, Iraqis, and Lebanese fighters to defend Iranian interests throughout the Middle East.

But the U.S. response to this is inconsistent. In Iraq, America is fighting alongside Iranian-backed militias. In Syria, U.S.-supported forces are fighting against those same militias. The tragedy of this policy is that the Islamic State has been able to hold and expand its territory in Iraq and Syria, while Iran has been able to tighten its grip on Baghdad.

Then another article from Daniel Horowitz, Conservative Review:

Anyone who visits Walter Reed Hospital will immediately see the irrevocable destruction of Hezbollah. Thousands of our troops have been incapacitated and mangled by IEDs from Hezbollah and other Shiite groups in Iraq, all funded by Obama's ally, Iran. Anyone who was around in 1983 will remember the 241 American servicemen who were killed in the Hezbollah terror attack in Beirut.

Guess what Obama is doing with them?

Eli Lake reports at Bloomberg News that our troops are sharing a base with Hezbollah-controlled Shiite forces, and we are bailing them out of their humiliating loss to the Islamic State.

□ 1945

The article goes on, but it is just exceedingly tragic; but it explains why the President has been unable to state that we have a clear strategy in the Middle East because, on the one hand, we have had the United States military give their lives fighting against the tyranny and the atrocities of Hezbollah.

On the other hand, we now have the President, the Commander in Chief, who commands over our forces that he has put in the same camp with Hezbollah. The hope, apparently, of the administration is, even though they are still bragging in Hezbollah about killing American soldiers, that maybe by having them camp in the same camp, they won't be killing them now. You have got to love that optimism.

As we see the Commander in Chief's troops being forced to come together with people like Hezbollah—that want to kill them, have killed them, have maimed them, Hezbollah is clearly supported by Iran—then we get this, ''AP Exclusive: Document outlines big-power nuke help to Iran,'' George Jahn, dated today, from Vienna.

The United States and other nations negotiating a nuclear deal with Iran are ready to offer high-tech reactors and other state-of-the-art equipment to Tehran if it agrees to crimp programs that can make atomic bombs, according to a confidential document obtained Tuesday by the Associated Press.

The draft document—one of several technical appendixes meant to accompany the main text of any deal—has dozens of bracketed texts where disagreements remain. Technical cooperation is the least controversial issue at the talks, and the number of brackets suggest the sides have a ways to go not only on the topic but also more contentious disputes with little more than a week until the June 30 deadline for a deal.

With that deadline looming, Iran's top leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, on Tuesday rejected a long-term freeze on nuclear research and supported banning international inspectors from accessing military sites. Khamenei, in comments broadcast on Iranian state television, also said Iran will sign a final deal provided all economic sanctions now in Iran are first lifted—in a sign the Islamic Republic may be toughening its stance ahead of the deadline.

In any event, that is great news.

Of course, the Senate and House passed a bill that turned requirements for authorization of treaties upside down. Instead of having two-thirds of the Senate required to approve a deal, we have flipped it. Now, it will take two-thirds of a vote in the House and Senate to disapprove a deal. That makes it easier for the President to give Iran the nuclear reactors they are hoping.

Mr. Speaker, I brought this up in past years; but here, in negotiating with Iran, one of our lead negotiators was the same person who was involved in the Clinton administration negotiations with North Korea, where they cut this wonderful deal basically saying, in essence, we will give you nuclear reactors for power if you will just promise that you won't use them to make nuclear weapons.

This dishonest, evil leader said: All you want is a promise from a dishonest leader that I won't use them to make nukes? Sure, I will promise you that. Bring on the nuclear power plants.

Those came, and they were converted. Now, North Korea is helping with parts of the evil empire to develop nuclear weapons of their own.

When you have somebody involved in that kind of deal with North Korea sent to negotiate with Iran, we should have known that this would be coming: Hey, we will give you nuclear reactors. We will help you make it happen. We just don't want you to use them to make nuclear weapons.

Since Iran has been—at least the leaders have been so evil in the way they have pursued Israel, in the way they have pursued Americans, continuing to brag about killing Americans, I don't think anybody should really be surprised if this deal gets cut and then Iran goes ahead and uses what we provide them or the P5+1 provides them in order to make nuclear weapons more quickly than they could have without this kind of deal.

But ''congratulations'' again go to the Republican leaders in the House and Senate for pushing through the authority for the President to have the ability to make these kinds of deals. Who says I can't be magnanimous and thank Republican leaders?

I hope the American public will wake up and understand, the deal that has been negotiated is deadly to our ally Israel; it is deadly to the United States. Make it clear that any party that hopes to have any chance of having a President elected from their party better not be part of the deal with Iran because it is going to get more Americans and Israelis killed.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed

without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 533. An act to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate concurs in the House amendment to the Senate amendment with an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1295) ''An Act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 644) ''An Act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.'', and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. STABENOW to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2032

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO THE HOUSE AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1295, TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–179) on the resolution (H. Res. 338) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1295) to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical procedure.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 615. An act 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.

H.R. 2146. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1901. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2015-2016 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0096; FV15-985-1 FR] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1902. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Biorefinery, Renewable Chemical, and Biobased Product Manufacturing Assistance Program (RIN: 0570-AA73) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1903. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Report to Congress on the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) for Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013'', pursuant to Pub. L. 113-186, Sec. 658L; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1904. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Gamma-Linolenic Acid Safflower Meal [Docket No.: FDA-2010-F-0537] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1905. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; TBHQ [Docket No.: FDA-2014-F-0364] received June 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1906. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the ''2012-2013 Report to Congress on Organ Donation and the Recovery, Preservation, and Transportation of Organs'', pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 274f-4, added by Pub. L. 108-216, the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1907. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress on the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts A and B Supplemental Funds for FY 2011 through 2014, pursuant to Secs. 2603(e) and 2620(d) of Title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1908. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2014 annual Performance Report to Congress, pursuant to the Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1909. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Australia, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-41; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1910. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's ''Country Reports on Terrorism 2014'', pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656f; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1911. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243) and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), for the February 14, 2015, to April 15, 2015 reporting period.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1912. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the ''Report on External Quality Control Review'' for the year ending on September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1913. A letter from the Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [CPCLO Order No.: 008-2015] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1914. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of The President, transmitting the ''2014 Report to Congress on the Benefits and Costs of Federal Regulations and Unfunded Mandates on State, Local, and Tribal Entities'', as required by 31 U.S.C. 1105 note and 2 U.S.C. 1531-1538; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1915. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des

Moines 2014 management report and financial statements, pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1916. A letter from the Officer, Equal Employment Opportunity, International Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. Section, transmitting the Commission's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1917. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2015 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 2nd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1918. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1919. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the semiannual report to Congress from the Social Security Administration Office of Inspector General during the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1920. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a notification that the Department, through the Bureau of Land Management, intends to accept a gift of land in Tulare County, California, from the Mojave Desert Land Trust, pursuant to Sec. 6 of the Wilderness Act of 1964, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1135); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1921. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Effort Limits in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015 [Docket No.: 150406346-5346-01] (RIN: 0648-BF03) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1922. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Edits [NPS-WASO-18005; PPWOVPADU0, PPMPSPD1Y.YM0000] (RIN: 1024-AE25) received June 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1923. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Special Management Zones for Delaware Artificial Reefs [Docket No.: 130702585-5454-02] (RIN: 0648-BD42) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1924. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Specifications [Docket No.: 150205118-5443-02] (RIN: 0648-BE87) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1925. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on compliance within the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions under Title I of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. 2266 subsections (b)(5) and (c)(5); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1926. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2014 Report to Congress on the STOP (Services, Training, Officers, Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Formula Grants Program (STOP Program), as required by the Violence Against Women Act, codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. 3796gg-3, and the 2014 Report to Congress on the Sexual Assault Services Formula Grants Program, as required by Sec. 1003(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000, codified at 42 U.S.C. 3789p; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1927. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Titles of Restricted Areas R-5301, R-5302A, R-5302B, and R-5302C; North Carolina [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1862; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1928. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0485; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-093-AD; Amendment 39-18176; AD 2015-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1929. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tribune, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0744; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ACE-5] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1930. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0249; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-211-AD; Amendment 39-18180; AD 2015-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1931. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0585; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-248-AD; Amendment 39-18182; AD 2015-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1932. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0618; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-171-AD; Amendment 39-18178; AD 2015-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1933. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Avidyne Corporation Integrated Flight Displays [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2191; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-019-AD; Amendment 39-18183; AD 2015-10-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1934. A letter from the FMCSA Division Chief, Regulatory Development, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Examiner's Certification Integration [Docket No.: FMCSA-2012-0178] (RIN: 2126-AB40) received June 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1935. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procurement, Management, and Administration of Engineering and Design Related Services [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2012-0043] (RIN: 2125-AF44) received June 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1936. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's temporary regulations — Suspension of Benefits under the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act of 2014 [TD 9723] (RIN: 1545-BM73) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1937. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Portability of a Deceased Spousal Unused Exclusion Amount [TD 9725] (RIN: 1545-BK74) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1938. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Partnership Transactions Involving Equity Interests of a Partner [TD 9722] (RIN: 1545-BM35) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1939. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration: 2015 Section 45Q Inflation Adjustment Factor [Notice 2015-44] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1940. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2014 Section 45K(d)(2)(C) Reference Price [Notice 2015-45] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1941. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rules — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary [TD 9724] (RIN: 1545-BM53) 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. 984. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices (Rept. 114–178 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 338. A resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1295) to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–179). Referred to the House Calendar.

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 Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2867. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2868. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 2869. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to permit cooperative governing of public entity health benefits through local governments in secondary States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2870. A bill to amend the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 to authorize appropriations to provide assistance for domestic and foreign programs and centers for the treatment of victims of torture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2871. A bill to provide an incentive for firearm owners to sell their firearms safely and responsibly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 2872. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to modernize the treatment of opioid addiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2873. A bill to prohibit employers from requiring low-wage employees to enter into covenants not to compete, to require employers to notify potential employees of any requirement to enter into a covenant not to compete, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 2874. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any discharge of indebtedness income on education loans of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 2875. A bill to encourage greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 2876. A bill to promote the recycling of vessels in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 2877. A bill to designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2878. A bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015; 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. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 2879. A bill to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2880. A bill to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of applicable large employer for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 2882. A bill to support Promise Neighborhoods; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 2883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2884. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate the firewalls between defense and nondefense discretionary spending limits; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income and employment taxes real property tax abatements for seniors and disabled individuals in exchange for services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KEATING):

H.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate contributions and expenditures in political campaigns and to enact public financing systems for such campaigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 336. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to create a small donor and public finance system for Congressional elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PITTS, Mr.

McGOVERN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. BERA):

H. Res. 337. A resolution calling for substantive dialogue, without preconditions, in order to address Tibetan grievances and secure a negotiated agreement for the Tibetan people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H. Res. 339. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the 25th anniversary of democracy in Mongolia; 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 Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 2867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fifteenth Amendment, Section 2 Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. regulate commerce . . . among the several states . . . as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and

2. provide for the general welfare of the United States as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 10

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 2871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 or Article I fo the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constittuion of the United States

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have Power [...] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States...''

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 2874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision grants Congress the authority to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans; and

2) The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 2879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 providing for the general welfare of the United States

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2880.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 14—Congress has the ability to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section, 9, Clause 7

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 2885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI to the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.J. Res. 58.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COOK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 20: Ms. BASS and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 21: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 167: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 213: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 223: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 224: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 282: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 379: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 403: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 430: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 465: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 539: Mr. COHEN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 540: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 564: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 611: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 634: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 635: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 680: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 686: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 692: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 700: Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 702: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 707: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 716: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 759: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 771: Ms. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 775: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MULLIN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 789: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 790: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 824: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 840: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 842: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 845: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 879: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 885: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 915: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 918: Mr. ISSA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 920: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 930: Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 969: Mr. SCHRADER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 980: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 986: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1019: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. OLSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. BERA, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 1062: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1078: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1086: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 1089: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 1091: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1095: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1120: Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1132: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NUNES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 1141: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1194: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1218: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1233: Mr. KLINE and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1258: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1299: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1300: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1301: Ms. HAHN and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1309: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 1321: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1328: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1342: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1384: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1434: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1439: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1453: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1462: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1475: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 1502: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1516: Ms. TITUS, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1559: Mr. FOSTER
H.R. 1566: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1567: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1594: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1598: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1600: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1603: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1604: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 1610: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1624: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1653: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1654: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1655: Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1680: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1684: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1686: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1722: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1725: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1728: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1743: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1752: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1769: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1774: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1801: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1818: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1832: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1853: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1859: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1861: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1882: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1893: Mr. BUCK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HARPER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POMPEO and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1901: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1937: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1950: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. BLACK and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1994: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2013: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2016: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2023: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2037: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2043: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2061: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2123: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2125: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2134: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2140: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. RUSSELL
H.R. 2148: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2169: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POCAN and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2191: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2216: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2233: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2280: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2285: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2290: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 2304: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2315: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2355: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2362: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2371: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2380: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2400: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2403: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2404: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2406: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2407: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2466: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 2524: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2530: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2560: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2595: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2602: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2612: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2615: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2636: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2646: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2650: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2652: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2653: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2660: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2662: Mr. COOPER and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2691: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2710: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 2726: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2742: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2762: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2763: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2775: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2802: Mr. BUCK, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2805: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 2809: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2825: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas
H.R. 2826: Mr. WELCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2835: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2838: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2850: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2856: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2866: Mr. FATTAH.
H.J. Res. 47: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. MOULTON.
H.J. Res. 54: Mr. BRAT.
H. Con. Res. 17: Ms. MCSALLY.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. WALZ.
H. Res. 54: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 82: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H. Res. 112: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 209: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Res. 227: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 291: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 294: Mr. UPTON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 310: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 318: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H. Res. 324: Ms. LEE, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 329: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. POLIQUIN

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 63.7570(b)(2) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 70, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue any final

rule pursuant to the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency complies with Section 321(a) of the such Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. WALBERG

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to lobby in contravention of section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, on behalf of the proposed rule entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'' (79 Fed. Reg. 22188; April 21, 2014).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. KILDEE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 68, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That an entity shall not be an eligible recipient for a grant under this paragraph unless the entity has experienced at least 15 percent population loss since 1970, as measured by data from the 2010 decennial census and has experienced prolonged population, income, and employment loss resulting in substantial levels of housing vacancy and abandonment and such housing vacancies and abandonments are concentrated in more than one neighborhood or geographic area within a jurisdiction or jurisdictions.''.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Strike section 418.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Strike section 422.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Strike section 439.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Strike section 417.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Strike section 434.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. AMODEI

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SAGE-GROUSE

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce, or administer any action to withdraw lands pursuant to section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1714) for the purpose of managing the greater sage-grouse or greater sage-grouse habitat.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to finalize, approve, or implement the Great Basin Region Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments for the Sub-Regions of Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon and Utah; the Rocky Mountain Region Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments for the Wyoming, Northwest Colorado, Lewistown, and North Dakota Sub-Regions; the Proposed Resource Management Plan for the Billings and Pompeys Pillar National Monument Resource Management Plan Revision; the HiLine District Proposed Resource Management Plan; the Miles City Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan; Proposed Resource Management Plan for the Bighorn Basin Resource Management Plan Revision; the Proposed Resource Management Plan for the Buffalo, Wyoming Resource Management Plan Revision; and the South Dakota Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan developed pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) or section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 14, line 3, before the period insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That none of such funds and appropriations may be used to enforce any prohibition under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) or the Act of June 8, 1940 (chapter 278; 16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.; popularly known as the Bald Eagle Protection Act) on the accidental taking of birds, before the date of the issuance of a rule that exempts such takings from such prohibitions''.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. HUDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO REMOVE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 260 FROM LEASING PROGRAM

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove oil and gas lease sale 260 from the Draft Proposed Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 2017-2022 (DPP), or from any subsequent proposed or final iteration of such Program.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. NEWHOUSE

AMENDMENT NO. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TREAT GRAY WOLVES IN WASHINGTON, OREGON, AND UTAH AS ENDANGERED SPECIES OR THREATENED SPECIES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to used to treat any gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) in Washington, Oregon, or Utah as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2015 No. 102

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, sustainer of nations, continue to heal our land. We claim Your promise that if people of faith will humble themselves and fervently seek You in prayer as they turn from evil, that You will hear their intercession, forgive their sins, and heal their land.

Use our lawmakers as instruments of unity. As they model the bridge building necessary to bring harmony and healing to nations, may their positive example transform lives. Lord, lead our Senators in righteous paths that will keep our Nation strong. Equip them to conduct the work of freedom with justice and humility.

Teach us all to disagree without being disagreeable, to seek to understand before being understood, to plant seeds of love to counteract hate, and to sow seeds of hope to eliminate despair.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday's TPA vote was a long-overdue victory for the American worker and the American middle class. It was not easy. Many thought it would never happen. We even saw corks pop in the facts-optional lobby a few weeks ago. But that proved to be premature because here is what we have always known about the legislation we will vote to send to the President today. It is underpinned by a simple but powerful idea: For American workers to have a fair shot in the 21st-century economy, it makes sense to remove the unfair barriers that discriminate against them and the products they make.

Some may disagree. They certainly were not quiet in voicing their opinions. It is OK if they do not share our passion for ending this unfair discrimination against American workers. It is OK if they would rather rail against them tomorrow. But a bipartisan coalition in the House and the Senate thought it was time for forward progress instead.

We were very pleased to see President Obama pursue an idea we have long believed in. We thank him for his efforts to help us advance this measure. We thank all of our friends across the aisle for their efforts, too, Senator WYDEN most of all. Over in the House, I commend Speaker BOEHNER and Chairman RYAN for everything they have done. It hasn't been easy, and without them it would not have been possible. Of course, let me thank Chairman ORRIN HATCH for demonstrating such patience, persistence, and determination throughout this process. He never lost sight of the goal. He never gave up. The people of Utah are lucky to have him.

The Senate's work on trade does not end today. I said the Senate would finish pursuing the rest of the full trade package, and it will. We will take another cloture vote today to that end. That process continues. But the key victory for American workers and products stamped ''Made in the U.S.A.'' comes today. The bill we are about to pass will assert Congress's authority throughout the trade negotiation process. It will ensure that we have the tools we need to properly scrutinize whatever trade agreements are ultimately negotiated. It will make clear that the final say rests with us.

We had plenty of bumps along the road—frankly, a few big potholes, too—but we worked across the aisle to get through all of them. That is an example of how a new Congress is back to work for the American people. I thank everyone who helped us get where we are. Now let's vote again to support the American worker and the American middle class by approving the bipartisan TPA bill.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, here is a headline from an Associated Press article that ran yesterday: ''Federal Agencies Are Wide Open to Hackers, Cyberspies.'' That headline is scary enough, but read just a little further, and it gets even worse.

Passwords written down on desks. Outdated anti-virus software. ''Perceived ineptitude'' in information-technology departments.

The federal government, which holds secrets and sensitive information ranging from nuclear blueprints to the tax returns of hundreds of millions of Americans, has for years failed to take basic steps to protect its data from hackers and thieves, records show. In the latest example, the Office of Personnel Management is under fire for allowing its databases to be plundered by suspected Chinese cyberspies in what is being called one of the worst breaches in U.S. history. OPM repeatedly neglected to implement basic cybersecurity protections, its internal watchdog told Congress.

Let me repeat that—''one of the worst breaches in U.S. history.'' If you are looking for something scary to tell the kids around the campfire tonight, I would suggest reading the rest of the article. It gets a lot worse. To call this alarming would be quite an understatement.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

So when the head of the agency that allowed that big breach to happen testified before a Senate subcommittee yesterday, you would think she would have come with a detailed action plan. You would think she would have announced that heads were rolling. You would think she said this could never ever be allowed to happen again under her watch. That is what the American people expect when a breach happens in the private sector and information is stolen. Why should they not expect as much from the public sector? But what did we hear instead? World-class buck-passing. World-class buck-passing. A complete lack of accountability and urgency. That tired and predicable excuse that the absence of leadership can be solved by throwing a few more dollars at the problem.

Well, Congress can certainly look at the funding angle. I know we will. But as we learned yesterday, it was not just the old stuff that was breached, it was the new stuff, too. More money is not going to solve a management problem, either. Let's be honest. This appears primarily to be a management problem. This appears primarily to be a management problem.

Here is what the American people were really looking for the OPM Director to address: Accountability. Accountability. A plan for the future. Confidence in the ability of the bureaucracy they hired and rarely, if ever, can fire to break out of the stereotype and show they can put the people's concerns first.

I thank Chairman BOOZMAN for holding that hearing. We learned a lot, but it is not the end of the story. The OPM Director will testify tomorrow before Chairman RON JOHNSON's homeland security committee, too. I hope she will take that opportunity to articulate a credible plan of action. I hope she will better address the legitimate concerns of the American people. That means a resolve to get to the bottom of what happened. That means giving the American people renewed confidence in a creaking bureaucracy. And that means pledging to work with policymakers to enact real reforms rather than simply accepting failure.

Whatever happens tomorrow, one thing does not change: the need for the Intelligence Committee's cyber security bill we tried to pass earlier this month. I am going to continue working with my colleagues toward that end. In the meantime, I look forward to seeing what happens in tomorrow's committee meeting.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky is certainly right that we need to move on cyber security. I have known that for many years, and we have tried. Why have we not done something on it? Because of filibusters by the Republicans. We had a bill that had been worked on for years that we brought before the Senate. But instructions were given from the Chamber of Commerce, and the Republicans dutifully walked down here and voted no, stopping us from moving forward on the bill. The Chamber said—and obviously Republicans agreed—this is not something for the government. It should be done in-house.

Well, my friend the Republican leader rails against the government, but he should also understand that this is a situation which involves the private sector also. We could name 25 companies, 50 companies, 100 companies that have been hacked and hacked very badly, not the least of which are Sony and Target.

It is hard for me to comprehend that my friend, my counterpart, is here talking about the need to do something about cyber security when he is the leader of the Republicans who have stopped us from doing this.

There is a bill—it is not a perfect bill; it is far from it—a bipartisan bill. It has the support of the chairman and ranking member of the Intelligence Committee. We could get to work on that right now. We should do that. I repeat, it is not perfect legislation, but it is certainly a step forward.

My friend said he wants heads to roll. If that were the case, then there are a lot of heads to roll in the public sector and the private sector because they do not have the tools to do much about this hacking. We need to help them with appropriate legislation. I hope we can do that and do it very soon. I remain committed to turning to cyber security as quickly as we can. We need to get that done. I hope we can get that done. On that issue, we could go to that legislation right now. Do you know why we are not going to go to it right now? Because the Republicans have holds on the bill. So the Republican leader will file a motion to invoke cloture on moving forward on this legislation. We are ready to move on it now. Again, the problem is on the Republican side, not our side.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our great country faces yet another manufactured crisis. In just a few weeks from now, the end of July—and that is coming quickly—on July 31, the authority for the recent extension of the highway trust fund will expire. The U.S. Department of Transportation will not be able to make payments to our States for highways, bridges, railways. All transportation agencies will likely postpone or cancel roadwork during the busy summer construction season. Why? Because they have no money. They know the highway Surface Transportation Program has been stymied as a result of 33 short-term extensions forced upon us by the Republicans in the Senate—33. How can these agencies plan ahead? They can't.

Before this crisis becomes full-blown, Democrats want to work with Republicans on a long-term reauthorization of the highway program. I know there are Members of the majority who want to do something about this.

The Presiding Officer has a plan to take care of highways. Is it a perfect plan? Of course it is not perfect, but it sure is a good step forward to do something about this program, something that is long term.

This crisis is about jobs, hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of high-paying construction jobs throughout the country. That is why we challenged the Republican leader to move forward with a robust, long-term surface transportation bill ahead of that deadline.

I am pleased Republicans have joined with Democrats to schedule a markup—in fact, it is going on right now in the Environment and Public Works Committee—on a 6-year surface transportation bill. This, of course, is an authorization only, but what terrific work done by Senators BOXER and INHOFE. They are an unmatched pair usually in all issues that come before this body, but on this legislation they are a matched pair. I admire and appreciate what they are going to mark up in just a few minutes. It is an authorization but a big step forward.

But next comes the need for funding what they authorize and maybe a little more. Their legislation will modernize our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. The bill the EPW Committee will consider is $275 billion. That includes modest increases of funding over the next 6 years. But modest increases, while important, will not allow us to make the investments our transportation system really needs. Every day we learn of new examples about the state of disrepair of our roads, bridges, our highways, and of course our transit systems.

The highway trust fund is no longer sufficient to fund the investments we so desperately need to rebuild them. Why? Because people's habits have changed. Vehicles have changed. People don't drive—every car they have is not a gas guzzler. We have a lot of electric cars. We have cars that run sometimes on gasoline, sometimes on electricity. We have cars that run on gasoline all the time, but they don't burn much gasoline.

So the trust fund, which was set to take care of all the road needs we have, surface transportation needs—we simply don't have the resources anymore, so we have to look for other resources because, I repeat, the highway trust fund is no longer sufficient to fund these investments we so desperately need to rebuild them. We know this because over the past few years Congress has transferred billions of dollars to make up the shortfall in the trust fund revenues.

Today, it is important to thank again Senators INHOFE and BOXER for

their leadership in marking up this bill.

I hope the new chairmen of the Banking, Commerce, and Finance Committees will demonstrate the same sense of urgency and schedule markups for their portion of the surface transportation legislation. Despite the common knowledge about the expiration of surface transportation funding, Republicans have delayed the important work of writing a bipartisan bill for far too long.

Our good citizens don't deserve another exercise in crisis management like we are seeing this week in the Export-Import Bank. Democrats have laid out a clear timetable and process for bipartisan negotiations. A long-term, robust bill can pass before the August recess.

To recap, we requested a number of things, but let me mention a few of them: hearings in each of the authorizing committees by June 23—we know how that has already passed—bipartisan markups in all authorizing committees by July 10 that include robust increases for highways, transit, passenger rail, and of course all kinds of new safety programs and maintain those we have; and basically a long-term bill on the Senate floor by July 20.

If the Republican leader continues to avoid conducting business on Fridays, we have only 15 session days in the month of July; that is, 15 days to address our country's major surface transportation needs and help our struggling economy by providing lots and lots of jobs. The clock is ticking.

At a hearing on the funding gap last week, Senator HATCH said: ''As chairman of the [Finance] committee, I intend to solve this problem.''

Well, I appreciate that very much. I am taking him at his word. Senate Democrats are ready to work with Republicans to grow, not cut, our transportation funding. But I say to my friend the senior Senator from Utah, please, please do something that is more than another short-term extension. We need a 6-year bill. Every State in the Union needs that. We have had them in the past, but now the Republicans, learning how to filibuster—they have stopped, basically, everything we have tried to do in this regard.

We cannot—I say to my friend from Utah—we cannot have another extension. I repeat, this would be the 34th short-term extension. Enough is enough. We need to move forward with a plan that funds our Nation's infrastructure, supports jobs, and grows our economy, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs. Americans rely on a strong transportation system to travel. They do this to commute and also, of course, to move goods across the country.

This program was the brainchild of Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, when he called upon his experience as a young military officer in trying to bring military equipment and men across the country. It was very difficult. As a young military officer he said: Someday, if I have any ability to change this, I will—and he did. The National Highway System is Eisenhower's highway system. This is not a program that was developed by anyone other than Dwight Eisenhower.

So temporary funding for the highway trust fund leads only to uncertainty, slowing construction, and of course hurting economic development in every State of our Nation. The Republican leadership should act now to avoid this looming deadline and support long-term investment into our Nation's crumbling infrastructure.

Mr. President, I see no one on the floor so I would ask what the business of the day is.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 2146, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with amendment No. 2060 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2061 (to amendment No. 2060), of a perfecting nature.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we had a wonderful event last night here in Washington that I was able to attend. It was a night honoring champions for anti-gun violence measures across the country. It was put on by Sandy Hook Promise, which is an organization that has grown up out of the tragedy in Sandy Hook. A number of parents have become the organizers of an effort to try and learn from what happened at Sandy Hook and make sure we don't repeat the mistakes of the past.

We actually got to honor two of our colleagues there. We honored Senator PAT TOOMEY for his work 2 years ago on the background checks bill, as well as Senator STABENOW, who, of course, has been a great advocate for increasing resources in our mental health system. And as wonderful a night as it was to honor these champions of change, it also was a night in which we were reminded about that terrible morning in December of 2012.

We watched a short video of the news coverage, and we listened to the parents of Daniel Barden and Dylan Hockley. The husband of Mary Sherlach talked to us about what their lives have been like in the years since that shooting at Sandy Hook.

I remember the hours and days after the shooting. I remember feeling like I needed to be really restrained about talking about the obvious policy issues that, to me, were due for airing and that sort of tumbled out of the facts surrounding that tragedy. I mean, this kid—this really troubled young man—walked into a school with a semiautomatic weapon designed for the military and shot 20 kids in less than 5 minutes. This gun was designed for the military, designed to kill as many people as quickly as possible, and it killed every single kid it hit. There were 20 kids shot. Twenty kids were dead in a matter of minutes.

So it seemed to me we should have an immediate discussion about why this kind of gun is still legal. But I held back because it felt like the mourning and the grieving should take precedence over action. It took me only up to the first wake that I attended to realize I was wrong. Senator BLUMENTHAL and I went to every single wake and every funeral we could over the course of that first week—and there were dozens.

At first, I remember waiting in a really long line, standing next to Senator BLUMENTHAL. I remember as if it were yesterday, talking to a sobbing mother, who was standing in front of us waiting in that line and telling us about how her child survived the shooting only because she had been sick that day and she stayed home from school. But all her daughters' friends were dead. As we approached that family, I remember struggling with what to say. I am lucky that the senior Senator from Connecticut, who sits behind me in the Chamber, had the right words ready. He said to the parents something like this: If you are ever ready or willing to talk about how we make sure this doesn't happen again, we will be waiting. The dad didn't pause more than a few seconds before he said, clear as day: We are ready now.

In the years since, these mass shootings have become as commonplace as rain storms. Since 2011, the number of mass shootings in the United States has tripled—tripled. After each one, the forces of the status quo—the defenders of the gun industry—tell us we can't talk about policy reform in the days after a shooting. One prominent commentator called those of us who dared talk about change in the wake of Charleston ''sick.'' How convenient that is. How convenient that, at the moment when the world is watching, when the country is asking itself what we can do to make sure another mass slaughter doesn't happen again, the rules say we can't say a word.

But think about how these rules would work, because Charleston happens 10 times over, every single day, across this country. Eighty-six people die, on average, every day because of guns.

Last Thursday the families of Clementa Pinckney, Cynthia Hurd, Tywanza Sanders, Sharonda Coleman Singleton, Myra Thompson, Ethel Lee Lance, Susie Jackson, Daniel Lee Simmons, Sr., and DePayne Middleton-Doctor mourned the loss of their loved ones in Charleston.

But the day before, on Wednesday, the families of Angel Feliciano, Malik Mercer, Eric Ferguson, Michael Kidd, Jr., Thomas Whitaker, Roy Brown, Martarese Gentry, Keith Battle, and Ronald Collins mourned their loss. And those were just nine. There were dozens more on Wednesday, the day before the Charleston shooting, who were killed by guns.

If we can't talk about anti-gun violence policy the day after a large number of Americans are shot, then we will never talk about anti-gun violence policy, because on average 86 people die from gun violence every single day. But even if we accept that there is never a bad time to talk about how we can end this carnage, then we also have to have the courage to take on all the other ridiculous arguments about why we can't act.

Now, the first one is familiar because it comes right after the mass shooting happens. A former NRA board member trotted this one out within hours of Charleston: He said that the solution was to just arm more pastors and parishioners in churches so they can defend themselves. The more there are people who have guns, the less people will die from guns—so goes this logic. So don't act.

The simple argument is that more good guys with guns equals less gun deaths. The problem with that argument is it is a boldfaced lie. Study after study shows that the more guns there are in a community, the more crime there is. The more guns there are, the more gun homicides there are. New evidence makes the case even clearer. As States more clearly separate between those with lax gun laws and those with stricter gun laws, we can look to see what happens.

The second argument is one that I have heard from my Republican colleagues in the Senate just in the last few days—that these laws can't stop a madman such as Dylann Root or Adam Lanza from perpetrating violence. Some of my colleagues say the only recourse is to close our eyes and pray this doesn't happen again. But again, these stubborn facts betray that argument. As I said, now that we have States that have loose gun laws and States that have tougher gun laws, we can see what happens. Over and over research shows us that jurisdictions that make it a little bit harder for bad guys to get guns have less gun deaths.

In my State of Connecticut, Johns Hopkins researchers concluded that our permit-to-carry laws have reduced gun crimes by 40 percent. Similarly, they concluded that in Missouri, the repeal of a similar law increased gun homicides by 25 percent. Now, both studies controlled for all other possible factors influencing gun crimes, and they still found these shocking results.

While the facts are still fresh out of Charleston, there is evidence that a different set of laws could have—not would have—stopped Dylann Root without having any effect on law-abiding gun owners in South Carolina.

Root had charges pending for trespassing and drug crimes. Alone, neither would have disqualified him from owning a gun. But what if our laws were different so that multiple misdemeanors—a pattern of criminal behavior—disqualified you from buying a firearm? Or what about a permit-to-carry law?

Maybe local law enforcement knew enough about Root—his criminal past or his association with extremist right-wing organizations—to know he shouldn't carry a weapon. Now, maybe not, but if South Carolina had a permit-to-carry law, at least there would have been a chance law enforcement would have withheld a permit from a young man as plainly unstable as Root.

But even if you don't believe that any specific law could have prevented the tragedy in Charleston or in Newtown, I am not sure that it matters, because separate and aside from the specific case-by-case impact of any law is the collective moral and psychological effect of nonaction. No matter how maligned Congress becomes, we still set the moral tone for the Nation. When we declare something to be morally out of bounds, especially when we do it in a bipartisan or nonpartisan manner, Americans listen. They take cues from our endorsements and from our approbations.

That is why, in my heart of hearts, I believe that our silence has made us complicit in these murders. I don't care that an assault weapons ban or universal background check maybe wouldn't have stopped the slaughter in Charleston. When we do nothing year after year, our silence sends a silent message of endorsement to the killers. I am not saying we are in conscious alignment with these assassins, but when all we do in the wake of Newtown, Tucson, Aurora, and Charleston is rhetorical, then those on the fringe, those hanging on the edge of reason, those contemplating the unthinkable take a cue that we don't really mean it when we condemn mass violence, because if we did, we would, at the very least, try to do something—anything—to stop it, and we don't.

Quite frankly, removing one flag from one building in South Carolina doesn't cut it, and neither does a handful of retailers ceasing to sell Confederate flag paraphernalia. Don't get me wrong. I actually think the tidal wave of sentiment to remove the last vestiges of this symbol of slavery and racism is significant. That flag has quietly endorsed conscious and subconscious racism, particularly in the South—but really all across the country—for as long as it has continued to be perceived as a mainstream American symbol.

The events of the last few days are also important because they show that people of all political stripes—conservatives and liberals, Democrats and Republicans—have been so emotionally moved by the shooting in Charleston that they were inspired to some sort of action. That matters.

But removing the Confederate flag is a necessary but totally, completely insufficient response to Charleston. Taking down a flag from a building is a pretty easy giveback. Deciding to spend billions of dollars to make sure that troubled young men get the help they need for their sickness is harder, and so is taking on the gun industry and listening to the 90 percent of Americans who want to make sure criminals aren't a continued profit center for the gun makers and sellers.

Now, Walmart should be congratulated for ceasing sales of the Confederate flag, but they still advertise an assault weapon online that even their description concedes is designed for use by law enforcement and the military. Did you know that last year there were at least 92 shootings in Walmart? Some 16 people died, and 42 people were injured by guns in Walmart. Getting rid of the Confederate flag from their shelves isn't going to help that unbelievably disturbing trend.

So we need real action, a real debate. We need a real, honest policy to happen here. And, no, it is not all about guns. It is about mental health, it is about law enforcement, and it is about a culture of violence and hate that we have just become immune to.

In South Carolina, Reverend Pinckney knew something about real action. He supported things like expanded background checks and body cameras for police, maybe because he came from a family of action. His father and grandfather were both pastors who fought to end White-only political primaries and segregated school busing. He wasn't just about condemnation. He lived his life to effectuate political

change. Last night, at the Sandy Hook Promise dinner, I chatted with my friend Mark Barden. His son, Daniel, massacred at Sandy Hook Elementary School by a young man wielding a military-style assault weapon with cartridges of 30 bullets apiece, would have just finished third grade last week. Mark recalled how special Danny was and how Daniel, just 6 years old, lived a life of action, too. Daniel was that kid who sensed when other children were hurting. His dad told me last night how Daniel would see little kids sitting alone at lunch with no one to talk to, and Daniel would go over, sit down next to them, and make a new friend, just because it was the right thing to do.

Reverend Pinckney and little Daniel Barden knew the difference between words and actions. They understood that actions are what really count.

The U.S. gun homicide rate is 20 times higher than that of our 22 peer nations. And 86 people die every day from guns—that is 4 Sandy Hooks, 10 Charlestons every day. Since Sandy Hook, there has been a school shooting, on average, every week.

How on Earth can we live with ourselves if we do nothing or, worse, if we don't even try.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to spend the next few minutes speaking about the Supreme Court and particularly the fact that the Supreme Court has some big cases they are going to hand down probably tomorrow, Friday, and Monday, before they adjourn for the summer.

I particularly wish to speak about King v. Burwell, which, as the Presiding Officer knows, could be the beginning of the end of ObamaCare. In the process, it also will potentially disrupt the health care coverage for more than 6 million Americans. The Court could issue its decision, as I said, as early as tomorrow. What they will decide is whether the IRS is bound by the law which Congress writes and which is signed by the President or whether they can make it up on their own.

Specifically, the case challenges the legality of subsidies provided to 6 million people in up to 37 States that they have depended on to buy their ObamaCare-approved policies, including about 1 million in my State of Texas.

If the Court rules against the IRS, it will literally be the third strike against ObamaCare from the Supreme Court of the United States. It would serve as yet another reminder of the administration's overreach of its authority under the Constitution—a practice that has become disturbingly routine.

This administration and our friends across the aisle have failed to own up to the repeated demonstrations of the flaws of ObamaCare since it passed in March of 2010. The biggest problem is that this is partisan legislation jammed through Congress that no Republican in the Senate voted for, so the responsibility lies clearly at their feet.

Through this law, the administration has wasted billions of dollars on exchanges that have failed to function properly. My colleagues may recall that the President even called the healthcare.gov exchange—which was so broken and just didn't work—a disaster. The President himself said that.

It is also based on a system that grows the bureaucracy at the expense of legitimate, needed health care delivery. I would have thought that if Congress was going to reform health care, it would certainly include reducing the cost and making it more affordable. However, time after time, we have seen that ObamaCare has actually driven up costs. Just last month, one study noted that nearly $274 billion of projected ObamaCare spending will end up going to its implementation—bureaucratic and administrative costs—and not actually for health care. That is $274 billion. Do we think that money could have been better spent providing people with health care policies they can afford and access to the doctors and the hospitals they need?

Today, ObamaCare has utterly failed to live up to the many promises the President and congressional Democrats made to the American people. Seeing the Presiding Officer in the chair reminds me that both he and I served as attorneys general in our States. One of my responsibilities in Texas—and no doubt the Presiding Officer's as well—was to enforce our consumer protection laws. Can my colleagues imagine, if anybody other than the Federal Government had made the series of promises the President and congressional Democrats made under ObamaCare that proved over time to be demonstrably false, whether a company in the private sector could withstand the flood of lawsuits by the Attorney General and other consumer protection officials against that company?

I guess the fact is that there is very little recourse to the American people—certainly the courts—to enforce our consumer protection laws against the outright deceit and misleading promises that were made in order to sell ObamaCare, which are clearly, as time has demonstrated, not true.

The President's trail of broken promises has instead led us to a damaged health care system and a limping economy. There is a reason why the economy shrunk last quarter by 0.7 percent. What that means is that fewer people can find work and their wages are depressed. We need our economy to grow. But as long as additional and heavy burdens, such as ObamaCare and unnecessary regulations, are imposed on the private sector, those jobs and those rising wages are simply not going to exist.

This week, many are rightly concerned that, depending on what the Supreme Court decides, millions of people will lose their access to health care should the Court rule against the President. I must point out that is a feature of ObamaCare. That is not the fault of the Supreme Court, and it is not the fault of the opponents of ObamaCare; it is the fault of the President and of the people who passed ObamaCare because this will be a feature of ObamaCare, this failed law.

Having said where the responsibility lies, while we didn't contribute to getting the country in this mess, we are ready, willing, and able to provide an off-ramp for the millions of people who may have their health care interrupted. My State, as I indicated earlier, is not immune. Close to 1 million Texans could suddenly see their costs shoot up. So I am here to emphatically say to the Texans whose health care coverage may be disrupted: We will not leave you out in the cold as a casualty of this flawed law, and we will no longer allow this flawed piece of legislation to cause additional hardship for hard-working Texas families.

In order to protect Americans and Texans who may lose their health care coverage if the Court decides against the President and against the IRS, we are prepared, having worked for months now, to protect those who need it as they transition out of ObamaCare.

Make no mistake about it—this will be the beginning of the end of ObamaCare if the Court rules for the plaintiff in King v. Burwell.

At the same time, we plan to provide an end to the individual and employer mandates, the opportunity for States to opt out of ObamaCare, and finally, an end to government-backed health care that the American people don't want, don't need, and cannot afford.

There is a better alternative. If the Supreme Court rules for King, we will offer the American people what ObamaCare never could—options, choices, and the freedom to choose the health care coverage they want at a price they can afford. Most importantly, we want to allow individuals as well as the States to opt out of this disastrous law all across the country. In doing so, Americans can get what they actually need and not what government tells them they must buy. By empowering States to opt out, we put the States back in the driver's seat. I must say, every public opinion poll I have seen indicates that the people have a lot more confidence in the ability of the States to deal with their health care needs than they do the Federal Government, particularly in light of the failed experiment over the last 5 years. We put the States back in

the driver's seat and allow them the flexibility they need to more effectively lower costs and increase choices.

So while we didn't create this mess, we are ready to do our best to work together to protect the American people from any more harm caused by this legislation. The American people deserve real, patient-centered reforms which, again, lower costs, making it more affordable, and increase access to care—not the opposite.

If the Court delivers what could be a third strike against ObamaCare, my colleagues and I are eager to provide the American people with the freedom and the options they need in order to get the best health care available at a price they can afford.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, as we are moving toward concluding debate on trade promotion authority, I rise to speak about what the Trans-Pacific Partnership will mean for our Nation's global standing. As we have heard throughout this debate, the potential economic benefits from TPP for our Nation are simply enormous. According to the Congressional Research Service, total trade in goods between TPP member countries reached $1.6 trillion in 2014; that is, the nations represented in TPP, $1.6 trillion in trade between those countries, representing nearly 40 percent of all global trade.

In my own State of Colorado, trade with countries involved in TPP currently supports over 265,000 jobs. The nations represented by the TPP agreement—the negotiations that are taking place right now—265,000 jobs in Colorado result from those nations. But we know the TPP is more than just an economic agreement. It is a critical test of U.S. strategic leadership in the Asia-Pacific region, a region that will be integral to our economic and national security for generations to come.

As stated in the 2015 National Security Strategy:

> Sustaining our leadership depends on shaping an emerging global economic order that continues to reflect our interests and our values. Despite its success, our rules-based system is now competing against alternative, less-open models. . . . To meet this challenge, we must be strategic in the use of our economic strength to set new rules of the road, strengthen our partnerships, and promote inclusive development.

Those are important words from the National Security Strategy issued just this year. Defense Secretary Ash Carter echoed that sentiment when he said on April 6, 2015, the ''TPP is as important to me as another aircraft carrier.'' If we fail to pass the TPP, we know others will rush to fill the vacuum left behind with such ''alternative, less-open models,'' as the National Security Strategy laid out.

So we should not be surprised when a rising China tries to fill the vacuum and that they would, indeed, exert efforts to fill that vacuum with policies and programs crafted from their own vision of what is beneficial for themselves and their region.

Let's take China's recent establishment of the Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank, the AIIB, as an example. On the face of it, the AIIB is a positive response to address the infrastructure challenges in the region. It is also the clearest evidence yet that the United States faces a very serious credibility gap in the Asia-Pacific region. The AIIB is envisioned as a $100 billion enterprise, with China as the largest shareholder that will hold veto power over major investment decisions. Its rules of governance and standards remain unclear.

Yet 56 nations, including some of the strongest U.S. allies, including the United Kingdom, Australia, South Korea, have indicated they will join the Chinese-led AIIB. We need to understand why. Do they believe the AIIB is primarily an economic opportunity for their companies? They might. But I would contend that the reason is a lack of leadership from the United States, again going back to that credibility gap.

China is also part of ongoing negotiations for another regional trade pact, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership, which would join China, Australia, India, Japan, New Zealand, and South Korea with nations comprising the Association of Southeast Asian Nations or ASEAN. In addition to the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership, Beijing is also entering negotiations to consider 6 agreements comprised of an additional 11 countries.

That brings China's total trade agreement portfolio to 33 countries. While the United States should continue bilateral and multilateral economic engagement with China that brings high levels of transparency and accountability, the fundamental question before us today is this: Do we want the United States or do we want China writing the rules?

It is clear that while our partners and allies in the region may welcome additional Chinese investment, they want more American leadership, not less. They want more American standards, not fewer.

We know the standards TPP and U.S. engagement brings include not only important economic benefits, such as removal of tariff or nontariff barriers, but fundamental American values such as transparency, good governance, respect for the rule of law, and basic human rights.

U.S. economic statecraft in the Asia-Pacific reflects our values and cements our leadership in the critically important region. We must look at TPP as just one step forward in this enduring commitment. Despite the crises of the day that are occurring in the Middle East, where the United States does and should play an important role, our Nation's future lies in Asia.

Just consider the following estimates from the Asian Development Bank. By 2050, Asia will account for over half of the global population and over half of the world's gross domestic product. The Asian middle class will rise to a staggering 3 billion people. Per capita GDP income in the region will rise to around $40,000, making it similar to the Europe of today.

We cannot miss the opportunity to be a part of this historic transformation. Working with Japan and regional partners, we must ensure that our policies strengthen existing friendships and build new partnerships that will be critical to U.S. national security and economic well-being for generations to come. Unfortunately, the administration's efforts to date with regard to the Asia-Pacific region have fallen short.

While I commend the President's leadership on TPP and our Asia rebalance, which many of us agreed to, the Asia rebalance policy has yielded few tangible results, and it is in need of a serious overhaul. The administration has consistently stated that the rebalance represented a ''whole-of-government'' effort to redirect U.S. military, diplomatic, and commercial service resources toward the Asia-Pacific region.

But in April of 2014, just a year ago, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee released a report stating that ''while the United States has successfully moved forward with the initial phases of implementing the military aspects of the rebalance,'' the State Department and the Department of Commerce have not substantially prioritized their resources to increase engagement with the Asia-Pacific region.

The report concluded that ''the administration can improve the effectiveness and sustainability of the rebalance policy by increasing civilian engagement, strengthening diplomatic partnerships, and empowering US businesses.''

It is clear we need an integrated, multiyear planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of the U.S. policy in Asia. That is why I was proud to offer an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act that passed unanimously that would require the President to submit a strategy within 120 days to promote U.S. interests in the Asia-Pacific region. Our partners in the region must know every day that the United States is here to stay. The TPP is the first step in the process.

This is an important debate that we have this week. Later on today, we will have the opportunity to vote for trade promotion authority. I hope this Chamber will see the wisdom of passing that legislation—265,000 jobs in Colorado from a region responsible for TPP,

responsible for increasing economic opportunity, increasing wage growth, and the number of jobs that we have not only in Colorado but around this country.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to fast-track trade promotion authority.

I am a blue-collar Senator. My heart and soul lies with blue-collar America. I spent most of my life in a blue-collar neighborhood. My mother and father owned a neighborhood grocery store and when Bethlehem Steel went on strike, my dad gave those workers credit.

Blue-collar workers in the labor movement stood with me during my first campaign for the House in 1976. I wish there were more of them left to stand with me now, but the great manufacturing unions have been whittled away. On this fast-track trade vote, and in my last years in the Senate, I will continue to stand with the unions.

Let me be very clear that I support and encourage trade. Trade is very important to my State. It is vital to The Port of Baltimore and Maryland's agricultural industries such as poultry on the Eastern Shore.

In the past I have supported bilateral trade agreements. We have leverage in those situations to get strong enforceable labor and environmental provisions into those agreements. We can improve living standards and stop child labor in sweatshops. And Maryland workers can compete successfully in a global marketplace if they are given a level playing field.

But I have always been suspicious of multilateral agreements such as NAFTA. I have seen too many of these big deals fail to deliver the promises of new jobs and businesses. Every time somebody talks about a big multilateral trade agreement that will provide a cornucopia of opportunity, we lose jobs in Baltimore. And my constituents in Dundalk don't have a steel industry anymore. They wonder why Congress didn't do more to protect them from the effects of trade.

I believe that a renewal of fast-track trade authority for the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership means more Americans will lose their jobs.

We should use the leverage of our trade agreements to ensure fair competition. That means workers in other countries should have the right to organize into unions. Without the strength of collective bargaining, their wages will always be below ours. They should also have worker safety protection and retirement and health care benefits.

We should use the leverage of our trade agreements to encourage countries to respect the basic human rights of their citizens. Everyone deserves the right to live in a healthy, clean, unpolluted environment. And every worker should be guaranteed fundamental rights at work.

Why is the role of Congress so important in trade agreements? To make sure that the American people get a good deal. I am ready to support trade agreements that are good for America, good for workers, and good for the environment. Congress should consider trade legislation and amendments using the same procedures we use to consider other legislation.

I have to base my decision on the facts and what I know to be true in my State. I know that proponents of fast-track say it is inevitable that there will be winners and losers. The problem with these big trade deals is that America's workers and their families always seem to be the losers. They lose their jobs. If they keep their jobs, or find new jobs, they lose the wage rates they have earned. Working people have faced the loss of jobs, lower wages, and a reduced standard of living, and a shrinking manufacturing base.

I have to stand with my constituents who have felt repeatedly betrayed by the trade deals. I have to vote against fast-track trade authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, across the street from the Senate Chamber is the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court this week has several important cases pending. We are waiting anxiously for decisions, but probably the one that affects as many Americans as any other is a case called King v. Burwell. King is a case that was brought by someone who was objecting to the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare.

They are arguing that the bill we passed in the Senate and the House did not include a subsidy, a tax credit, for those who are under Federal marketplace plans. My State of Illinois is one of those States. In Illinois, there are about 232,000 individuals who receive a tax credit that allows them to pay for their health insurance. Their income levels are such that they need a helping hand, otherwise the health insurance premium would be too expensive.

In my State, the average tax credit that goes to these 232,000 is $1,800 a year—not insubstantial—$150 a month. Now, those who brought the lawsuit say that the law does not provide this tax credit. I believe it clearly does. No one during the course of debating this bill ever suggested otherwise. In fact, there were many times when we calculated the impact of this law. We always assumed the tax credit would be there for families, whether their State had its own State insurance exchange or used the Federal exchange, as we do in the State of Illinois.

But the big problem we have is that if the Court rules the other way, if those who are critical of the Affordable Care Act—and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been on the floor this morning talking about getting rid of the Affordable Care Act—if the Court rules in that direction, we are going to have a problem on our hands because at least in my State, 232,000 people will see their health insurance premiums go up 35 percent, on average, based on that Court ruling.

There are not many working families who can face that kind of increase and say, well, it really does not make any difference. It makes a big difference—on average $150 a month. For families living paycheck to paycheck and struggling who qualify for this tax credit, it is a big problem. Many of them will not be able to afford health insurance.

So what happens next? We go back to where we were before: More uninsured Americans. I don't know how many people in the Senate Chamber who serve here have ever been in a position in their lives where they did not have health insurance and needed it. I have. Newly married, my wife and I had a baby with a serious health issue. We had no health insurance. It is a humbling experience, as a father, as a husband, to be in that position. It means hoping you get the best medical care and hoping you can pay for it.

For many families across America, that was the standard before the Affordable Care Act. But because of the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, we now have fewer people uninsured in America. That is a good thing, not just because it gives you peace of mind and access to quality health care but because uninsured people still get sick. When they get sick and go to the hospital, their expenses that they can't cover because they don't have health insurance are passed along to everyone else. How can that possibly be a good outcome?

So the Affordable Care Act has increased the number of people across America who have health insurance by about 11 million people—not insubstantial. It has reduced the uninsured rate, as I mentioned, 3½ percent in just a 1- or 2-year period of time. Six million receive these tax credits. So there are 6 million families who may not know it, but what happens across the street at the Supreme Court this week or next week could have a big impact on the family budget.

I struggle to try to understand those who hate the Affordable Care Act like the devil hates Holy water. They cannot stand this notion that 11 million people have health insurance. They want to get rid of it. There are proposals from the other side of the aisle to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. They want to eliminate the individual mandate. What does that mean? That is the part of the law that says: You have a personal responsibility to have health insurance.

Now, do we run into any other aspect of life where we are required to have insurance? Drive a car in my State, you better have automobile insurance. Buy a home in my State, virtually every bank requires fire insurance. It is a matter of responsibility. So the individual mandate not only says to everyone: You need to buy health insurance, it helps those who are in low-income

categories, and it is a critical part of the big picture.

Here is the big picture: If we are going to say, as we do in this law, that no health insurance company can discriminate against you because of a preexisting condition that you have or that someone in your family has—if we are going to say that, the only way it works in the insurance business is if you have a lot of people who are in that insurance pool. That includes people with preexisting conditions.

So when the Republicans argue: We are going to get rid of the individual mandate, you can sign up if you want to, the people who run insurance companies say: It doesn't work. You have to have a pool with a lot of people in it: healthy and those not so healthy. Otherwise, you cannot write insurance that is going to work. What else has happened because of the Affordable Care Act? The rate of growth in health care costs has started—just started—to come down. It does not have to come down much to have a dramatic impact on our economy.

This Affordable Care Act, incidentally, which many on the other side are cheering to have it abolished—this Affordable Care Act, according to the Congressional Budget Office, is going to cut $353 billion in deficit. How could that be?

Because one of the largest drivers of cost to the Federal Government is the cost of health care. If the rate of growth in the cost of health care just takes a little dip down and you project it out, it is big dollars.

We even used what many Republicans believe is holy writ called dynamic scoring. We even said: Take a look. Use dynamic scoring, and tell us what impact it has on the deficit.

It turns out that even with dynamic scoring, our Affordable Care Act reduces the deficit by $137 billion. It works. More people are being insured. Folks cannot be denied insurance because of a preexisting condition. The overall cost of health care is starting to dip down. It brings down the deficit. What part of that isn't good news? I think it is all good news.

For a lot of individuals who live in my home State of Illinois, it is pretty personal. I have met with them. Last week, in my newsletter I asked people to share with me their experiences with the Affordable Care Act. The response was overwhelming, and the majority was positive.

Danny Blight lives in Germantown Hills, IL. He was diagnosed with bladder cancer in 2005. At the time, he was lucky enough to have a job with health insurance, but then he was fired and let go. He lost his health insurance, and he couldn't afford coverage because of his preexisting condition, his history of cancer, and he required surgery to treat his cancer. According to Danny, he relied on the local sisters of St. Francis to provide basic care for him and his family when he couldn't afford health insurance until the Affordable Care Act became the law. Now Danny Blight and his family have health insurance. Is this an important law for them? It may be the most important thing we have done in Congress when it comes to this family.

I got in a debate back in my own hometown once with a group who opposes this law. They were of the opposite political faith, and I knew it. They had some pretty strong feelings about the role and the size of government, and they said as much. I would answer them by saying: Well, let me tell you about a family I met. Let me tell you about this family.

Finally, one man stood, raised his hand, and said: Stop telling stories. We don't want to hear these stories.

I know why they didn't want to hear it—because these stories are reality. These stories don't reflect political philosophy so much as the reality of life for a lot of people across America.

We know that discriminating against families because of preexisting conditions is a real problem. We know there are many families, for example, with a history of some illness, even mental illness, who in days gone by had no chance to have health insurance.

There were two other things we did in this law, and I don't understand why the other party wants to get rid of these provisions. The Affordable Care Act says that if you have a child graduating from college, your family health insurance plan can cover them until they reach the age of 26. Why is that important? Because many times young people coming fresh out of college have a lot of student debt and no job—no full-time job—and very few of them have health insurance immediately, and they think they are invincible.

I remember reaching out to my daughter when she graduated from college.

I said: Jen, what about health insurance?

Dad, don't worry about it. I feel fine.

Well, I did worry about it, and a lot of parents do. So our law says you can keep your recent college graduate under your family plan until they reach the age of 26. Why would you want to get rid of that? Why would someone want to eliminate that provision in the law?

The other thing it says is that if you are a senior and you are on Medicare—the Part D, which provides your prescription drugs, used to have what is called a doughnut hole in it. What that meant was Medicare would cover your prescription drugs to a certain point and then stop, and you had to go to your savings account, pull out about $1,200, pay for your prescription drugs, and then coverage would start again. The doughnut hole is what we called it. We filled it. We filled it so seniors don't have to worry about going to their savings to make sure they can keep taking prescriptions that keep them independent, strong, and healthy. What is wrong with that idea? Why do they want to get rid of that? That is part of the Affordable Care Act as well.

I just wonder sometimes if those who get all tied up over the philosophy of this legislation deal with the reality of family life in America.

Jean Terrien and her husband Michael live in Evanston, IL. They are both cancer survivors. Jean had breast cancer at age 45, and Michael had prostate cancer at the same age. Neither could purchase insurance before the Affordable Care Act because of preexisting medical conditions in their family. Because of this law, they have an affordable policy, and Jean is able to do freelance work without having to worry about health insurance. She told me she worries about losing her coverage if the Supreme Court goes the wrong way or if the majority party here gets their wish and abolishes the Affordable Care Act. I think we owe it to them to strengthen the law and not to repeal it.

The Affordable Care Act, incidentally, has been very good when it comes to Medicare. Because of the Affordable Care Act and the slowdown in the rate of growth in health care costs, Medicare will have an additional 13 years of solvency. How about that. I worried about it for many years. I still do. But it is good news to us, to know that we have, in the Medicare Part A trust fund, 13 years more solvency since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. The trustees of the Medicare Program in 2010 said that the Affordable Care Act ''substantially improved'' the financial status of Medicare. Is that a good thing for America? Forty million Americans think it is. Those are the people who depend on Medicare.

The law is helping seniors with their prescription drugs, as I mentioned earlier, and it is a savings of about $925 a year for each senior in America.

So for those who are cheering and hoping the Supreme Court will somehow derail the Affordable Care Act, my questions are very direct: What do you have to replace it? What will you do to deal with preexisting conditions and denying health insurance? What will you do to make sure parents can keep their kids under their health insurance plans until the kids reach age 26? What will you do to fill the doughnut hole? What will you do to replace the deficit reduction the Affordable Care Act has achieved? What will you do in terms of the long-term solvency of Medicare to make up for the 13 years the Affordable Care Act has purchased?

And the answer is, they don't have an idea. They just don't like it. They don't like ObamaCare, and they don't want to hear these stories, just like the folks whom I debated with in my hometown, because these stories reflect the reality of life.

NORTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS TORNADOES

Mr. President, it was 2 months ago when I came to the floor and talked about tornadoes in my State of Illinois, the north central part of the State. We

had it again on Monday night. Nine twisters tore through the small towns in five Illinois counties Monday evening, accompanied by baseball-sized hail, flooding rains, and wind damage. Grundy, Lee, Kankakee, Will, and Whiteside Counties all experienced severe damage.

One of the towns that was hardest hit was Coal City in Grundy County, IL. Here is a photo of Grundy County and some of the damage. You can see the destruction. The National Weather Service said the tornado that struck this town was an EF–3, winds of 160 miles an hour. Some of the homes had the roofs ripped off and others were just flattened. Debris was scattered across the town. Many roads were impassible. There were downed power lines and trees, and there was flooding. This is the second tornado to hit Coal City in 2 years.

As soon as the twister passed Monday night, the first responders—God bless them—went door to door to try to make sure the 5,000 people there were accounted for. Thank goodness there were no fatalities or life-threatening injuries.

This tight-knit community is pulling together to help the victims. One man who lives in Coal City, Rick Druse, said he was lucky that one of his neighbors came to find him and his family—they were trapped in a crawl space. The homeowner across from Rick also was trapped in his home, which had been flattened by the storm. Power was knocked out for roughly 61,000 customers, and some are still waiting for it to be restored.

Yesterday, we reached out to Terri Halliday, the mayor of Coal City. We have spoken with Grundy County Board chair David Welter and Lee County Board chair Rick Ketchum.

My staff connected with Sterling mayor Skip Lee and Whiteside County Board chair Jim Duffy about the tornado that struck Sterling. That is another town which is also dealing with flooding. I reached out to each of them last night and, not surprisingly, had to leave voice mails. I know they were out and about. But we are there to help them if we can.

As is so often the case with disasters such as this, first responders, friends, and family waste no time helping their neighbors. It isn't just a Midwestern thing, but we are pretty proud of it in the Midwest. I have no doubt that the people in Coal City, Sublette, Sterling, and all of the others are going to stand up and help one another clean up, rebuild, and get on with their lives.

My thoughts are with the many people today who have lost their homes and other property.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to speak a little bit about an agreement that very well could be reached between now and the time that the Senate returns right after the Fourth of July. The agreement has been negotiated for 2 years now with Iran, although it seems to me that using the term ''negotiation'' is a stretch. As to most of what we said we wanted to achieve in this so-called negotiation, the Iranians have said they didn't want to achieve it. We seem then to move forward to the next point once we concede that point.

Yesterday, I read in press reports that the State Department has now decided it will not demand a full accountability for the past nuclear research on the part of Iran before they conclude a deal. One of the early statements was: We want to know what Iran did, how long they had been doing it, what scientists were involved, what material, and what information they had achieved in their efforts to actually have a nuclear weapon.

It appears now that we are happy if Iran is just nuclear-weapons capable, with a clock that would start at some time, and we seem to feel we suddenly have a new ability to monitor everything Iran does even though we don't appear to have the ability to get them to tell us what they have done.

As I have said before, this is one of the areas where there is no question that no deal is better than a bad deal.

According to the State Department, which recently reported again that Iran should still be considered a country that encourages terrorism; that, in fact, you can make the case that there is no greater encourager of terrorist activities in the world today than Iran—but all of those things seem to be off the table as we talk to Iran.

The true nature of the regime, and why we want to have an agreement on just a nuclear program and not all of the other things Iran has going on, continues to be of great concern to me.

The news reports today were that the Iranian Parliament, the Iranian legislature will now finalize legislation demanding that we not be able to look at military sites as part of our inspection. If the goal here is to stop Iran from having a nuclear capability, having a nuclear weapon, having a military capacity to use a nuclear weapon, why would we take military sites off the list of things we are supposed to pay attention to? Where would we expect them to be finally developing a weapon if not at a military site?

The Iranian Parliament appears to have a whole lot more to say about this negotiation than the Senate. In fact, I am afraid we are going to find with the legislation that we did vote on that it is going to be a lot easier to prevent disapproval than it would have ever been to get approval of this agreement that looks like it is headed toward a very bad agreement.

The Supreme Leader of Iran has ruled out any long-term freezes of nuclear activities and demands that sanctions be lifted immediately. A few weeks ago, when the United States said what our understanding of the framework moving forward would be—it seems to be about 180 degrees different from what Iran is announcing every day. They want immediate sanctions relief. We say they are only going to get sanctions relief when they begin to comply. They don't want to have inspections at military sites. We say one of the reasons we want to have this agreement is so we can ensure that nothing happens at military sites.

Meanwhile, Iran advances violence and instability around the world. Supported by Iran, Assad in Syria is massacring his own people. So far, at least 190,000 Syrians have been killed in what is going on in Syria today. Iran is supporting that regime. Shiite militias support Assad. They promote division and wage violence outside of Syria, now into Iraq, encouraged by Iran. Supported by Iran, Houthi rebels have seized key territory in Yemen and seek to overthrow the government.

By the way, I remind the President that this was something which less than a year ago President Obama said was a great example of how our foreign policy under his leadership was working, that Yemen was an example. Only a few months later, we are fleeing the country and closing our Embassy. Actually, the President may have been right. Maybe Yemen is a great example of how our foreign policy is working.

Hezbollah and Lebanon wage terrorism against Israel, encouraged by Iran.

Palestinian terrorists in Gaza, encouraged by Iran, continue to lob mortars and rockets into Israel.

Last April, Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard stopped a Marshall Islands-flagged ship in the Strait of Hormuz.

Iran continues to hold hostages without any reasonable charge. Three American citizens—Pastor Saeed Abedini, former U.S. marine Amir Hekmati, and Washington Post journalist Jason Rezaian—are being held by Iran. A fourth American, former FBI official Robert Levinson, is missing and is in Iran, with no assistance from Iran to find him. In fact, they don't know exactly where he is. I have repeatedly called, as others in the Congress have, on the administration to just stop negotiations until there is a show of good faith to let these Americans go.

I saw a few days ago that Pastor Abedini was beaten again in the prison he has been put in, the most dangerous prison in Iran.

How could we not get three people whom they are holding under charges that will not stand up to any public view? How could we allow them to continue to hold these people while we continue to have talks about something like letting this country become nuclear capable?

Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian was arrested after security forces raided his home. His case was referred to a Revolutionary Court on January 14 of this year, but details of his charges and details of his court date have not been released. His mother is concerned—as we all should be—about his health, which is deteriorating as he is being imprisoned. Recent reports would suggest that this Washington Post reporter is being charged with espionage.

Pastor Abedini was imprisoned in September of 2012. In January of 2013, he was sentenced to 8 years in prison for ''practicing his religion.'' That is his crime—practicing his religion. The Iranian Government charged that Pastor Abedini was undermining the Iranian Government by creating a network of Christian house churches and attempting to sway Iranian youth away from Islam. In August of 2013, his appeal was denied. He was then put in the worst prison in the country. He has been beaten up in prison. I think he was beaten in the hospital when he had to be taken there, as his life had almost ended with prison beatings. Why do they still have him?

Why do they have Amir Hekmati, a former U.S. marine who was arrested while visiting his family in Iran in August of 2011? The Iranian Government sentenced him to death for espionage. Fortunately, his death sentence was overturned by an appeals court in March of 2012. However, he was still convicted of aiding a hostile nation—that would be us, by the way—and was found guilty of espionage.

Bob Levinson, who is a retired DEA and FBI agent, disappeared in March of 2007 while visiting Iran's Kish Island. It is very likely, many people believe, that Mr. Levinson is currently a prisoner in Iran. Just 3 weeks after he disappeared, Iranian state television reported that he was in the hands of Iranian security forces.

Why are we assuming that the Iranians will agree to something much more complicated when they will not let these four people go? Why wouldn't we insist on that?

Finally, Iran is responsible for killing and maiming thousands of American service men and women in Iraq and Iran from deadly, armor-piercing improvised explosive devices that originated in Iran. They don't deny it. I think they take pride in it.

The destabilizing impact of a nuclear weapons-capable Iran is hard to overstate. If you want to do one thing to cast a huge shadow over the next decade and perhaps decades of this century—unless that shadow somehow is removed before the end of the decade, it is hard to imagine.

Sanctions, with the credible threat of military force, were doing good until we decided we would ease those sanctions if Iran would come to the negotiating table. That began 2 years ago. Two years ago we said things we would insist on. Two years later, none of those things appear to be things that are still being discussed in these Iranian so-called negotiations.

Sanctions should stay in place until Iran fundamentally changes its course and its behavior.

I am greatly concerned that the agreement on Iran's nuclear program will not be presented to the Congress in a way that allows the Congress to really weigh in, and I am concerned that this program as it will be presented to the Congress will establish Iran as a nuclear-capable, nuclear-threshold state. When that happens, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Jordan have all stated they will claim the exact same rights to do whatever it is we allow Iran to do. If we come up with an agreement that says Iran will be within 6 months of having a nuclear weapon and that they have to tell us when they start that 6-month clock, other countries will also want to be within 6 months of a nuclear weapon.

If we believe we can monitor Iran within 6 months or 12 months or whatever the number is, I think we are kidding ourselves, and most of the world doesn't believe we can do this either.

Turkey and other countries outside of the immediate neighborhood will also want to view nuclear weapons capability as a new status quo in a dangerous world.

An agreement that doesn't change the terror threat from Iran, an agreement that doesn't allow inspection of military facilities, an agreement that doesn't disclose past secret research for nuclear weapons, an agreement that doesn't ensure long-term inspections, an agreement that doesn't maintain sanctions in place until important compliance benchmarks are made is not an agreement that would be good enough.

We are facing a dangerous time. Iran is one of the chief perpetrators of terrorism in the world today. How we let that country that has one example of bad behavior after another, one example of hatred for Israel after another, one example of contempt for the United States after another, how we let that country become nuclear capable is amazing to me, as it is to the world. That is why our friends question whether they can depend on the United States of America any longer and why our enemies aren't afraid of us, as you would want your enemies to be.

I hope we don't settle for a bad deal. I will say again that a bad deal is worse than no deal at all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, last night a number of us from this Chamber and many of us from across the country gathered for a remarkable evening to support and honor an organization called Sandy Hook Promise. It is an organization that was created in the wake of the horrific, unspeakable tragedy in Newtown that involved the mass murder of 20 beautiful, innocent children and 6 great educators. Sandy Hook Promise was created to make some good come of this horrific evil, to protect children against violence and prevent more gun violence around the country, to advance the cause of mental health and wellness, and to make sure that no one is alone, no one eats alone, no one suffers alone, and no one endures mental illness alone.

Sandy Hook Promise is a wonderful, inspiring organization, and I was proud to serve as the cochairman of this event, along with my great colleague, CHRIS MURPHY, who has been a partner in efforts to stop gun violence in this Chamber and in Connecticut and around the country. I was also proud that the dinner and evening honored two of our colleagues, Senator DEBBIE STABENOW, a wonderful friend and distinguished Member of this body from Michigan, and PAT TOOMEY, our friend from Pennsylvania, who added his name and the weight of his support to a measure in the last session that seeks to protect children against gun violence by imposing a universal background check.

The evening was designed to honor our two colleagues, but it was also so inspiring for me to hear from Nicole Hockley, Mark Barden, and Bill Sherlach, whose lives were transformed and changed forever on that horrific day.

I will never forget that day when I arrived at the firehouse in Sandy Hook and seeing the grief and pain experienced by those families who learned for the first time that their beautiful children would not be coming home that night. The searing memory of their faces and voices will be with me forever. Their courage and strength in the wake of that tragedy will inspire me forever.

It inspired many of our colleagues to vote for the commonsense, sensible measures that Senator TOOMEY and Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia helped to spearhead. It was a bipartisan package of measures that was advanced and advocated so ably by them and many of us tirelessly in those days before the vote. A majority of Senators voted in favor of that package of measures. Unfortunately, that majority did not reach 60 votes. But last night was a time to renew and redouble our efforts to prevent gun violence and to take positive, constructive, commonsense, sensible steps to help prevent it around the country.

At the very outset of the evening, both Senator MURPHY and I requested a moment of silence to honor the loved ones and families in Charleston, SC. Our hearts and prayers go out to them, as they have since that unimaginable tragedy. It was a violation of not only human life but the sanctity of a place of worship, just as Newtown involved the violation of a place we regard as among the safest, our schoolhouse—killing our schoolchildren.

When we finished that moment of silence, I am sure all of us retained the

grief and pain. We in Connecticut know and understand that grief and pain and outrage because we remember that day when we felt it in the same way the people of Charleston felt it when nine people were killed. Their families were left with holes in their hearts just as we were on that day in Newtown.

But the message of last night was not one of despair or desperation, it was one of hope and energy. That message came from Nicole Hockley, Mark Barden, and Bill Sherlach, the families of the Sandy Hook tragedy who came here to Washington. They have continued their work through Sandy Hook Promise and other organizations to make some good come from that evil.

We can do it. We can make sure this country does more than grieve and remember. We need to redouble our commitment as a nation to make our Nation safer and better, not just for those 9 innocent people in the church in Charleston or the 26 innocent people in a schoolhouse in Sandy Hook but for the 11,000 people who are killed every year on the streets of Hartford, New Haven, Stamford, in our rural and suburban communities, and on our military bases. Every year, 11,000 people throughout our country die from gun violence.

We will never eliminate all gun violence. We will never stop all of the deaths and killings, but we can save lives. That is what the families of Newtown said to me in the wake of their tragedy, and that is what I hope our Nation will say to itself in the wake of the Charleston tragedy. We will never stop all evil, but we can take a stand and stop some of it.

Last night, I recalled the conversation I had with one of the moms when I was at the funeral of her child. When I approached her, I said, somewhat apprehensively: When you are ready, I would like to talk to you about what we can do together to stop gun violence in this country. And she said, with tears in her eyes: I am ready now. That was the spirit the families from Newtown brought to our Capitol. That is the spirit I hope we can honor with action and not just with words on the floor of the Senate or in the eulogies that will be given tomorrow.

We need to have an answer for those victims of Charleston and Newtown and the 11,000 people who die needlessly and senselessly every year from gun violence. We need to answer the question that all of us have: What can we do to stop gun violence? And there are some answers, such as background checks, a ban on illegal trafficking, an end to straw purchases, mental health initiatives, and school safety. Those are some answers, and we should think of other solutions. We need to work together, just as Sandy Hook Promise has done, regardless of party, race or religion, where we live or what our interest is because we have a common, shared interest in making our Nation safer and better.

That is why honoring both PAT TOOMEY and DEBBIE STABENOW was so meaningful, because they have given so much with their courage and leadership and have helped to make our Nation safer and better.

The killer in Charleston was not just a murderer, he was a domestic terrorist. He meant to terrify, not just kill. He meant to start a race war. He was a racist and White supremacist, and, rightly, has been regarded as someone who came to that church not just to target innocent worshippers but an entire community. He targeted the town of Charleston, the State of South Carolina, and our Nation. His message was not about hate for specific individuals, it was hate for an entire race.

We should recognize domestic terrorism and racism for what it is. We are not the only country with racists, but we are a country with a uniquely high number of gun violence incidents.

The shooting in Charleston was a physical manifestation of ideas that go beyond this murderer. To prevent future shootings, we must understand and undercut the ideas for which he killed so he could advance. We need to call this problem for what it is and understand it and fight it. Hate-inspired domestic terrorism is an evil all its own.

We can make progress against gun violence. We know we can, just as surely as 10 days ago no one thought the Confederate flag on State grounds in South Carolina would ever be removed. No one ever thought, plausibly, that the Governor of South Carolina would ever advocate it, and now that has happened, just as commonsense, sensible measures against gun violence can happen. We can prevail. Nobody thought before Ronald Reagan was almost assassinated and Jim Brady was paralyzed that the Brady bill would ever be passed. In fact, it took 10 years.

So we are here in a marathon, not a sprint. We are here for the long haul. We are not going away, not giving up, not abandoning this fight, and not surrendering to the forces of domestic terrorism or racial hatred or gun violence. We are better than that as a nation.

As we leave and go back home for this recess, I hope we will not only share the grief and pain of those brave and courageous families in South Carolina who were so heroic in the face of evil but resolve that we will redouble our efforts to raise awareness and organize people who are of good will and want to stop gun violence and who need to be heard because the vast majority of the American people want us to take commonsense, sensible measures to make America safer and better.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Indiana.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today, I am back on the floor of the Senate for the 15th installment of the waste of the week. We all know the debt clock is ticking and that the Federal Government is racking up trillions of dollars of debt, which will have to be paid off at some point in the future by our generation and more likely our children and our grandchildren.

It is unsustainable. It is going to cause immense harm. It is something that has been ignored as of late, but we are unable to move forward with any kind of constructive solution to this problem or putting us on a path to deal with this because the President of the United States simply refuses to come to an agreement in terms of how to deal with this and, in fact, doesn't even bother to mention it.

We also have an issue that is part of the problem; that is, an inefficient, ineffective use of taxpayer money here in Washington. The money that was hard-earned by the people back home and then deducted from their payroll income and sent to the Federal Government. It is not always used in an effective, efficient way to address the necessary and essential issues the Federal Government deals with and that we talk about here every day. Instead, it goes into programs that can only be deemed as waste, fraud, and abuse, and that is what I have been trying to highlight for the past 15 weeks as we deal with the waste of the week.

Today, what I would like to talk about is a sweet deal. Everyone likes a sweet deal, right? Well, no, not quite everyone and not always. But, unfortunately, in this case what is a sweet deal for some is actually a raw deal for the American taxpayer. I am talking about the sugar subsidy.

Currently, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the USDA, issues loans to sugar producers and allows them to repay those loans with raw sugar if sugar prices fall below a certain price. After obtaining the sugar through this so-called loan, the USDA ends up with a bunch of sugar that it needs to resell, and it resells that sugar at a discounted price. As a result, these loans function as a price support for sugar, ensuring that sugar producers never sell their product below the price determined by the government—not the fair market but by the government. This cost taxpayers nearly $300 million in 2013 alone. I don't have the figures yet for 2014. I assume that they are the same or that they may have fluctuated a little bit up or down, depending on the world sugar price.

If this sweet loan deal for sugar producers isn't enough—$300 million a year in cost—there is more. In addition to providing a subsidy to sugar producers through the program I just described, the Federal Government also enforces a system of quotas and tariffs on imported sugar, thereby blocking Americans' fair-market access to cheaper sugar and resulting in a large difference between the international or global price of sugar and domestic sugar prices. In fact, the USDA's sugar program has caused the price of American sugar to be about 40 percent higher than the global price, resulting in an

estimated cost to consumers of $3.5 billion annually between the years 2009 and 2012.

So when we take these two programs and put them together, they effectively function as a mass Federal subsidy of sugar, which drives up prices for consumers and provides a double benefit to the sugar industry.

As a result of these two sweet policies, thousands of jobs in sugar-using industries, particularly candy manufacturers, have been lost, and the American taxpayer pays for it all.

Now, why were these policies put in place in the first place? Well, the global price of sugar was much higher in the early 1980s. So the idea was that higher sugar prices would result in more sugar growers, and the more sugar growers we had, the more sugar would be produced, thus lowering the price. That is how fair and free markets work. It is a supply-and-demand issue. But government interference through subsidies distorts the free-market price of goods, and in the case of sugar, it results in a direct hit to the taxpayer and much higher costs for the consumer of sugar-based products.

To this day, the sugar subsidy remains a giveaway to sugar producers and a raw deal for sugar consumers. Ice cream, doughnuts, cakes, pies—we know they are not the healthiest foods to eat, but they are some of the more desirable foods that we like to eat, particularly after we have been forced to eat broccoli and greens. Our mothers raised us saying that you can't have ice cream or cake or pie after dinner unless you eat what is on your plate. And so we should suffer through eating some of that green stuff—I don't mean to belittle that, it is healthy and we should do that, but I'm not going to tell the public what to eat. Nevertheless, it is these products and many others that incorporate the cost of sugar in making the product that drive up the price of the product simply because of the subsidies that are provided by this government through its policies to sugar producers.

The end result is companies not being able to provide the jobs they would like to provide or to be the dynamic industry they would like to be, and that puts them in a less than competitive position against our overseas producers. Many companies in my home State of Indiana have been affected by this subsidy. Let me give a couple of examples.

The Albanese Confectionery Group, Inc., is a renowned Indiana-based manufacturer of confections, including the World's Best Gummi Bears—in Germany they call them Gooies; here we call them Gummis—Gold Label Chocolates, and other products. They are a very successful manufacturer. They estimate they could save $3 million annually by having access to sugar from the world market price. But, no, they are not allowed to do that. They are forced to buy it at the U.S.-subsidized producer price, which is, as I indicated earlier, roughly 40 percent more than what they could otherwise pay.

Lewis Bakeries is headquartered in Evansville, IN, and is one of the few remaining independent bakeries in the Midwest and the largest wholesale bakery in Indiana, and they have the same issue.

Artificially high sugar prices contribute directly to increased costs that hamstring budgets of businesses such as Lewis Bakeries and other bakeries throughout Indiana.

Artificially high sugar prices affect the large companies also, such as Kraft Foods. It has a marshmallow and caramel plant in Kendallville, IN. They say that dismantling the sugar program would enhance the competitiveness of U.S. food manufacturers.

If Congress were to terminate the sugar subsidy program, which we have tried to do year after year after year and have not succeeded in passing it, we could save billions of dollars for U.S. taxpayers, not just from the U.S. Treasury but also in the grocery bills of American families. These savings could have extremely positive consequences for our economy if they were allowed to be used to support the economy.

According to an Iowa State University study, if the sugar program were abolished, domestic sugar prices would fall by roughly a third—earlier we were talking about 40 percent—saving consumers, said this study, at least $2.9 billion to $3.5 billion a year. And according to a recent report by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, eliminating this subsidy could save the Federal Government at least $116 million over 10 years.

So here we have a subsidized program by the Federal Government that is costing consumers billions per year. And here we have a second subsidized program by the Federal Government that through its policies of pricing and unfair practices, in my opinion, is costing nearly $116 million a year to American taxpayers. This is a perfect example of an outdated government program that is hurting consumers and wasting taxpayer dollars. The net effect of the program is that Americans are paying higher prices for sugar and more taxes to pay for the sugar subsidy.

So what is a sweet deal for the sugar producers is a raw deal for the American consumer. It is a subsidy—a package of subsidies that only go to the producers and deny the consumers the right to have reasonable prices for sugar in accordance with international pricing.

I have joined with a bipartisan group of my colleagues in supporting legislation, the Sugar Reform Act, introduced by Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire, that would end the sugar subsidy. If we could pass this legislation, it would result in a savings of at least $116 million, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

So today I add to our chart $116 million of savings that the government can claim, moving our chart ever closer to our goal of $100 billion of savings.

How do we pay for some essential programs here, and where are we going to get the money? Why don't we start here? Why don't we start by eliminating some of these programs? Better yet, why don't we let the taxpayers keep their hard-earned money rather than send it to Washington to pay for waste and abuse that occurs almost on a daily basis.

We are gradually creeping up to our $100 billion goal. I think we are going to have to go way beyond that, because these examples just keep rolling in. They are documented through nonpartisan agencies related to Congress and related to the Federal Government, including inspectors general and various programs. Why are we spending this money in the first place? The program is wasted, it is abused, and it is misused. It doesn't need to be in place.

So we are going to keep coming to the floor week after week talking about the waste of the week. No. 16 is on the way. Stay tuned.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in just a short period of time here in the Senate Chamber we will be voting on fast-track legislation designed to create a very quick path through the Senate for the Trans-Pacific Partnership and for trade agreements to come thereafter.

So I rise now to share with my colleagues and to share with the American people my concerns about this course of action. It is President Kennedy who once said: ''The trade of a nation expresses, in a very concrete way, its aims and aspirations.'' What are our aims and aspirations in the context of this trade agreement and fast-track?

From my perspective, the thing that really matters is whether this trade agreement will create good-paying jobs or will destroy good-paying jobs. Will this trade agreement make the American economy work better for working Americans? I feel it fails the test. I am going to explain why.

Now, it is true that the trade agreement is complex. It is multidimensional. It has a dimension that deals with intellectual property, with the extension of copyrights and patents and protections for trade secrets. That is certainly a win for protecting an innovation economy and innovation by Americans and American companies.

It has an agricultural section. We have sought out an analysis of the agricultural section, but don't have one yet. But those in the know say there is a good chance that the tariffs that are

struck down and the nontariff barriers that are struck down as barriers to U.S. products may on balance benefit the U.S. agricultural economy. I look forward to an analysis to really examine that in detail.

But the heart of the trade agreement is about manufacturing. We have multinational companies that are seeking to be able to make things at the lowest possible cost. That is the heart of this trade agreement, as with other trade agreements. That means being able to incorporate into an economic circle countries where the costs are very low to make things. That is certainly the case with this trade agreement.

This trade agreement includes a couple of countries that have no minimum wage and others that have a very low minimum wage. We are really talking about Vietnam, Malaysia, and Mexico. In Vietnam they have a regional minimum wage. So it varies from place to place. You hear different amounts, but roughly it is 60 to 75 cents per hour. In Malaysia it is $1.54. In Mexico it is 66 cents. Well, those are all incredibly low compared to the American minimum wage of $7.25.

Of course, many of our States have State minimum wages that are higher. But the minimum wage is only a part of the puzzle. When you include the cost of labor in the United States, you have to include such things as workers' compensation and set aside expenses for Social Security and disability insurance and the cost of maintaining safe working standards, which are rigorously enforced.

So when you compare all of that, you probably have a labor ratio that is on the order of about 20 to 1. That is a playing field tilted against the American worker at a 20-to-1 ratio for manufacturing. That is certainly not a level playing field. Our companies will say time and again: Here in America, we will thrive with anyone in the world on a level playing field. But when the costs are 20 to 1—that is, when the costs overseas in countries such as Vietnam, Malaysia, and Mexico are lower than in the United States on a 20-to-1 ratio—that is a playing field steeply tilted against the United States.

So it is no wonder that in previous agreements we have seen an increase in trade deficits and a big loss of jobs here in the United States of America. Let's take a look at three of those cases.

In 1993, we signed the North America Free Trade Agreement. That incorporated Mexico into our economic circle. So let's compare the trade deficit in 1992, a year before, with 2014. In the course of those years, the trade deficit increased from $5.3 billion to $53.8 billion. That is a massive, massive change. Now, by various estimates that translates into a job loss of between 480,000 to 680,000 jobs. So half a million Americans lost good-paying jobs as a result of NAFTA.

Let's take a look at China. China came into the World Trade Organization, or WTO, in the year 2000. So let's compare 1999 with 2014. The trade deficit went from $68.7 billion to $343 billion. That is an increase of one-quarter of a trillion dollars. That is not a collective amount. That is an annual amount. By various estimates that resulted in job losses of between 2.7 million and 3.2 million American jobs.

Or let's look at South Korea. Remember how folks said that this would facilitate so much access to consumers in South Korea, and it would not have a big impact on our trade deficit? The South Korea agreement was signed in 2011 or ratified. So comparing 2010 to 2014—just 4 years—the trade deficit ballooned. It ballooned from $10 billion to $25 billion. The resulting job losses are estimated to have been between 75,000 and 150,000 jobs. Now, when I say jobs, maybe that is abstract. So let's translate this to families. Between the low estimates and the high estimates, we are talking about 3.3 to 4 million American families losing their jobs—good-paying manufacturing jobs. You know, there is no better foundation for a family than a good-paying job.

So when we pull away that foundation by striking agreements that send our jobs overseas, that is utterly devastating to families across our Nation and certainly to families in my home State of Oregon and certainly to families in every single State. So you cannot be pro-family and also be for shipping our good-paying jobs overseas. There is no government program that substitutes for a good-paying job.

That is why I am so deeply disturbed about the outline of the agreement that we are undertaking. Each and every time that improvements to wages here in the U.S. come up, the makers will say: If you raise your wages, if you add family vacation or family leave or sick leave or medical leave or help with daycare for your children—you know what—we may just have to move our manufacturing overseas or we may have to move our supply chain overseas or we may have to produce less at the factory here and more at the factory overseas.

It does not stop there. The construction that is envisioned by our multinational manufacturers in pursuit of their low-cost production is not just to play off the United States against Malaysia or the United States against Mexico or the United States against Vietnam—although all of that will happen—it is also to play off each of those low-cost countries against each of them.

So they can say to China, which has a certain cost structure and is not yet envisioned to be part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership but does benefit from WTO access: China, your costs are going up. Oh, you are enforcing those environmental laws, and your costs are going up. Oh, you are adding health standards, labor standards, and your costs are going up. You are paying overtime, and your costs are going up. We are going to shift more of our manufacturing to Malaysia, and if you keep at it, we will shift all of it.

Or to Malaysia: You are just close by to Vietnam. Your costs go up, and we are going to ship more to Vietnam.

Or to Vietnam: You raise your standards, you raise your costs, you raise your pay, and you raise your standard of living. So we are going to move those jobs to Mexico.

This is tremendous leverage if you are an owner of a multinational, if you own stock in a multinational, if you are an investor in a multinational, because you can sell—you can produce your product at lower costs by playing off economy against economy—at the world market price and you make more money.

But if you are a worker in the United States who is being played against a worker in Vietnam, it is a bad deal. If you are a worker in Vietnam being played off against a worker in Malaysia, it is a bad deal.

That is not all that is wrong with this arrangement. Let's look at the various things that could have made fast-track stronger and that are not in fast-track. We have heard a lot of conversation and a lot of presentation that this is a gold-standard framework, that this is a new style of trade agreement. But the fact is that key provisions that could have made it a gold standard or a new strategy are not there.

Let's start with the fact that there is no minimum wage required in this agreement—not even a minimum wage of $1 an hour, which would have certainly affected Mexico or Vietnam—and no mechanism for where there is a minimum wage, to increase it gradually over time to help lift up workers in our poorest nations and to reduce the gap and level out the playing field between low-wage countries and high-wage countries such as the United States.

Second, the agreement does not address currency manipulation. Everyone in international trade understands that tariffs can be replaced by a pseudo-tariff through currency manipulation, through intervention in the currency market. In 2009, when I came to the Senate, our Congress estimated that the currency manipulation by China amounted to a 25-percent tariff on American products and a 25-percent subsidy to Chinese products. Why would we agree to an arrangement where currency manipulation can produce a tariff against our products and a subsidy to our competitors within that framework?

Third, we have had a problem with the loss of our sovereignty on health issues, environmental issues, and consumer issues by giving that sovereignty away and that decision-making away to an international panel. Just weeks ago, under the World Trade Organization structure—the WTO structure—we lost a case, and the outcome of that case was that here in America we are not allowed to label our meat ''Produced in America.''

That is a loss of our sovereignty. I want to live in an America where if our consumers, if our policymakers, if our legislators believe it is in the best interest of this Nation for our consumers to be able to know where their meat is raised, if our consumers want to exercise some patriotic decisionmaking and support American ranchers, they ought to be able to do so. We ought to be able to have that law and not give away our lawmaking authority to an international panel.

So this is an investor-state dispute settlement panel of three corporate lawyers, who can be advocates in one case and the judges in the next. It does not provide anything close to an appropriate mechanism to decide issues of health, safety, and the environment. We could have taken those off the table so that if we wanted to control a dangerous environmental toxin such as cancer-causing flame retardants in our carpets, we could do so without going afoul of trade agreements.

But there was no effort to protect our health and safety here in America in this trade agreement. If we really believed that we were going to have a new-order agreement, we would have an enforcement mechanism for labor standards and for environmental standards. We have heard folks talk on the floor that there are such new enforcement standards. So I am aggrieved to report to you that that is simply not the case.

Now, let's start with the fact that we could have required the passage of laws before countries are admitted into the trade agreement and required that they bring their environmental standards, their legal standards, and their labor standards up to snuff before admission and then show that they were actually implementing them and have a 2-year demonstration period to show that they were actually enforcing them. Because that is the easiest point at which to bring nations accountable before they are members of the trade agreement, before they get the lower tariffs. That is the point you have incentive. That is the point you have leverage. But there was no effort to force countries, to require countries to meet those minimum standards before being admitted into this trade agreement.

We could have had some form of snapback provision that said: If you fail in bringing your laws into accordance on the environmental side or the labor side, if you fail to enforce your laws, then tariffs snap back. But there is no snapback provision in this agreement.

We could have expanded the dumping provisions in international law to give a way to take on situations where countries are producing at low cost because they are not abiding by the goals in the environmental or the labor area, but there is no such provision envisioned or required in fast-track or anticipated in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

In the course of our trade agreements, there has been only one situation where we challenged labor laws, and it was with Guatemala. We challenged them 7 years ago, and to date that case has never been adjudicated. It is virtually impossible, after a country has failed to come up to standards, to go back and retroactively enforce those standards without some new mechanism, some new strategy. But there is no new mechanism or strategy that applies in this situation, nothing that would solve the Guatamala case and actually end with it being adjudicated.

To continue with the challenges to this fast-track, the failures of this fast-track, there is nothing in this that provides for Congress to be consulted when other nations dock; that is, tie on to the framework that will exist in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

We had an amendment here on the floor that if China was to try to dock with the TPP and become a TPP fully privileged member, it would have to come back to the United States for consideration. That would give us a chance to look at China's currency manipulation or China's cheating on international intellectual property. That would give us a chance to examine a whole facet of things. But no requirement like that exists.

To add on to everything else, now, because of the way this process has proceeded, there is no guarantee that there will be trade adjustment assistance for families who lose their jobs when their jobs go overseas, no assistance in training.

I find it absurd that the same folks who say that there will be virtually no jobs lost proceed to say that the cost of compensating families by giving some minimal training to them when they lose their jobs will be vastly expensive and that America can't afford it. So on the one hand they say there will be no jobs lost. On the other hand they say that so many jobs will be lost that it will be too expensive for our Nation to afford. So they are OK with leaving American families not only stranded without jobs but stranded with no training to try to find new jobs in the economy.

If we go back to where I started with President Kennedy and his vision that the trade of a nation expresses in a concrete way its aims and aspirations, our aim should be to create good-paying jobs here in America. Our aspiration should be to create a trade agreement that works for working families. Unfortunately, this trade agreement is constructed around a different aspiration, one of maximizing the value of stock in the multinational manufacturing corporations, and that is done by shipping our jobs overseas. That is the wrong aim for this Nation. That is the wrong aim for our working families. We have seen the impact of Korea. We have seen the impact of China joining the WTO. We have seen the impact of Mexico and NAFTA. As a result, we have lost millions of good-paying jobs in our Nation and undermined the success of millions of American families.

There is a lot of conversation on the floor of the Senate about inequality in our Nation. Do you know what drives inequality? Well, I will tell you. It is this: When you create trade agreements that are great for investors but are terrible for workers, that drives inequality. That is why I encourage my colleagues to vote no when it comes to the fast-track legislation being voted on later today. It is wrong for America because it is wrong as far as solving inequality. It is wrong for America because it is wrong for working families to have their jobs shipped overseas. It is wrong because it does not fulfill the vision of working for working Americans.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am on the floor today for the 104th time—one of these days, I am going to get it right—to urge that we wake up to the dangers of climate change.

The scientific community has been sounding the alarm for decades. Our most respected scientific institutions are virtually unanimous in their verdict: Carbon pollution from humans' burning of fossil fuels is warming our atmosphere and oceans, raising and acidifying our seas, loading the dice for more extreme weather, and disrupting the natural systems upon which we all depend. They are not alone.

Our defense and intelligence communities warn us of the threats these climate disruptions pose to our national security and to international stability.

Public health officials warn that greenhouse gas pollution and its effects trigger human health risks.

Economists—even very conservative ones—have long recognized the distortion of energy markets ignoring the true cost of carbon pollution.

Our government's accountants now list climate change as one of the most significant threats to America's fiscal stability. The new Republican CBO chief even put sea level rise and increased storm activity from climate change into his budget outlook just last week.

Of course, voices of faith call to us. They plead that we heed the moral imperatives of protecting God's creation, seeking justice for all people, and meeting our own responsibilities to future generations.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama has called for us to ''develop a sense of the oneness of humanity'' and address climate change.

The Archbishop of Canterbury recently issued a declaration, along with other British religious leaders, warning of the ''huge challenge'' of climate change and supporting an international climate treaty to be negotiated in Paris this December.

Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, the spiritual leader of Orthodox Christians worldwide, has called climate change ''a matter of social and economic justice.''

More than 350 rabbis have signed a rabbinic letter on the climate crisis calling for vigorous action against climate disruption and global socioeconomic injustice, reminding us that ''social justice, sustainable abundance, a healthy Earth, and spiritual fulfillment are inseparable.''

Last week, Pope Francis, the worldwide leader of the Catholic Church, which is the largest Christian denomination in the world, the largest Christian denomination in the United States, and the largest Christian denomination in my home State of Rhode Island, added his charismatic voice to the call.

In the Roman Catholic Church, an encyclical is a papal letter sent to all bishops. It is considered among the most authoritative documents of Catholic teaching. Rather than just an internal communication to the clergy, however, this encyclical of Pope Francis on climate change is explicitly addressed to ''every single living person on this planet.'' It is entitled ''Laudato Si','' or ''Praise Be to You,'' a reference to the ''Canticle of the Sun'' by St. Francis of Assisi, the patron saint of the environment, friend of the poor, and namesake of this Pope.

This encyclical accepts and affirms what we know about climate change: that most is due to the greenhouse gases emitted by human activity; that seas are rising, oceans acidifying, polar ice melting; that weather is worsening at the extremes; and that basic systems of life on our planet home are being disrupted.

He writes:

> [W]e need only take a frank look at the facts to see that our common home is falling into serious disrepair. . . . [T]hings are now reaching a breaking point. . . . [H]umanity has disappointed God's expectations.

The Earth herself, he says, ''groans in travail.''

Pope Francis tells us that ''humanity is called to recognize the need for changes of lifestyle, production, and consumption, in order to combat this warming or at least the human causes which produce or aggravate it.'' Specifically, he says that ''technology based on the use of highly polluting fossil fuels needs to be progressively replaced without delay.''

The Pope reminds us that as we in power sleepwalk through this crisis, we are hurting people who have no voice today. First, we harm future generations, leaving them a world that, to use his own words, ''is beginning to look more and more like an immense pile of filth.''

''[T]he world is a gift which we have freely received and must share with others,'' the Pope writes. ''Intergenerational solidarity is not optional, but rather a basic question of justice.''

The Pope also emphasizes that when we damage that gift, we inflict particular harm on the poor, who live close to the Earth—outside of our privileged bubble of consumption. They rely on agriculture, fishing, and forestry for their livelihoods and sustenance. As climate change disrupts natural systems, the poor take the hit most directly. As a result, Pope Francis says, we who have profited most from burning fossil fuels owe a debt to the rest of the world. He calls it our ''ecological debt.''

The United States has produced more carbon dioxide than any other nation. Our historical responsibility calls us to help other nations develop cleaner energy, relieve their systematized poverty, and soften the blow of climate change. This responsibility, this call from Pope Francis matters particularly for America, the indispensable and the exceptional nation. Years ago, Daniel Webster described the work of our Founding Fathers as having ''set the world an example.'' From John Winthrop to Ronald Reagan, we have called ourselves a city on a hill, set high for the world to witness, to emulate.

Should we ignore the climate disruption we have caused, Pope Francis warns, ''those who will have to suffer the consequences of what we are trying to hide will not forget this failure of conscience and responsibility.'' In saying that, Pope Francis aligns squarely with Daniel Webster's warning from that same speech—his warning about our American experiment in popular liberty: ''The last hopes of mankind, therefore, rest with us; and if it should be proclaimed that our example had become an argument against the experiment, the knell of popular liberty would be sounded throughout the earth.''

Pope Francis's encyclical even has something to say directly to us in Congress. He says:

> To take up these responsibilities, and the costs they entail, politicians will inevitably clash with the mindset of short-term gain and results which dominates present-day economics and politics. But if they are courageous, they will attest to their God-given dignity and leave behind a testimony of selfless responsibility.

Remember the Pharisees. Remember the traders and the money changers in the temple. If we choose to ignore the call of the Pope and of leaders of faith around the world and choose to protect the side that is polluting and destroying, even when we see right before our faces its ravage of our natural world, its harm to the poor, its robbery of future generations, what are we then? What are we then? Jesus himself, the Lamb of God, lost his temper twice, the Bible tells us; once at the Pharisees and once at the traders and money changers in the temple. He went after them with a lash, actually. Are we to take their side now? Must we, in the Senate, serve Caesar in every single thing? Is there no light left here at all?

Here in the Senate, the hand of greed lies so heavily upon us. Please, may the Pope's exhortation give us the courage to stand up against the power of these selfish forces and do what is right for our people and for our planet.

The fossil fuel industry has been a particular disgrace, polluting our politics as well as our planet. Ever since the Citizens United ruling gave polluters the ability to inject unlimited and untold amounts of money into our elections, the tsunami of their slime has drowned honest debate on climate change. Senators who once supported commonsense legislation have gone silent as stones under the threat of the polluters' spending. Getting past the dark influence of the fossil fuel industry will indeed take some light and some courage, especially on the part of the Republican majority whom they so relentlessly bully and cajole. But we must do it. Again, mankind will not forget this failure of conscience and responsibility.

Senator SCHATZ and I have even offered legislation rooted in conservative free-market principles. We would put a fee on carbon pollution and return all the revenue to the American people. It would reduce carbon pollution 40 percent by 2025 and be a significant downpayment on our ecological debt to the world and, by the way, it would generate significant tax cuts and economic benefits for American families and businesses in the process. I urge friends across the aisle, please, take a serious look at our bill.

In seeking a solution to the climate crisis, Pope Francis asks each of us to ''draw constantly from [our] deepest convictions about love, justice, and peace.'' He dares us even ''to turn what is happening to the world into our own personal suffering''—into our own personal suffering—''and thus discover what each of us can do about it.'' He urges us to recognize the systems around us—the financial systems, the industrial systems, the economic systems, the political systems—are drawing us down a destructive and unjust path.

But his encyclical to the world illuminates another path—a compassionate path, blazed with abiding faith in the human family, a path toward the preservation of our common home and our common decency. The choice of which path we take will be a fateful one.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, let me just commend the Senator from Rhode Island. He has made a number of important points this afternoon, but I am particularly pleased my colleague has laid out, in such a thoughtful way, the implications of the Pope's encyclical. This was very important as a major new focus of the debate, and I really commend my colleague.

I suspect we are now on 101 or 102—oh, 104. I was there for 100, so I must have missed one along the way. But I

commend my colleague and thank him for his commitment. He knows I share many of his views with respect to creating a fresh set of approaches to deal with this climate change question, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very kindly.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today the Senate is taking major steps toward a new, more progressive trade policy that will shut the door on the 1990s North American Free Trade Agreement once and for all.

One of the major ways this overall package accomplishes this goal is by kicking our trade enforcement into high gear. Later today, the Senate is going to vote to go to conference with the House on strong bipartisan legislation that was passed by the Chamber only a few weeks ago by a vote of 78 to 20.

It has long been my view that vigorous enforcement of our trade laws must be at the forefront of any modern approach to trade at this unique time in history. One of the first questions many citizens ask is, I hear there is talk in Washington, DC, about passing a new trade law. How about first enforcing the laws that are on the books?

This has been an area I long have sought to change, and we are beginning to do this with this legislation and I want to describe it. For me, this goes back to the days when I chaired the Senate's Subcommittee on International Trade and Competitiveness. We saw such widespread cheating, such widespread flouting of our trade laws, my staff and I set up a sting operation. We set up a sting operation to catch the cheats; in effect, almost inviting these people to try to use a Web site to evade the laws. They came out of nowhere because they said: Hey, cheating has gotten pretty easy. Let's sign up. And we caught a lot of people.

So we said, from that point on, that we were going to make sure any new trade legislation took, right at the center, an approach that would protect hard-working Americans from the misdeeds of trade cheats. In fact, the core of the bipartisan legislation that heads into conference is a jobs bill—a jobs bill that will protect American workers and our exporters from those kinds of rip-offs by those who would flout the trade laws.

The fact is, when you finally get tough enforcement of our trade laws, it is a jobs bill—a true jobs bill—because you are doing a better job of enforcing the laws that protect the good-paying jobs of American workers.

I guess some people think we are going to get that tougher enforcement by osmosis. We are going to get it because we are going to pass a law, starting today with the conference agreement that is going to have real teeth in it—real teeth in it—to enforce our trade laws.

Foreign companies and nations employ a whole host of complicated schemes and shadowy tactics to break the trade rules, and they bully American businesses and undercut our workers. So what we said in the Finance Committee, on a bipartisan basis, is the name of the game will be to stay out in front of these unfair trade practices that cost our workers good-paying jobs. My colleagues and I believe the Senate has offered now the right plan to fight back against the trade cheats and protect American jobs and protect our companies from abuse.

It really starts with what is called the ENFORCE Act, which is a proposal I first offered years ago that will give our Customs agency more tools to crack down on the cheaters. Then, we have a bipartisan, bicameral agreement on the need for an unfair trade alert. That is another major upgrade that responds to what we heard companies and labor folks say again and again. What they would say is that trade enforcement laws get there too late. They get there too late. The plant is closed, the jobs are gone, the hopes and dreams of working families are shattered. So what we said is we are going to start using some of the data and the information we have to have a real trade alert so we can spot what is coming up and get that information to our communities and our working families and our companies to protect our workers. So this unfair trade alert is another major upgrade in how we tackle enforcing our trade laws.

My view is that any bill that comes out of that enforcement conference, the Customs conference, needs to reflect important American priorities, and that should certainly include smart protection of our environmental treasures. When our trade agreements establish rules on environmental protection, they have to be enforced with the same vigor as the rules that knock down barriers for businesses overseas.

Our colleague from Colorado Senator BENNET offered, in my view, a very constructive proposal that is going to accomplish this important goal. It was overwhelmingly agreed to by the Committee on Finance and passed by the Senate, and I would like to note that much of the good work done by Senator BENNET mirrors what my colleague in the other body, Congressman BLUMENAUER, is doing on this issue as well.

It is my view—and why it was important to hear from Senator WHITEHOUSE—that climate change is one of the premier challenges of our time. It is critical to make sure this enforcement package sends the right message on environmental issues. Whether the issue at hand is climate change, fisheries or conservation, this package—the package we are going to be dealing with in the Customs conference—strikes the right balance for the environment.

I also want to take a moment to build on what I discussed yesterday with respect to the Democratic priorities that my colleagues and I are going to fight for in conference. This stems from an important point made by our colleague from North Dakota Senator HEITKAMP, who said we really need to go into this Customs conference with some markers—some strong markers that lay out a path for some of our priorities with respect to enforcing the Customs law.

So after the pro-trade Democrats met on Monday night, I talked with Chairman RYAN with respect to these issues. We intend to champion provisions by Senator SHAHEEN which will help our small businesses take full advantage of trade. A lot of people say, oh, trade bills are for the big guys; the big guys are the ones who are going to benefit. I have always thought big guys can take care of themselves. They have lots of people to stand up for them. But what Senator SHAHEEN is saying—and it is particularly important in my home State, where we have mostly small businesses. Senator SHAHEEN is saying she is going to make sure, as part of the enforcement efforts, we beef up the effort to help small businesses, particularly at the State level—not at the Federal level, at the State level—promote these efforts to have more markets for our small businesses in the export field.

In addition to Senator SHAHEEN's amendment, as far as those Customs markers are concerned, we are also going to make the environmental protection provisions I just described authored by Senator BENNET a priority and Senator CANTWELL's trade enforcement trust fund. I am very hopeful about the trade enforcement trust fund as well. Suffice it to say, there is interest on both sides of the aisle because there is an awareness that, again, we can have some trade laws, but we are going to need some resources in order to make sure they are implemented. So I think that trade enforcement trust fund is another very important priority, and it is one that the pro-trade Democrats have said would be part of our short list in terms of our Customs markers.

As I noted, when I have town meetings at home—I have had more than 730 of them and am going to have more of them this upcoming week—I do find people say that everybody in Washington talks about new laws, new proposals, trade ideas: Enforce the laws on the books first. It has been too hard—too hard in the past—for our businesses, particularly our small businesses, to get the enforcement that matters, enforcement with teeth, enforcement that serves as a real deterrent to cheating.

So this legislation is our chance to demonstrate that strengthening trade enforcement—enforcement of the trade laws—will now be an integral part of a new modern approach to trade, an approach that says we are not part of the 1990s on trade, where nobody had Web sites and iPhones and the like. We have a modern trade policy with the centerpiece enforcing our trade laws.

Our policies are going to give America's trade enforcers the tools they

need to fight on behalf of American jobs and American workers and stop the trade cheats who seek to undercut them. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote yes later today on the motion to send the enforcement bill to conference and work on a bipartisan basis, as we did in the Finance Committee, to put strong trade enforcement legislation on the President's desk.

Now, I would also like to briefly make some remarks on the trade adjustment assistance package. As we have said, later today, the Senate is going to take a series of votes that again speak to how we kick off a new progressive era in trade policy that closes the books on the trade ideas of the 1990s once and for all.

Once again, a key part of that effort is protecting our workers and ensuring that more trade means everybody has an opportunity to get ahead. That is why the package of legislation under debate expands and extends the support system for America's workers called trade adjustment assistance.

Now, this program dates back to the days of President Kennedy. President Kennedy, during his push for the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, called it ''a program to afford time for American initiative, American adaptability and American resiliency to assert themselves.'' Since then, this program has been extended by Republican and Democratic Presidents. The program is now a lifeline for more than 100,000 Americans, including 3,000 Oregonians who receive job training and financial support. The heart of it is to provide a springboard to new opportunities, and it guarantees that workers and their families don't get knocked off stride when times are tough. In my view, it is a core element of what I call trade done right.

As I noted yesterday, Tim Nesbitt, former past president of the Oregon AFL–CIO, essentially said our legislation was a blueprint for trade done right.

Now, for 1½ years, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program has been running at reduced strength. But that is going to change once this legislation becomes law. The funding for trade adjustment assistance goes back up to a level that will cover everybody who qualifies. Once again, service workers will be eligible for the program because in today's economy they are facing competition from overseas as well. Trade adjustment assistance would take into account competition from anywhere in the world, not just from our trade agreement partners.

These are significant improvements that I will tell the Presiding Officer and colleagues I fought very hard for in what were negotiations that really lasted well over 6 months with Chairman HATCH and Chairman RYAN. I believe these changes are going to make a big difference for workers across our Nation who fall on tough times. If China manages to lure a manufacturer away from the United States, for example, now those workers will be covered. They will have a chance to learn new skills and find a job that pays good wages, and they will not have to worry about whether the bills will get paid or if they are going to have food on their table.

Along with trade adjustment assistance, this legislation will reinstate the health coverage tax credit that expired at the end of last year. The majority of workers in this country—tens of millions of middle-class people and their families—get health insurance through their employer. The health coverage tax credit guarantees that workers and families affected by trade are going to still be able to see their doctor. If they get sick or suffer an injury, they aren't going to face colossal medical bills or the threat of bankruptcy. They get protection, and they get it until they are back on their feet.

In the process of bringing this legislation together, my friend and colleague on the Finance Committee Senator BROWN offered a proposal that goes a long way, in my view, to strengthening our enforcement of key trade laws. It is called the Leveling the Playing Field Act. I urge the Senate majority leader to include this important legislation in the TAA bill, both because it is a good policy and it is a sign that both parties are working on issues that are logical bipartisan priorities. Leveling the playing field—and I can say this at this point in the debate. If we look at the Senate Finance Committee files, leveling the playing field was a top priority for those in the unions—the steel unions and others—and it was also a top priority for their companies. So having this policy in trade adjustment assistance is exactly the kind of bipartisan work the American people want done—business, labor, Democrats, Republicans—a strong record of evidence as to why it is needed. This legislation is going to be the difference between steelworkers and paper workers being on the job or being laid off because it ensures that the remedies of trade law—what is called countervailing duty law, anti-dumping law—is going to be available to workers and their companies earlier and in a more comprehensive way. It is going to protect jobs, which is a priority of both political parties.

I made mention how important this was to me. My first hearing—my first hearing when I became chairman of the Finance Committee's trade subcommittee—was on trade enforcement. So I could have chosen a lot of topics. We could have talked about exports, hugely important to my State. We could have talked about the fact that the trade laws haven't kept up with the digital age, hugely important to my State. I said my first hearing was going to be on trade enforcement.

My good friend from United Steelworkers, Leo Gerard, together with the U.S. Steel chairman, Mario Longhi, spoke at length about how American workers wanted to see the Senate and the Finance Committee stand up for them and finally fix the shortcomings in our trade remedy laws. That is what we have done now. Getting behind SHERROD BROWN's proposal to strengthen our trade laws, to stop unfair trade so foreign companies do not undercut American workers and manufacturers ought to be an American priority—a red, white, and blue priority, a priority for every Member of this body.

I am proud to have worked with Senator BROWN on this important issue. I thank him for the fact that he has brought this up again and again and again. I said quite some time ago that we weren't going to let this package become law without the Leveling the Playing Field Act authored by Senator BROWN at the outset. That is going to be the case, and I thank him for his work.

The three programs—the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, the health coverage tax credit, Senator BROWN's Leveling the Playing Field Act—are now moving through the Senate alongside legislation that creates new economic opportunities for impoverished countries in Africa and other places around the world. This trade package will extend the biggest of these programs, the African Growth and Opportunity Act—what is called AGOA—for 10 years. I am a strong believer in AGOA. It works for our country, it works for Africa, and it builds a stronger economic future for so many around the world. We worked hard again on a bipartisan basis in the Finance Committee to find ways to strengthen AGOA. That was the point of our hearing, to find ways to strengthen it, extend it for another decade, and the committee came together on a bipartisan basis to make smart improvements.

Once again, we see the value of a progressive trade policy. Two of our very outstanding colleagues—my colleague Senator COONS on this side of the aisle and our friend Senator ISAKSON on the other side of the aisle—are always working in a bipartisan way, pointing out that this is what our country is all about, and certainly creating opportunities for impoverished parts of the world is a core American priority. Hearts and minds around the world are hoping we will have this kind of leadership.

I will close, and I think this will be my last comment before the vote. It is my view that for all who want to see trade done right, for all who want American workers to thrive in the 21st century, getting behind these key programs is an ideal way to do it. By supporting this legislation, the Congress reaffirms what President Kennedy really rhapsodized over half a century ago: You get behind these programs, and it reaffirms America's commitment to American initiative, to adaptability, and resiliency.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote yes to support these important programs when we vote later today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk briefly about trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, and about trade enforcement. I will be supporting the TAA bill.

TRIBUTE TO CASEY ADEN-WANSBURY

But before I talk about that, I would like to recognize my chief of staff, Casey Aden-Wansbury, who has never been on the floor before. She asked to be on the floor today, since she is leaving. Of course, I said yes.

But I said that so that I could talk about you, Casey. You didn't know that. You have to sit through this.

Casey has served in my office since I joined the Senate in July of 2009. She is leaving Washington next week and is heading to San Francisco, where her husband will be starting an amazing new job. Jamo has a great job, and he has been so supportive of you, Casey, and also of Casey's parents. You will now be much closer to them.

I am very excited for Casey, but I wish she weren't leaving. Everyone in my office is going to miss you—no one more than me.

When my grandson was 30 minutes old, I held him in my arms, and I said to him: It is all staff.

It is true. It is all staff. Casey has been an amazing chief of staff. She is the most focused, determined person I know.

I am a member of the Writers Guild and the Screen Actors Guild. I get screeners. We got ''Zero Dark Thirty'' sent to me during the awards season. My wife and I were in our living room. We put ''Zero Dark Thirty'' on. At a certain point in the movie, I said to Franni: The lead character reminds me of someone. Finally, I said: It is Casey. If Casey had been in the CIA, I think we would have gotten bin Laden a little earlier.

Casey deserves an enormous amount of credit for all the work that I and our office have been able to get done in my first term—the day-to-day work that we do to improve the lives of people in Minnesota and across the country. Whether it was mental health in schools or improving workforce training or protecting net neutrality or defeating the Comcast-Time Warner Cable deal, I am so proud of the work we have done in the Senate. And it is all staff. Casey has led that staff brilliantly every step of the way. I will miss Casey more than anyone, including myself, really knows.

Whoever gets Casey next will be very, very lucky indeed.

Casey, I cannot express how deeply thankful I am for all you have done for me, for our office, and for the State of Minnesota. Thank you.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to turn briefly to the trade adjustment assistance package. I believe that when trade is done right, it can benefit our workers, our communities, and our businesses. But I was concerned that the fast-track procedures set up by the trade promotion authority bill will not do enough to make sure that we do trade right. So I voted against that bill, and I will vote against it again later.

Once we are done with that bill, we will consider the trade adjustment assistance bill that was originally packaged together with the fast-track bill. I will support TAA. It is far from perfect. For one thing, it simply does not provide enough assistance. But it will go a long way toward providing help for workers who are displaced by trade, as we know some will be.

I also strongly support the Leveling the Playing Field Act, which is included in this package along with TAA. Senator BROWN's bill, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, would help strengthen our trade remedy laws—the laws that enforce our trade policies and protect our domestic industries from dumped and subsidized imports from other countries.

In Minnesota, I have seen firsthand the damage that happens when we don't have—and just as importantly, can't enforce—strong trade protections. In the last few months alone, we have seen what happens when countries unfairly dump their goods here. Nearly 1,000 Minnesotans in the Iron Range are losing their jobs after a flood of dumped steel imports.

The Leveling the Playing Field Act would help improve our anti-dumping laws, including restoring Congress's original intent in setting the standard for when a domestic industry is materially injured by unfairly traded foreign imports. We need to be able to respond effectively when dumped imports are harming our domestic iron and steel industry and the workers in that industry or when those imports are harming other industries, as is happening now. This bill will be an important step in enabling that more effective response. With these provisions, we are standing up for American manufacturers by putting in place and enforcing fair trade practices.

For these reasons, I will be voting for the trade adjustment assistance bill, and I look forward to its being enacted into law.

Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing me to say a few words about Casey and about TAA.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have come to this floor a number of times arguing against trade promotion authority. I have done that for months. This body should not give up its authority to amend trade agreements, and it should not pave the way for a trade deal that looks like it is going to be more of the same—corporate and worker sellouts.

We have seen it with NAFTA, and we saw a similar kind of move on PNTR with China, where our bilateral trade deficit almost literally exploded since 2000, when this body and the other body moved forward on PNTR. We saw it with the Central American Free Trade Agreement, when President Bush had to wake in the middle of the night and get on the phone with Republican Member after Republican Member to get them to change their vote on fast-track so he could get the Central American Free Trade Agreement, which he sold in the name of counter-terrorism. We saw it in the South Korean trade agreement, when this President made promises of more job creation and higher wages, neither of which has borne out.

We have seen big promises and bad results on trade issue after trade issue after trade issue after trade issue. We have seen it through the Presidencies of George Bush 1, Bill Clinton, George Bush 2, and now Barack Obama.

As I said, this body should not give up its authority to make better trade agreements. In essence, what we are saying in this body with this vote, which will take place within the hour or so, is that we are willing to give up these powers to the executive branch to give us more of the same, trade agreements that don't work for our communities, don't work for our workers, don't work for our families, and don't work for our small businesses.

While this Chamber will vote on trade promotion authority today, so-called fast-track, it doesn't mean we throw in the towel on the congressional oversight of our Nation's trade policy. Moving forward with fast-track means it is more critical than ever that we protect Congress's prerogative to have a say on a deal that could offset 40 percent of the world's economy. Members on both sides of the aisle, Members on both sides of this debate, supporters and opponents, Republicans and Democrats, a good mix of each, have had conversations with me and many others about how this deal, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, is too secretive.

We have had conversations about how the U.S. Trade Representative is not answering the concerns of Members, even supporters of TPA and TPP, on issues such as currency, workers' protections, workers' rights, tobacco, and public health. Starting today, we need to make sure any Trans-Pacific Partnership deal—and that is the deal we will vote on later. I am assuming TPA will pass today. I hope not. I assume it will pass, go to the President, and I assume he will sign it.

The next question is, What happens with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is 12 countries coming together. It includes a handful of countries in the Western Hemisphere, including the three NAFTA countries—Canada, the

United States, and Mexico—a couple of South American countries and Asia and the Australian subcontinent countries will be part of this trade agreement. If China is added to it, we hope there is a vote in the Congress, although there is no promise of that from the administration—but we need to make sure any deal on the Trans-Pacific Partnership includes strong labor protections. There are always big promises about labor protections, but a President has yet to deliver on these labor protections.

I am particularly concerned about Vietnam, a large country of tens of millions—approaching 100 million people. Vietnam is a country that has one labor union controlled by the Communist Party. It is a country that doesn't have collective bargaining rights. Yet we are assuming somehow that wages will come up high enough in Vietnam that they don't undercut U.S. wages, even though they don't have free trade unions, they don't have collective bargaining, and there is no mechanism so far in these trade agreements, whether it is TPA or Trans-Pacific Partnership, that Vietnam reach these wage levels and begins to move toward collective bargaining and free trade unionism prior to its admission to TPP.

We need to figure out all of those questions. We need to make sure that any TPP deal has strong environmental protections. Again, there were big promises on other agreements, but there is never much on the delivery side of these promises.

We want to see strong currency provisions. Again, there have been big promises on TPP but with little results in the past, and so far we have an administration that is not willing to carry it out.

We need to make sure we protect Medicare and Medicaid from investor-state dispute resolution, and we need to preserve access to medicines. We know citizens in the developing world simply can't afford the high cost of Western medicines. Much of the time Americans can't afford the high cost of medicines, and we are an affluent country.

When we look at some of these TPP countries in South America and Asia, they can afford them even less. We need to make sure there are strong preserve-access-to-medicine provisions. We need to include protections that prevent this deal from being a tool for tobacco, which is perhaps the simplest to understand and one of the most troubling because of its moral bankruptcy.

This body is about to vote for fast-track legislation. If we don't stop this train from going down the track on which it seems to be heading, we are handing Big Tobacco even more power to addict children to tobacco in the developing world and countries that don't have nearly the public health system we do and don't have the affluence to be able to fight back against Big Tobacco. We have been pretty successful in doing that and protecting our children.

About 15 years ago when I was a member of the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health, I remember seven tobacco executives came to our committee. There was a picture on just about every front page of newspapers in the country, where the seven CEOs of the biggest tobacco companies in the country, some of the biggest in the world, raised their right hands and pledged to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and out and out lied to that committee about nicotine and cigarettes and the addictive qualities of nicotine.

These same tobacco companies, over time, pledged that they would no longer put billboards near schoolyards, pledged that they would no longer hand out sample packages of cigarettes near schools, pledged that they would stop their Joe Camel promotions.

I remember the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN, was as outraged as I was with Big Tobacco.

I asked them a question at this hearing. I said: You are willing to do that in this country? You are willing to say that you will no longer have billboards near high schools, and you will no longer hand out samples of cigarette packs near schools, and you will stop your Joe Camel ads? I then said: Are you willing to do that in other countries around the world?

The answer was: No, no, no, no, no, no, no.

When these tobacco companies go to the developing world and peddle their poisons, they know public health in the developing world is about fighting cholera, fighting AIDS, fighting malaria, and fighting tuberculosis. They simply don't have the public health resources that we do in our country to fight Big Tobacco. That is my concern about what could happen.

I will talk for a moment about how Big Tobacco uses trade agreements generally to undermine public health. We know tobacco use is the world's leading cause of preventable death. It is why countries around the world are passing stricter laws to protect their citizens from the massive health risks tobacco poses. Big Tobacco has turned trade deals into a tool for defeating commonsense international public health efforts.

How could that happen? Why would a trade deal be a vehicle to weaken anti-tobacco laws, the laws that especially protect children against addictive tobacco? Here is how it happens: It uses a trade agreement provision known as investor-state dispute settlement to attack a nation's public health law. Under this process, corporations use trade agreements to dispute domestic laws that they say undermine their investments.

I will use the best example, but there are several. Not many years ago, Australia passed the Tobacco Plain Packaging Act. Big Tobacco challenged this law. First of all, they opposed it in the Australian Legislature. They lobbied against it, but they were unsuccessful. The Australian Legislature passed the plain packaging consumer protection anti-addicting children tobacco law in 2011. Then, they sued, and it went to the Australian supreme court. Big Tobacco lost that case too.

So you know what they did? I give them credit for being pretty clever. They paid their lawyers a lot of money. Big Tobacco challenged this new law under the Australia-Hong Kong Bilateral Investment Treaty in a World Trade Organization dispute settlement proceeding. That means although Australian courts had ruled in favor of this law—their legislature passed it and the supreme court said it is constitutional—Big Tobacco, from the platform of Hong Kong, sued the Australian Government, saying, fundamentally, that was takings, that would undermine their profits.

I believe a three-person tribunal will hear this case. These are not Australian lawyers. Australia has nothing to do with this case except that they are going to be victimized.

I know the Presiding Officer cares about sovereignty for our country. I know this cuts across party lines. Conservatives, as much as progressives, care about sovereignty and public health. What we are doing is turning over the sovereignty of our Nation to these tribunals that can undercut our sovereignty.

Tobacco companies have launched similar cases against Uruguay and Togo over proposed laws. Cases like these can bankrupt small countries. Togo is one of the 10 poorest countries on Earth. It was forced to give up its tobacco labeling laws, bowing under pressure from Philip Morris, a company whose sales, I believe, are larger than the GDP of Togo—bowing under pressure from Philip Morris, which threatened an ''incalculable amount of trade litigation.''

So here are some U.S. trade lawyers who threatened to sue a poor African government or, in some cases, Latin American government which, once it exercised its sovereignty to protect its children against potential addictive tobacco marketing—marketing that will lead to children being addicted to tobacco—but they back off because they can't afford to go to court against the deep pockets of Philip Morris. This is Big Tobacco's strategy: Litigate and bankrupt countries into submission.

What we are facing is huge corporations using trade laws to blackmail countries—call it another word if you want; I think ''blackmail'' is about as close as it gets—into overturning laws that were passed by their legislature and usually ratified by their court system. People from another country—a

very rich country—and one of the richest industries in that country, represented by some of the most privileged Harvard- and Yale-trained lawyers, are saying: We are going to overturn your democratically elected law because our profits are more important than protecting your children in Togo or your children in Uruguay, than protecting your children's health. That is fundamentally what they are saying.

So a vote today—since we haven't fixed tobacco—on fast-track is essentially saying—unless the people voting for it are going to go to bat, for a change, against Big Tobacco—fundamentally, we are saying it is OK for Big Tobacco and it is the privilege of the Big Tobacco lawyers to go to court and choose large tobacco profits over 15- and 16—or may I say 12- and 13-year-old children's health in poor countries in the developing world. That is a rather uneven match. Yet we ratify that with a ''yes'' vote today.

(Mr. TOOMEY assumed the Chair.)

We also have a responsibility to look out for the American worker who we know will be hurt by this deal. We know that—while I may disagree with the Presiding Officer from Pennsylvania over whether these trade agreements produce net jobs or what he, I think, believes—I believe these trade agreements produce a net loss of jobs.

That aside, people on both sides of this debate understand and have acknowledged that because of our actions, because of what we do here in this body and in the House and in the White House—what we do here with this trade agreement will throw some people out of jobs. We know there will be dislocation. People will lose their jobs because of our decisions. So how in the world could we possibly pass this without first taking care of those workers who lose their jobs? We make a decision; you get thrown out of work. My colleague makes a decision; you get thrown out of work. We are just going to turn our backs because we don't really care about helping you even though you lost your job because of our decision.

So TAA is particularly important. It is not that we should pass the trade adjustment assistance; it is what we should do with it. I am disappointed that the TAA bill being considered today is significantly less generous to those workers than it should be. There will be many workers who lose their jobs. Even if we pass TAA, there will be many workers who lose their jobs who will not be taken care of under TAA. It does not make the program available to all workers.

I am disappointed that the bipartisan funding levels—which almost every Democrat in this body cosponsored—in my legislation that included a more generous level for TAA—we agreed to it in 2011 in this body, but for no reason at all, those numbers were cut. I want to expand eligibility. I want to increase its funding.

We are making it easier to pass TPP, but we are cutting the TAA Program by 20 percent. So how does that figure? We are saying we are going to pass this trade agreement—40 percent of the world's economy—yet we are cutting the protection for workers, the aid for those workers who lose their jobs because of our decisions in this body. We are cutting those workers 20 percent.

Last, we have an opportunity in this bill today to once again support the Leveling the Playing Field Act and ensure it gets to the President's desk. This will be the vote after the TPA vote. This bill is essential to protect our manufacturers from illegal foreign competition. We can't have trade promotion without trade enforcement. This is not controversial. It shouldn't be partisan. Regardless of how one votes on TPA, we need to make sure our deals are enforced.

Leveling the playing field will increase U.S. companies' ability to fight back against unfair trade practices. It is critical for our businesses, and it is critical for our workers who are drowning under a flood of illegally subsidized imports. It has the support of businesses and workers, Republicans and Democrats.

I want to particularly thank Senators PORTMAN and GRAHAM and CASEY for their work in support of this issue. No matter where we stand on TPA, we should all be able to come together to demand enforcement of our trade laws. We cannot have trade promotion without trade enforcement and without protecting those workers who we know will be left behind.

We know these agreements cause wages to stagnate. We know these agreements cause factories to close. They cause imports to increase. They devastate families and communities. This is a terrible mistake we will make—which we have made over and over and over and over—if we pass this today. If we pass TPA, it is the same mistake we made with NAFTA—big promises of job increases, wages going up. Bad results. We did it when we passed PNTR. We did it when we passed CAFTA, the Central America Free Trade Agreement. And we are about to do it again. Shame on us. At least take care of workers if we are going to pass this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, there is a lot of talk about the imminent decision of the Supreme Court ruling in King v. Burwell. I will get to that a little bit later in my speech, but I wish to start by talking about how we got here.

I would like to review what Americans were told were the reasons for ObamaCare. It was supposed to help the 15 million people who are currently uninsured to get covered with quality, affordable insurance. Everyone else, we were promised, would be left alone. Remember that promise: If you like your doctor, you can keep him. If you like your health care, you can keep it. That is the first of several broken promises ObamaCare has ultimately produced. I will go through a few this afternoon.

Let's take a look at what has happened since ObamaCare was implemented and where we stand. Most of the uninsured nationwide are—and they were prior to ObamaCare—working families; 71 percent in 2013. They either couldn't afford the cost-sharing of their employer plan or their employer didn't offer a plan. Of those who got insurance under ObamaCare, too many were working families who actually didn't get private insurance under ObamaCare; they were ultimately forced into Medicaid, which is supposed to be a safety net, not a permanent solution for working families.

Is Medicaid the quality, affordable insurance that we all want for Americans and that people thought they were getting with ObamaCare? I don't think so. The provider payment rates in Medicaid are so low that many doctors refuse to see patients and participate in the plans. I don't really begrudge the doctors and the health care providers for this because the cost of care oftentimes exceeds the Medicaid reimbursement rates, and the redtape that comes with it absolutely is destroying the administrative side of health care. That is why doctors don't participate in the plan. That is why the doctors are not available for the people who actually need good, quality health care.

It is not for lack of investment though. States are drowning in unaffordable Medicaid Programs that eat more and more of their budgets at the expense of other essential services. States are throwing everything they can and then some at Medicaid, but it is still unacceptable in terms of cost, quality, and access. That is exactly why North Carolina refused to participate in ObamaCare's Medicaid expansion. I was speaker of the house in North Carolina at the time.

We know that if we are going to solve the health care problem, it has to be a real solution. We have to bring back a vibrant, robust, patient-centered, private insurance system, customized for our State rather than dictated by bureaucrats in Washington.

My constituents deserve a plan that pays doctors fairly so that provider networks are big enough to ensure that people don't get turned away at the door. Herding more of our hard-working, proud neighbors into a substandard welfare plan designed to be a temporary safety net is no solution at all, but that is exactly what ObamaCare has done. The President even brags about it.

In North Carolina, prior to the implementation of ObamaCare, there were some 1.9 million of our citizens who were uninsured. Who are these people? Ten percent were already Medicaid eligible before ObamaCare. Most of them are children. We could have enrolled them without ever passing ObamaCare and disrupting and destroying health care for everyone else. About a third

were people who were eligible for subsidies on the exchange—almost half a million.

So did all of those folks get help? It might look as though they did. After all, 459,000 have signed up through the Federal exchange in North Carolina. But wait. Are those the same people, the same ones who were insured before ObamaCare? It turns out that even more than that—473,000 people—had their plans canceled by ObamaCare. Again, 473,000 North Carolinians received a letter saying: The Affordable Care Act has determined you can't keep your plan. They didn't like it, even though those who were insured were satisfied with their plans.

This was a nationwide trend. The Associated Press reported that 4.7 million people had their plans canceled because of ObamaCare. There was such an outcry that the President, by Executive fiat, actually instructed the insurers to continue to allow the plans for a period of time. So how many people lost their plan this time is still not clear. But what is clear is that the individual mandate is going to cause problems down the road because those who lost their plan or who will lose their plan, are going to be required by law to buy a Washington-approved insurance plan no matter how unaffordable ObamaCare has made insurance.

Again, in North Carolina, more people received cancellation notices for plans they liked than have actually signed up for ObamaCare. Between the half million whose plans were initially canceled by ObamaCare and the 1.9 million people who were already uninsured prior to ObamaCare, we should end up with a wash—with no change in the uninsured figures for my State of North Carolina, but, actually, we don't. The uninsured rate has gone down 2.7 percent—from 19.9 percent in 2013 to 17.2 percent in 2014—after the first full year of the ObamaCare implementation, so roughly equivalent to about 200,000 people in North Carolina. But were all of those people getting quality, affordable plans on the exchange as promised by ObamaCare? Hardly. The reason is Medicaid enrollment. The majority of the people who the administration claims ObamaCare covered have been those who went to the exchange to get insurance but were then forced to enroll in Medicaid. And when I say forced, I mean forced. The law requires them to have insurance, but the exchange doesn't allow them to buy a private plan if they are eligible for Medicaid. It shows them one option: Medicaid.

Well, wait. You said North Carolina didn't expand Medicaid, so how did this happen? It is true. Medicaid enrollment for my State has increased by 300,000 people—the biggest enrollment increase of any of the States that didn't expand Medicaid. What that means is much if not all of the drop in the uninsured rate is due to North Carolinians enrolling in Medicaid through the exchange. These are the same people who were eligible before ObamaCare was ever passed.

Nationally, last year, nearly 90 percent of ObamaCare's net coverage gain was through Medicaid. A study from MIT released in April found that Medicaid enrollees receive much less value from the program than the cost of paying for services.

So far, I have been talking about people who were targeted by ObamaCare, including the population of previously uninsured, as well as those who became uninsured because ObamaCare forced them into the exchange. Again, ObamaCare didn't really make a dent in our uninsured numbers—not to this point in North Carolina—and it actually harmed many who were forced onto the exchange. It turns out that ObamaCare is an equal opportunity wrecking ball. It hurt the people it was supposed to help. It forced working families who needed quality, affordable, permanent care into a program that provides the lowest quality access there is—Medicaid.

ObamaCare took over and removed the insurance options, the individual market for people who didn't have employer coverage, leaving those Washington-approved ObamaCare plans with increased premiums, increased deductibles, and increased copays. You see, increased coverage doesn't necessarily mean better health care. If you can't afford your plan or you can't find the doctor, then your health care suffers.

But that is not all. ObamaCare broke health care for everyone else. Those of us who were supposedly happy with our doctors and happy with our health plans have been affected and will continue to be negatively affected.

What about the majority of Americans who actually have insurance through their employer? They haven't necessarily lost coverage yet, but they have been harmed. Despite the President's promise to lower insurance premiums, the average family premium for employer-sponsored coverage has risen $3,500 a year between 2009 and 2014.

In North Carolina, during the first full year of the exchange rollout, premium price increases outpaced increases in wages and inflation, losing ground to the working family. Even worse, premium prices in individual insurance markets—a market my daughter was a part of—went up 147 percent as a result of a plan that promised to reduce our health care insurance costs.

I know I am not the only one who remembers what President Obama said about ObamaCare. He said the average premiums would go down $2,500. The reality is they have gone up an average of $3,500 a year. All of this leads to the problem of people having insurance they can't afford, and they are not able to use it because their deductibles and copays are simply too high.

Between this group and the people who are now on Medicaid who can't get appointments with the small number of doctors who accept Medicaid, what one gets is a dramatic increase in the use of emergency rooms. That is exactly the opposite of what supporters of ObamaCare predicted. They predicted that emergency room visits would go down. We were told that once everyone was insured under ObamaCare, people could go to their doctors in outpatient settings and not show up at the ER. Instead, people can't afford the copays and deductibles or they can't get an outpatient appointment, so they wait until their problem is critical and end up in the ER.

In fact, Kaiser Family Foundation reports that emergency room utilization is up significantly among ObamaCare participants. In a survey of more than 2,000 emergency room doctors, three-quarters of them said emergency room visits have risen since January 1, 2014. Medicaid recipients covered under ObamaCare are struggling to find doctors who will accept their coverage, so they have no choice but to end up at an emergency room, where the costs skyrocket.

A spokesman for the Emergency Room Doctors Association, Dr. Howard Mell, noted:

> There was a grand theory the law would reduce emergency room visits. Well, guess what, it hasn't happened. Visits are going up despite the ACA, and in a lot of cases because of it.

One of the most troubling elements of ObamaCare to me is the intergenerational wealth transfer from the young and the poor to the older and the wealthier. When I say ''older,'' I don't mean elderly and frail or the population who may be on Medicare; I am talking about a wealth transfer from young people in their twenties to people like me in their fifties. I would never ask my daughter, who is about to start a career in nursing, to pay for her mother's insurance or for my insurance, neither would any of you or any other American. That is not how parents are wired. But an impersonal law that empowers an impersonal bureaucracy does not have the same moral compass as a parent.

For example, ObamaCare's mandates have jacked up premiums for young people to keep premiums down for older people like me. I am not sure ''let's fleece our children and grandchildren'' is a winning talking point, so the supporters of the bill try to hide the truth in Washington-speak. They call this ''age rating bands.''

Another talking point that tends to not fly too well with folks is ''Let's kick seniors off of their Medicare Advantage plans.'' That is exactly what happened in North Carolina late last year. Many who know about Medicare Advantage plans know they are very important and popular among seniors. In my State last year, 57,000 seniors—more than any other State in the Nation—were sent cancellation letters from the Medicare Advantage plans they liked. Many of these seniors were offered a minimum benefit plan with

higher copayments and higher premiums instead, all because ObamaCare cut reimbursement for Medicare Advantage plans out of some bizarre but longstanding aversion to the program on the part of some of our friends on the other side of the aisle. I have never understood it. Does Medicare Advantage somehow give seniors too much control, stability, and convenience in their Medicare benefits? I suspect my mom is watching me right now in Nashville, TN. I bet if she was asked that question, she would say no.

Just when you think it is really bad, realize that some of the toughest ObamaCare hits haven't even been taken yet.

First, the individual mandate penalty. The penalty for not having insurance increases next year to almost $700 per adult or 2.5 percent of one's annual income, whichever is greater. This is a penalty which many people will be surprised to see when they get their tax return and they are expecting this amount and it is $700 or $1,000 less to pay for the mandated care. If an individual's income is $50,000, they will pay a penalty of $1,000. A family with two adults with an income of $50,000 will pay $1,400. When adding a college kid to the mix, the penalty is $2,100. A lot of people are in for a shock when they open up that tax refund and they see the additional hidden costs of ObamaCare on working families. That penalty, however, is still dramatically lower than the out-of-pocket costs of an ObamaCare plan. So we are forcing Americans to pick between bad and worse.

Second, the employer mandate and penalty. President Obama knows the devastation the employer mandate will cause not only for businesses but, more importantly, for workers. Employers will be forced to cut workers. They will be forced to reduce wages and drop employer-sponsored health plans altogether and pay the penalty because the penalty will cost less than the mandates will to provide the care, and many employers simply can't afford it.

So far, people with employer-sponsored coverage have been harmed only by rising costs and shrinking provider networks, but they haven't for the most part lost their plans yet. The day is coming when the President can no longer delay the employer mandate, and that is when the plans they were promising you can keep will be canceled. We will see a massive disruption in the group market where most North Carolinians get their health insurance.

Premiums are going up every year because fewer younger, healthier people are enrolling than projected. This was completely predictable. Young people are no dummies. They know this is a terrible deal for them. As a result, insurance companies recalculate premiums based on the cost of the pool actually enrolled. The largest insurer in my State announced premium hikes for next year in the individual market of at least 26 percent. You know it is a bad thing when I felt better about the fact that our premium increases in North Carolina were only 26 percent because in some States they were upwards of 50 percent, and there is more to come.

ObamaCare relies on people paying into the pool to subsidize the sicker and poorer members of the pool. That is how insurance works. But virtually no one is signing up who isn't eligible for the subsidies.

CMS released data yesterday showing that 2015 exchange enrollment is 30 percent below projections made just 3 years ago. And of those who do enroll, they are doing it because of the lure of the subsidy. Ninety-three percent of the North Carolinians who are on the exchange have received those subsidies. That means the plans are unaffordable without massive subsidies. Those ineligible for the subsidy don't bother to sign up. That is why we have seen almost no movement in our State for uninsureds.

ObamaCare is forcing employers to cut jobs and move full-time workers into part-time positions. New data show a decline in the average hours worked per week by lower wage employees, and many workers are just below that 30-hour threshold, 30 hours per week.

I was at a restaurant in North Carolina a couple months back, and I was talking with a manager, who said it was heartbreaking for her to go and talk to a single mom who was able to make ends meet between the tips and her salary at 40 hours a week and tell her that she can now only work 30 hours a week because the restaurant simply cannot afford to be exposed to the mandates.

Now you have people who may have been able to make it on 40 hours a week or 45 hours a week having to get two jobs to make ends meet. I hear employers talking about how they are having to call each other to try to work out the schedules for these hardworking folks.

The CBO projects that ObamaCare will reduce employment as a result of all this by 2 million full-time equivalent jobs in 2017.

President Obama campaigned saying he wouldn't raise taxes on families making less than $250,000 a year. Let's talk a little bit more about that. ObamaCare broke that promise as well by creating or raising 20 different taxes amounting to more than $1 trillion in the first decade. Several taxes directly punished families making less than $250,000 a year.

University of Chicago economist Casey Mulligan modeled the macroeconomic effects of ObamaCare and estimated that the damage would be twice as large. He expects Obamacare to cause a 3-percent drop in employment and work hours and a 2-percent drop in our gross domestic product and worker income. If he is right, the total loss of worker compensation caused by the President's health care law will exceed $2 trillion between 2017 and 2024.

Now let's talk about the King v. Burwell case that has everyone's attention, with the Supreme Court imminently in a position to issue a ruling, probably sometime next week. The question for the Supreme Court is this: Did the President break the law by going around the will of the people in the States that wanted to opt out of establishing a State exchange, like we did in North Carolina?

Mr. President, what I just finished was a very long list of broken promises and the fiscal disaster we call ObamaCare. But now I want to talk about the King v. Burwell decision.

The question is this: Did the President break the law by going around the will of the people in the States that wanted to opt out of establishing a State exchange, such as North Carolina?

I am not interested in litigating this. I am not an attorney; I am a businessman. I will leave the lawyering to others. When I look at King v. Burwell, I don't see a legal battle; I see an opportunity. It may sound trite, but I see hope. The Court may give us the chance of a generation—the chance to fix health care once and for all. We can't fix ObamaCare, but we can fix health care.

But here is the thing. We don't come up with the solution ourselves. The press is counting on us to come up with a solution. Others are pressuring us on the other side of the aisle. But here is what I think we need to do. I think we need to look beyond the traditional way of trying to solve health care to a new way, and it starts with something fairly simple—humility.

I won't read the definition, but I think it is something that is sometimes missed in Washington. The solution is that we take the power out of Washington and we let the States do it. We give States, which are closer to the people, the chance—the privilege, really—to offer health care solutions that are local, accountable, and affordable.

Every State is different. Let's respect those differences. I believe the solution is one that will give States the flexibility, the funding, and the control to decide how best to serve the people of their particular State.

I just went through the long list of problems with ObamaCare. It has been problematic from the start, with higher costs, lower quality, less freedom, and people losing their coverage. It is a badly written law, and it hurts almost everyone.

Washington had its chance. Now it is time to let the States decide what is best for their people, and let the people decide what is best for their health care. To do that, we are going to have to do something we don't always do up here. We are going to have to jump on this opportunity and work together—Republicans and Democrats, the Federal Government and the States—to find commonsense solutions that are truly patient-centered.

That is the type of patient-first approach that will give patients more

freedom, more choice, and control over their health care. That is what will expand coverage—not bureaucratic power. That will promote genuine quality and innovation. It is also what is going to bring costs down. I do not think my responsibility is to my party. I do not think our responsibility is to the institution of the Senate or the prerogatives of the Federal legislative branch.

I think our responsibility is to the patients who deserve the highest quality care; to the patients who want the best treatments for their children; to the nurses and doctors who deserve freedom to heal according to their wisdom, their experience, and their conscience; and to the businesses that deserve the freedom to design affordable coverage that fits their workforce.

Finally, I think we are responsible to the seniors who have paved America's road to prosperity before us and who deserve a strong, secure Medicare program. The Court may just give us the opportunity to firmly and finally reject ObamaCare so that we can deliver what everyone in America deserves—a health care solution.

The law has not worked. It cannot work. It is time we return the power of medicine to the people. It is time to stop fighting and to start cooperating and to find a permanent solution.

Patients deserve portability in their health insurance, and they deserve affordability. They deserve their peace of mind when their parent or their child or they themselves are in their hour of crisis and when they can count on getting the best health care America has to offer.

Sometimes politicians in Washington forget that health care is not about systems or rules and structure or even markets. It is about real people and real families and real lives. So my commitment is simple. Our commitment should be simple. No one who has ObamaCare-subsidized care today will lose that coverage tomorrow. We are equally committed to providing long-term, State-designed, patient-empowering solutions that deliver better long-term results, and safe, secure, and affordable health care and an improved economy.

We commit that every patient with a preexisting condition will be able to find affordable coverage. No one will hit a cap on benefits. Anyone can renew their health plan. That is our commitment. Health care is about patients, not politics. It is about doctors and nurses, not politicians. For the millions who have been affected, from the cancelled plans to the higher costs, we are committed to real solutions to protect patients and make health care genuinely personal and genuinely affordable.

Hard-working taxpayers deserve certainty, stability, and peace of mind when it comes to health care. A temporary extension of subsidies alone would not be enough. It would just be another Washington gimmick. It would not address the very real problems with the President's health care law. Let's commit to each other—Republicans and Democrats—that we will show a little modesty. We won't assume we know what is best for every American, and we will let the States come up with solutions. We will work together to return power to the States, to the people, and really to the kitchen table, where most health care decisions are made.

I know what you are thinking: I am new and have been here for 6 months. Maybe I am a little bit naive. But I have herded a lot of cats in the North Carolina legislature. I have stepped up to very serious challenges, and we produced a lot of good results for my friends and colleagues and citizens in North Carolina. I know it can be done at the State level when policies are on the line that have a real impact on our neighbors—neighbors we have to face in the checkout line and in the church pews.

I am looking forward to providing a solution to the health care problems in the United States. I am looking forward to seeing bipartisan cooperation, to delivering on the promises that we make here, and to fulfilling the promise of fixing health care for our great country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 4 p.m. today, June 24, all postcloture time on the motion to concur with respect to H.R. 2146 be considered expired, the pending motion to concur with amendment be withdrawn, and the Senate vote on the motion to concur; that if cloture on H.R. 1295 is invoked, all postcloture time be considered expired, all motions and amendments be withdrawn except the motion to concur with amendment, and the Senate immediately vote on the motion to concur with amendment; further, that following the disposition of H.R. 1295, all time on the compound motion to go to conference under rule XXVIII on H.R. 644 be yielded back and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture with the mandatory quorum waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we are now one vote away from final passage of our bill to renew trade promotion authority. One more vote and we can finally, and at long last, send this important bill to the President's desk. That vote is expected to take place within the next 25 minutes.

This is a critical day for our country. In fact, I would call it a historic day. It has taken us a while to get there, longer than many of us would have liked. But we all know that anything worth doing takes effort. Believe me, this bill has been worth the effort. This is, I believe, the most important bill we will pass in the Senate this year. It will help reassert Congress's role over the U.S. trade negotiations and reestablish the United States as a strong player in international trade.

Renewing TPA has been a top priority for me for many years, and as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am pleased that with the help of Ranking Member WYDEN, we have been able to deliver a robust and bipartisan bill. It has also been a high priority for the Senate majority leader. Thanks to his strong support and leadership, we are one step away from completing this important task.

This bill will help farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and our entrepreneurs throughout our country get better access to foreign markets and allow them to compete on a level playing field. This bill will help give these job creators and the workers they employ greater opportunities to grow their businesses, which will help create a healthier American economy. The business and agricultural communities understand the importance of strong trade agreements. That is why they came together in strong support of this important legislation. We have heard from all of them throughout this debate. I appreciate their enthusiasm and support.

This has, from the outset, been a bipartisan effort, and I am glad that it has remained that way. Throughout this entire debate—here in the Senate and over in the House and here in the Senate again—we have been able to maintain a bipartisan coalition in support of TPA, fair trade, and expanded market access to U.S. exporters. This is no small feat. I am appreciative of everyone who has worked so hard to make this possible.

With this final vote, we can complete the work we began so many years ago. But let's be clear. Passing TPA is not the end of the story; it is just the beginning. As chairman of the Finance Committee, I intend to remain vigilant in our oversight as the administration pursues the negotiating objectives that Congress has set with this legislation. If they fall short, I will be among the first to hold them accountable. But that is for another day.

Today, I urge my colleagues to help us finalize this historic achievement and join me in voting in favor of this bipartisan TPA bill. If the vote moves the way I think it will, today will be remembered as a good day for the Senate, the President, and the American people.

Once we vote to pass TPA, we will then be voting to invoke cloture on the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015. This bill will reauthorize and improve three of our trade preference programs: the Generalized System of Preferences, or GSP; the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA; and tariff preferences for Haiti. I want to take some time to reiterate why each of these programs is important.

First, the GSP promotes trade with developing nations by providing duty-free tariff treatment of certain products originating in those countries. The program helps beneficiary countries advance their economic development and move toward more open economies. It also helps manufacturers and importers in the United States to receive inputs and raw materials at lower costs.

Approximately three-quarters of U.S. imports under the GSP are raw materials, parts and components, or machinery and equipment used by U.S. companies to manufacture goods here at home.

The program expired in 2013. As a result, businesses that would typically benefit from this program have had to deal with high tariffs on these imports for the last 2 years. Last year alone, American companies paid over $600 million in tariffs that would otherwise have been eliminated with the GSP in place. Once we finally pass this bill, we will take a long overdue step toward solving these problems.

The preferences bill also includes a long-term renewal of the AGOA Program, which lowers U.S. tariffs on the exports of qualified sub-Saharan African countries, encouraging them to further develop their economy. Since AGOA was enacted in 2000, trade with beneficiary countries has more than tripled, with U.S. direct investment in beneficiary countries growing more than sixfold during that time.

The program has also helped to create more than 1 million jobs in those countries. The AGOA authorization in this preferences bill will improve on this past success.

Some of our colleagues here in the Congress have voiced concerns about the AGOA Program and the failure of some beneficiary countries to live up to their commitments. I share many of these concerns. We tried to address them with this bill. Most notably, the bill creates a mechanism under the AGOA Program to allow for benefits to be scaled back if a country is found not to be making good faith progress on eligibility criteria. We expect the administration to use this new tool aggressively.

Finally, the preferences bill will also extend preferential access to the U.S. market for Haiti. As we all know, Haiti is one of the poorest countries in the Western Hemisphere. The Haiti preference programs support the creation of jobs and stability in a country dealing with debilitating poverty and unemployment. I hope this extension will encourage continued economic development and democracy in Haiti.

It is easy to see why these programs have all received bipartisan support. I expect that support to continue. In addition to those preferences programs, the bill we will be voting on includes legislation introduced by Senators PORTMAN and BROWN to strengthen the enforcement and administration of our antidumping and countervailing duty laws. As I have noted in the past, antidumping and countervailing duty laws are among the most important trade tools we have to protect U.S. companies from unfair foreign trade practices.

A number of Utah companies do benefit from these laws, which allow them to compete against imports that unfairly benefit from the support of foreign governments. I am pleased we were able to include this legislation in the preferences bill.

Finally, also included in this bill is an extension of the trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, Program. I think I have said enough about my opposition to this program here on the floor over the past several weeks. I will not delve too deeply into that issue here. However, I do understand that for many of my colleagues who want to support TPA and free trade, passage of TAA is a prerequisite.

From the outset of this debate over trade promotion authority, I have committed to my colleagues to working to ensure that both TAA and TPA move on parallel tracks. I plan to make good on this commitment, and today will show that. That is why, despite my misgivings about TAA, and with the entire picture in view, I plan to vote for this latest version of the trade preferences bill.

Back in April, the Senate Finance Committee reported four separate trade bills. All of these bills have enjoyed bipartisan support and are priorities for many Members of Congress. I committed to doing all that I could to get all of these bills through Congress and onto the President's desk. While the path has taken some unexpected turns, I think the light at the end of the tunnel at this point is very visible. Once again, we will shortly be voting to pass our TPA bill and send it to the President. Shortly thereafter, I expect that we will pass our trade preferences bill, which includes TAA, and send it to the House, where I think it will pass, hopefully, without much difficulty.

Then we expect to appoint conferees on the Customs bill, which will get us closer to the finish line on that important legislation. Needless to say, I am pleased with these developments. I think they speak well of what Congress is able to do when Members work together to address important issues and solve real problems.

Once again, I thank my colleagues for working with us on the bipartisan effort to update and improve U.S. trade policy. Most notably, I once again thank Senator WYDEN for his assistance and support throughout this effort and on all of these trade bills. He has been a great partner and deserves much of the credit for getting us this far. I also thank our distinguished majority leader for his unwavering support, even in the most difficult times. I also need to thank Chairman RYAN of the House Ways and Means Committee, who has been a coauthor and a key partner in this endeavor. Of course, I thank Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republican leadership for their efforts in getting us through all the twists and turns we have had to take to get to this point.

We also need to give credit to President Obama and Ambassador Froman for their work in building and maintaining a coalition of support for this entire undertaking.

Ultimately, I need to thank everyone who supported our work on these bills in the Senate, in the House, in the administration, and elsewhere, but that list is too long for me to go through on the floor. I just hope everyone who had a hand in today's success knows I am grateful for the work they have put in. I hope we can build on this success and that we can find more ways to work together to help the American people solve our Nation's problems.

I also praise my chief trade counsel on this matter, Everett Eissenstat, who with his vast foreign policy experience and trade experience has been nothing but a tremendous help to me.

Chris Campbell, who is our chief of staff on the Finance Committee, has played another role; Jay Khosla, who is one of my chief policy advisers; and the rest of my staff: Mark Prater, Jeff Wrase, Bryan Hickman, Shane Warren, Rebecca Eubank, Kevin Rosenbaum.

I compliment Senator WYDEN's staff as well: Joshua Sheinkman, Jayme White, Elissa Alben, Greta Peisch, Anderson Heiman, and Michael Evans. They have worked long and hard and, really, we have had a lot of good days together and a lot of tough days together, but hopefully it will come out all right.

I can say without reservation that I look forward to tackling the bipartisan challenges that lie ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

OBAMACARE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it has been said that there is nothing certain in life but death and taxes.

I would suggest there is a third item that can be included in that saying, and that is bad news about ObamaCare, because if there is one thing that can be counted on, it is the regular revelation of new ObamaCare failures.

This past week, we learned that the Obama administration cannot verify whether almost $3 billion in subsidies that it paid to insurance companies during the first 4 months of 2014 was properly paid. Thanks to the government's failure to ensure that a reporting system was in place by the time exchange plans went into effect in 2014, the government made payments to insurance companies without any way of verifying if the payments were correct or if the people it made payments for were still enrolled in their plans.

Unfortunately, missing systems are just par for the course when it comes to the President's health care law.

I don't need to remind anyone of the massive breakdowns that occurred

when the partially finished healthcare.gov kicked off 2 years ago. The President himself referred to healthcare.gov last week as a ''well-documented disaster.''

But as bad as these problems have been for a health care law that the President once claimed would make purchasing health care as easy as shopping on Amazon, they are just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to ObamaCare.

Two weeks ago, I came to the floor to talk about the massive rate hikes customers on exchanges are facing for 2016. Let me just read a couple headlines from the first week in June. CNN: ''Obamacare sticker shock: Big rate hikes proposed for 2016.'' From the New York Times: ''Many Health Insurers Go Big With Initial 2016 Rate Requests.'' From the Wall Street Journal: ''More Health-Care Insurers Seek Big Premium Increases.'' From the Associated Press: ''8 Minnesota Health Plans Propose Big Premium Hikes for 2016.'' From the Newark Star-Ledger: ''Premiums to jump more than 10 percent on many Obamacare policies.''

I could go on. Nationwide, insurers have requested double-digit premium increases on hundreds of individual and small group plans for 2016. More than 6 million people are enrolled in plans facing average rate increases of 10 percent or more. Around the country, rate increases of 20, 30, and even 40 percent are common.

Yet the President promised that his health care plan ''would bring down the cost of healthcare for millions.'' Well, in fact, the President's health care law has been driving up the cost of health care for millions since its inception. The average family health care premium has increased by almost $3,500 since 2009, despite the President's promise that health insurance costs for families would decrease by $2,500 if his law were passed.

I could go on about ObamaCare's many failures. I could talk about the State exchanges that are failing or those that have already failed. I could talk about the individuals who lost their health insurance plans—plans, I might add, that they liked—as a result of this law. I could talk about the people who no longer can see doctors they saw for years because their new ObamaCare plans have severely limited the network of doctors they can see. I could talk about the small businesses that are struggling with the costs imposed by ObamaCare or the fact that the Congressional Budget Office has stated that the law will reduce work hours equivalent to 2 million full-time workers by the year 2017.

I think every American gets the point. ObamaCare is broken. It has been broken from the beginning. It has failed to deliver on the promise—the President's promise—of more affordable, accessible health care, and it has made things worse for American families.

In the next few days, the Supreme Court will release its decision in the King v. Burwell case. If the Supreme Court abolishes or phases out the ObamaCare subsidies, Republicans will take action to provide effective assistance to Americans to repeal the mandates that forced these Americans to buy government-approved insurance in the first place. Our plan will protect families while we move away from costly, top-down, government-mandated health care and toward a system that will actually drive down costs and increase choices for American families.

President Obama promised that his health care law would be a solution to the problems plaguing our health care system. The last 5 years have proved that ObamaCare is anything but. Not only did ObamaCare fail to solve the existing problems in our health care system, it has created entirely new ones, and American families are those who are suffering as a result.

It is time for Democrats to stop defending this broken law and start working with Republicans to replace it with real health care reform that will lower costs, put patients back in charge, and provide greater access to quality care. That is what we should be working on. That is what the American people expect, and it is long overdue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak for up to 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the greatest domestic policy train wreck we have seen in our lifetime, a fundamentally flawed law that is holding back our economy and limiting people's freedom when it comes to choices in health care. Of course, I am talking about the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare.

ObamaCare was the creation of a Democratic supermajority that crammed ObamaCare through Congress without open debate by the American people. In the last 5 years since ObamaCare became law, the American people have not yielded in their strong opposition to ObamaCare. In fact, today, more than a majority of Americans continue to disapprove of this law, and there is no wonder why.

When I am back home in Georgia, one of the most frequent and sobering concerns I hear about is the insidious, negative economic impact of this law. The consequences of ObamaCare are hurting Georgians in many ways and millions of Americans.

First, the individual mandate is forcing people onto ObamaCare, whether they can afford it or not. Like my wife Bonnie and I, many people have had their insurance plans actually canceled, lost access to their preferred doctors or were forced onto insurance plans that cost more, not less. In Georgia alone, dozens of ObamaCare plans are expected to have double-digit rate hikes next year, with some people's plans skyrocketing over 60 percent. That is just unacceptable.

Second, ObamaCare's employer mandate is causing small businesses to cut back workers' hours and, in some cases, businesses have actually stopped hiring completely. Due to the 30-hour workweek rule inside ObamaCare, many people are being forced to move from full-time to part-time work. This is devastating the families already struggling to get from payday to payday. Without a full workweek, many moms and dads are juggling multiple part-time jobs to provide for their families and try to save for the future. Next year, for example, 2.6 million people are in danger of having their hours cut because of ObamaCare. Sixty percent of those individuals are female and over 60 percent are the young, first-time workers between 18 and 35 years of age.

Third, given the growing, aging population, ObamaCare is contributing to a dangerous doctor shortage. The Association of American Medical Colleges is predicting a shortage of as many as 90,000 doctors by 2025.

Another survey by the Physicians Foundation found that 81 percent of doctors describe themselves as either overextended or at full capacity, and 44 percent said they planned to cut back on the number of patients they see, retire, work part time or actually close their practice to new patients.

Ultimately, ObamaCare is raising costs, not lowering them; cutting workers' wages, not growing them; decreasing access, not expanding it; and making it harder on the middle class, not easier.

While the sentiment of the Supreme Court on ObamaCare is still to be determined, one thing is crystal clear: ObamaCare is hurting people and our economy. It must be fully repealed and replaced.

We have to stop allowing Washington to dictate what is best for individuals and their families. Putting bureaucrats between patients and their doctors, between patients and their insurance provider, and between doctors and the insurance providers is what created this catastrophe in the first place.

ObamaCare was wrong from the start. We have seen the growing unintended consequences of this flawed law in its implementation over the last 5 years. We now have the power to change course and create a better health care system for all Americans. I remain committed to using every tool at our disposal to repeal ObamaCare.

Achieving consensus on repealing ObamaCare with a patient-based alternative will require diligence and robust debate, but I am hopeful we can achieve that goal. I urge my colleagues to continue to work not just to fight against ObamaCare but to fight to protect the millions of people who are hurt by it every day.

We can create a health care system that offers the American people affordability, transportability, and yes, insurability. We can create commonsense health care policy that lowers costs and doesn't harm the economy like ObamaCare. And yes, we can create a bipartisan solution that helps people by putting patients first and getting Washington out of the way.

It won't be easy, but is achievable. It must be achievable. For the sake of our kids and grandkids we must do this. We must get rid of ObamaCare once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

Under the previous order, the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, with an amendment, is withdrawn.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146.

Mr. HATCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 219 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Ayotte	Feinstein	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Murray
Bennet	Flake	Nelson
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Cantwell	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cochran	Isakson	Sullivan
Coons	Johnson	Thune
Corker	Kaine	Tillis
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Cotton	Lankford	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Warner
Daines	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Wyden

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	King	Sanders
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Sessions
Casey	Markey	Shelby
Collins	Menendez	Stabenow
Cruz	Merkley	Tester
Donnelly	Mikulski	Udall
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Franken	Paul	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—2

Lee	Rubio

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAHAM and I be allowed to speak for about 5 minutes, equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONDEMNING THE ATTACK ON EMANUEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 212, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 212) condemning the attack on Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, and expressing encouragement and prayers for all affected by this evil assault.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I stand before you today and before the Nation not as a Senator, not as an elected official but as a humble South Carolinian. The past week has been one of terrible tragedy and amazing unity.

Last Wednesday night, we experienced an unimaginable tragedy. Nine men and women—nine mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, sons, daughters—were lost forever. The hateful and racist actions of one deranged man have changed nine families forever. It has changed South Carolina forever and Charleston forever. But what we saw from the nine families at last Friday's bond hearing was simple. It was powerful and absolutely the best of who we are as Americans.

A few minutes ago I was in the cloakroom, and I had the opportunity to talk to one of the victim's sons, Daniel Simmons, Jr. I was talking to him back there.

I said: Is there anything you want me to share when I go on the floor of the Senate?

He said: Please share that God cares for his people. God still lives.

I was amazed.

Then he said with great enthusiasm and energy and a sense of excitement: This evil attack will lead to reconciliation, restoration, and unity in our Nation.

Those are powerful words.

It is with great sadness and amazing hope that our future as a nation has been changed. It has been changed because one person decided to murder nine. It has been changed because the response of those nine families has been so courageous and so inspiring.

If you permit me, I will read the names of those nine individuals.

We honor the Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, beloved teacher and coach at Goose Greek High School. Her son Chris has shown us all what an amazing mother she was through his strength over the past 6 days.

We honor Cynthia Hurd, whose love for education has been shared for over 31 years as a librarian in the public library system.

We honor Susie Jackson, who at 87 years young still offered her beautiful voice to the choir and had recently returned from visiting her family in Ohio.

We honor Ethel Lee Lance, who served her church with pride and whose daughter calls her the strong woman who just tried to keep her family together.

We honor Depayne Middleton-Doctor, who dedicated her life to serving the poor and helping her students as an enrollment counselor at Southern Wesleyan University.

We honor my good friend, the Reverend Clementa Pinckney, an amazing man of faith, a great dad, and a wonderful father.

We honor Tywanza Sanders, beloved son of Tyrone and Felicia, whose warmth and heartfelt spirit has kept us moving.

We honor the Reverend Daniel Simmons, Sr., whose granddaughter said: My granddaddy was an amazing man. It seemed like every time he spoke, it was pure wisdom.

And we honor Pastor Myra Thompson, who served the Lord with grace and dignity. She loved her children, her grandchildren, and her great grandchildren.

If you would pause for 9 seconds, I would appreciate it.

(Moment of Silence.)

Thank you.

In closing, I want to thank all of my colleagues in the Senate and the House for their kind words over the past week and for the prayers that continue to come into our city from across the Nation.

We are Charleston, we are South Carolina, and we are absolutely united. We are committed to replacing hate with love, pain with kindness, and ill will and hostility with goodwill and comfort.

I yield to Senator GRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to recognize Senator SCOTT. We all know Senator SCOTT is a man of quiet

faith. He does it when no one is looking, by the way. I remember being in the cloakroom watching a basketball game, which is consistent with me, and the Senator was over in the corner with headphones on. I said: What are you listening to or what are you doing?

He said very sheepishly: I am doing my Bible study.

Senator SCOTT has been a great comfort to our State because he is truly a man of God.

To the rest of you, I want to tell people in South Carolina that in the Senate we have a lot of differences and we display them a lot. I wish you could have heard what was said to me and Senator SCOTT. Everybody in this body has come up to us in one way or another and said the most kind things. In the Senate we have our problems, but we are still a family. Thank you all, from all over this country, for the kindness you have shown during these difficult times.

Very quickly, I don't know how you can sit with somebody for an hour in a church and pray with them and get up and shoot them. That is Mideast hate. I didn't think it was something we had here, but apparently we do.

I just can't imagine what it takes of an individual to be welcomed in a church—here is what happened. He went to Charleston with a plan. The people in the church had no idea who he was or what he had in mind. He came into the church, and he was sitting in the pews by himself and they invited him up for the Bible study and spent an hour with him.

And he said: They were so nice, I almost backed out.

That says a lot about them. It says a lot about him. But Senator SCOTT mentioned something that I cannot get over. Within 48 hours of having your family member murdered, to appear in a public setting, looking at the guy in the eye and to say: You ruined my life but I love you and I forgive you—that is a level of love and understanding that can only come from some higher authority. I don't have that within me.

When it comes to representing South Carolina, Senator SCOTT and I will do our best. But on our best day, we are nowhere close to these people. There is no politician in America who can represent their State better than the people of Mother Emanuel AME Church when they went to a public place, looked the killer in the eye and said: I forgive you; I am praying for you.

I wish we could muster that kind of love for each other, just for a little bit. What would America be like?

Thank you all for your kindness.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote in the series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295, an act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295, with an amendment, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Reid
Boozman	Heitkamp	Rounds
Boxer	Heller	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Shaheen
Capito	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	King	Sullivan
Carper	Kirk	Tester
Casey	Klobuchar	Thune
Coats	Leahy	Tillis
Cochran	Manchin	Toomey
Collins	Markey	Udall
Coons	McCain	Warner
Corker	McCaskill	Warren
Cornyn	McConnell	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Menendez	Wicker
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Ernst	Mikulski	
Feinstein	Murkowski	

NAYS—22

Barrasso	Gardner	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cotton	Inhofe	Scott
Crapo	Lankford	Sessions
Cruz	Moran	Shelby
Daines	Paul	Vitter
Enzi	Perdue	
Fischer	Risch	

NOT VOTING—2

Lee	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). On this vote, the yeas are 76, the nays are 22.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the compound motion to go to conference with respect to H.R. 644 be withdrawn and that following the disposition of H.R. 1295, the Senate vote on the compound motion to go to conference with respect to H.R. 644.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me just tell everybody what that means. For the information of all Senators, this means that we will be able to process all of the other votes on trade by voice vote, and so there will be no further rollcall votes this week. Having said that, the Senate will be in session tomorrow. There are multiple committee meetings that are going to occur, but no votes will be expected tomorrow.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on the compound motion, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 129, 130, 149, 150, 151, 152, and 154; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 1295, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the

Senate to the bill, with McConnell/Hatch amendment No. 2065 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell amendment No. 2066 (to amendment No. 2065), to change the enactment date.

McConnell motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2067, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2068 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2067), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2069 (to amendment No. 2068), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

Under the previous order, all motions and amendments with the exception of the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295, with an amendment, are withdrawn.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

Under the previous order, the question occurs on the motion to concur, with the amendment.

Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 644, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

Pending:

McConnell motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

VOTE ON COMPOUND MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on the compound motion to go to conference on H.R. 644.

Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CHARLES C. ADAMS, JR., TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND

NOMINATION OF MARY CATHERINE PHEE TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN

NOMINATION OF NANCY BIKOFF PETTIT TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA

NOMINATION OF GREGORY T. DELAWIE TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO

NOMINATION OF IAN C. KELLY TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GEORGIA

NOMINATION OF JULIETA VALLS NOYES TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA

NOMINATION OF ANNE ELIZABETH WALL TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Charles C. Adams, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland; Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Sudan; Nancy Bikoff Pettit, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Latvia; Gregory T. Delawie, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kosovo; Ian C. Kelly, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Georgia; Julieta Valls Noyes, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Croatia; and Anne Elizabeth Wall, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

VOTE ON ADAMS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles C. Adams, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON PHEE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Sudan?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON PETTIT NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Nancy Bikoff Pettit, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Latvia?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON DELAWIE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gregory T. Delawie, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kosovo?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON KELLY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Ian C. Kelly, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Georgia?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON NOYES NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Julieta Valls Noyes, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service,

Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Croatia?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON WALL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Anne Elizabeth Wall, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume legislative session.

The majority whip.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I understand that Senators have some business to wrap up and are expecting an early out here today, and this Senator is letting some of them finish their conversations. I do want to speak, and I appreciate the unanimous consent request to go forward.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, the nuclear negotiations with Iran are now approaching a self-imposed deadline of June 30, just a few days from now. The negotiators chose that deadline when they concluded the interim accord 6 months ago and have reportedly been determined to stick to it to focus their efforts.

At the same time, it may be the case that a brief extension deadline rather than a rush to a conclusion that would bring us to a bad deal is something we ought to consider. Senator CORKER has told Secretary Kerry exactly that, cautioning him that there is no need so desperate that requires either accepting a bad deal or yielding to unacceptable Iranian demands. I don't necessarily oppose a short-term extension to reach a better conclusion or a better deal, but I have deep concerns about whether that will be the case, even if we extend for a small amount of time.

I fear the Obama administration is not hearing the message that a potential bad deal could be in the making, and it raises great concern. I fear that yielding to one Iranian demand after another in order to secure a deal is exactly what the Obama administration has been doing in its negotiations. I fear that we will return from our Independence Day celebrations to take up a pending Iran nuclear deal that neither permanently foils Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions nor makes us or the world more secure. I fear this administration, so seemingly desperately eager for a legacy, will choose to define any Iranian deal at all as a great success for diplomacy, no matter how much it concedes to Iranian positions.

In May, I and many of my colleagues worked hard to impose a requirement for the administration to present any Iran deal to Congress. Despite strong opposition from the Obama administration, 99 of the 100 Senators were convinced that Congress must have the ability to evaluate in detail every aspect of a negotiated settlement and how it is to be imposed, how it is to be monitored, and verified. That is our core task once a deal is presented to us. It is an immensely important duty of historic dimensions.

I hope and pray that each of us will evaluate the proposed deal on its merits alone and what it would mean for our Nation's security, both now and in the future when the terms have expired. Unfortunately, to take up that duty and perform that task, we will have to immerse ourselves in some of the arcane technical details that lie near the heart of such negotiations. I say ''near'' the heart rather than ''at'' the heart because the very central issue for me—and hopefully for my colleagues—is the nature of the Iranian regime, their proven, demonstrated ill will revealed by decades of murderous aggression and lying deceit. That is the proven record of our negotiating partner, and all their claimed commitments will have to be evaluated in that light.

However, evaluating the technical details will present its own challenges and we need to prepare ourselves for those challenges. We need to take stock now of some of those details as they appear at the moment any deal is finalized. To do that, we will have to look through a fog of claims and counterclaims to see the outlines of something that is still evolving, even as it remains in the shadows. But with just those partial images, I have some deep concerns.

First, it now appears from public comments that our negotiators—and especially Secretary Kerry himself—are no longer insisting that Iran come clean on its past nuclear weapons development activities. This has long been a central demand by our side, as often confirmed by our negotiators themselves. To cave on this demand would be a fatal flaw and should all by itself lead to rejection of the deal.

Let me state that again. To cave on this demand that Iran come clean on its past nuclear weapons development activities all by itself should lead to rejection of the deal, if we do not achieve that goal.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, has been pressing for information from Iran about the past nuclear weapons programs for years. Recently, the IAEA Director General explained the importance of the issue this way:

> What we don't know [is] whether they have undeclared activities or something else. We don't know what they did in the past. So, we know a part of their activities, but we cannot tell we know all of their activities. And that is why we cannot say that all the activities in Iran is in peaceful purposes . . . the Agency is not in a position to provide credible assurance about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran, and therefore to conclude that all nuclear material in Iran is in peaceful activities.

The Obama administration has long agreed with the IAEA that Iran needs to come clean on its past activities to create a baseline for understanding future activities under any agreement—an absolutely essential standard that has to be met.

The U.S. head negotiator, Wendy Sherman—who, incidentally, negotiated the utterly failed deal with North Korea as well—told a Senate committee in 2013 that ''Iran must agree to address past and present practices, which is the IAEA terminology for possible military dimensions . . . we intend to support the IAEA in its efforts to deal with possible military dimensions.'' Later, she told the SFRC that ''in the Joint Plan of Action we have required that Iran come clean.''

These are the statements of our negotiators. These are the commitments they made to the Senate and to the American people that these were the standards that could not be breached and that if it was not a part of the arrangement, then we would not accept this deal.

So we are quoting here from the record of what policy and what conditions the United States has laid out before the Iranians that, if not achieved, are a nonstarter of a deal.

Secretary Kerry has repeatedly said that the possible military dimensions of the Iranian nuclear program ''will have to be addressed'' and ''that Iranians will have to do it.''

''It will be done,'' he said.

However, I was shocked to read last week that Secretary Kerry told this to the Department of State press corps:

> We are not fixated on Iran specifically accounting for what they did at one point in time or another. We know what they did. We have no doubt. We have absolute knowledge with respect to the certain military activities they were engaged in. What we are concerned about is going forward.

First of all, this is completely misleading. It is a complete 180-degree turn from what had been committed to earlier. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I can state emphatically that we do not have absolute knowledge of anything. That is not how intelligence works.

Secretary Kerry's statement suggests that he may be misusing one of our most useful tools of statecraft—perhaps a more concerning issue than the statement itself.

If we did have absolute knowledge of what the Iranians had done and have done to this date, we would not have spent the past years joining with the IAEA and the responsible international community to demand that Iran come clean. For the life of me, I cannot understand what the Secretary is thinking about when making such a claim. It is in total contradiction of a key facet—maybe the key facet of this deal.

Now, suddenly we are backing away, saying ''We know everything'' when we have for years been pursuing with the IAEA to get the knowledge of what we do know and the IAEA basically saying to us: No, we don't know everything. There is a lot we do not know.

In any case, I regard this new position as a blatant reversal of a key part of our negotiating objectives and a capitulation to the Iranians—a capitulation that reveals, perhaps, how desperate the administration is to secure a deal—any deal.

The next point of concern is the type and pace of sanctions relief we seem to be dangling as an incentive for the Iranians to accept any deal. This issue is very complex technically, legally, and legislatively. One key point is that throughout these negotiations, the administration has consistently argued that any deal would lead only to sanctions relief regarding nuclear issues. But the fact sheet that the White House put out following the interim deal framework stated that U.S. sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under the deal.

Let me say that again. The administration put out this fact sheet following the interim deal stating that U.S. sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under the deal.

Now it seems this limitation was not good enough for the Iranians, and we have caved again.

Yesterday, the so-called Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, included this matter in his expanded list of redlines. He said that all economic, financial, and banking sanctions implemented either by the United Nations Security Council, the United States Congress, or the administration must be lifted immediately when the deal is signed.

According to media reports, which have not been refuted by the administration since they began appearing last month, the Supreme Leader has won again.

The emerging deal may roll back sanctions that had been imposed for these other nonnuclear reasons. According to these reports, based on leaks from the negotiating teams, 23 out of the 24 currently sanctioned Iranian banks will be delisted as sanctions targets, including the Central Bank of Iran. This is the Revolutionary Guard Corps-dominated institution that was sanctioned because of its role in money laundering, financing terrorism, ballistic weapons research, and campaign claims of bolstering the Assad regime in Syria. Removing sanctions applied to these banks will give Iran hundreds of billions of dollars that could be used for their terrorism activities in regional proxy wars.

These reports, if true, constitute yet another reversal of clearly stated policy and yet another capitulation to the Iranians.

No. 3, it appears that negotiators may be aiming at an arrangement to set aside the dispute about open, free access to Iranian facilities. We have long maintained that any agreement would have to give the IAEA such access—stated over and over to us through our briefings, by the Secretary, and by others negotiating this. What this means is open, free access anytime, anywhere. It appears this is not now the case. We have long maintained that the IAEA have access anytime, anyplace, as their spokesmen have often emphasized. President Obama himself reassured the region's nervous Arab leaders on this very point in an effort to gain their acceptance of the deal.

In the meantime, once again Ayatollah Khamenei, the Supreme Leader, has stated emphatically that no such access would be granted, and other Iranian authorities repeated this redline that the Iranians have drawn in the deal and that we are capitulating to, one after another. Their Parliament even recently passed a law to this effect. It looked like an unbridgeable gap. Khamenei repeated this firm position again just yesterday.

Some argue that Khamenei's declarations are part of the negotiating strategy. Well, if so, it seems to have worked. Anyplace access for intrusive inspection has been taken out. We have dropped ''anytime, anyplace.''

The buzzword phrase that now is being giving to us is ''managed access.'' When I first heard that, I said, what in the world does that mean, ''managed access''? With this concept, it appears there would now be a mechanism that would evaluate requests for access to determine if there is a genuine need. Instead of anytime, anyplace, anywhere, for any reason, in order to verify that the Iranians are not cheating, that has turned into now a request for a search or for access at their time and their decision as to what the place will be or what the place will not be. This makes a mockery of the state of the original required demand for access at anytime, anyplace. ''Access where needed, when needed'' seems to be the new mantra—where needed, when needed, giving them plenty of time to make a decision as to yea or nay or to remove from those sites damning evidence of their pursuit of nuclear capabilities.

Because this issue of access is crucial to the issue of credibility, verification, and compliance, it arguably is the most important requirement of all for an acceptable deal. Those advocating for the emerging deal are actually boasting that this artful dodging is a negotiating victory.

Is there anything more we need to say about the weak and compromising negotiating strategy of those who are currently at the table representing the United States? I have just named and spelled out three major concerns regarding these negotiations, but there are many other aspects of the apparently emerging deal that separately and together show a pattern—a very disturbing pattern of constant retreat and capitulation by this administration in the negotiations with the Iranians. I won't go into the details of each of these, but let me just run off several other issues of major concern.

One, the clearly inadequate timeframe for any agreement, the sunset clause—it is no longer a part of the negotiations; two, outrageously generous details of sanctions relief, both scale and timing; the almost laughable, specious claims of sanctions snapback provisions—whatever that means—once the sanctions regime has been dismantled; the number of and types of enrichment equipment to be retained by the Iranians; the types of enrichment activities that will be permitted in the thousands of modern centrifuges in the most fortified, bunkered facilities; fatal limitations on our ability to monitor and verify compliance; and the Joint Plan of Action provisions that Iran has already blatantly violated without any White House comment.

My colleagues, once a deal is announced, it will be critical that we exercise the wisdom and courage to evaluate it honestly. My doubts about our ability to do so are aggravated by the public relations campaign we can foresee. Indeed, we have seen it before when the Clinton administration told us the nuclear deal with North Korea was ''good for America.'' I was a Member of the Senate at that time. I raised a number of issues and concerns about whether this deal with North Korea was good for America. I did not vote to support that effort. Nevertheless, the treaty was agreed to.

The framework agreement with North Korea, President Clinton said in 1994, ''is a good deal for the United States. North Korea will freeze and dismantle its nuclear programs.'' North Korea will freeze and dismantle its nuclear programs. ''South Korea and our other allies will be better protected. The entire world will be safer as we slow the spread of nuclear weapons. . . . The United States and international inspectors will carefully monitor North Korea to make sure it keeps its commitments. Only as it does so will North Korea fully join the community of nations.''

That is what was promised in 1994. That is what was stated to Senators on

this floor in 1994—that we can count on the fact that we are going to know if the North Koreans cheat and we are not going to allow them to do that. How significantly this resonates now, all these years later, as we are assured by the administration and by Secretary Kerry: Don't worry. Everything is covered. Inspections will take place. They won't be able to cheat. We will know it if they do. The sanctions will come back on. We will snap back those sanctions, et cetera, et cetera.

Some Members took a bite of that apple and regret that. I did not. I am sure not going to take another bite of that apple, and no one else should view this current negotiation with Iran without putting it in the context of what was done before. We have been here before. We need to learn the lessons from that. We now know that North Korea possesses dozens of nuclear weapons and the ballistic missile capacity to deliver those weapons. We now know they cheated blatantly and we did not know it. The so-called guarantee of verification was not accomplished and not achieved.

So before making a final decision on the Iran so-called deal, we need to learn the lessons from the Clinton administration and the agreement with North Korea. The similarities between the secret negotiations then and the secret ones now are remarkable.

In 1994, a key sticking point was complete access to nuclear sites, and then, too, we caved in order to get the deal.

In 1994, the White House and major media outlets trumpeted a deal that would make the world safer—a victory for diplomacy over force and hostility. Those who did not see this as something that was going to be enforced were called warmongers.

Here is the choice, war or peace. Some choice. North Korea promised to forgo their nuclear weapons ambitions, and although I could not vote to support President Clinton's request, enough of the Senate did to approve the agreement with North Korea.

Now we know they have between 20 to 40 nuclear weapons, possibly miniaturized, ICBMs—intercontinental ballistic missiles—to put them on and recently tested submarine launch missiles.

Another lesson is the time gap between the heralded diplomatic breakthrough and the revelation that we had been taken to the cleaners. It took years to learn what we had really done in North Korea and not done in North Korea.

The failure of a bad deal with Iran will not be evident to most of us for years perhaps—perhaps even 10, 11 or 12 years, even when President Obama concedes that Iran's nuclear breakout time will be zero.

In fact, such a delay—in the unlikely event Iran actually complies with a deal—is the stated objective of the P5+1 negotiators—to impose a delay of a decade or so on Iran's nuclear weapons program. That is what they will define as success.

But we must remember this: Today's brutal, unhinged, nuclear-armed North Korea is actually a product of misguided and naive American diplomacy, sold to the Senate as something other than what it was. We now know the agreement with North Korea was not a diplomatic victory but a diplomatic and policy failure, an absolute failure. My deep concern is that this time many will, once again, see the emerging deal as a great victory for diplomacy, no matter what it contains.

The utterly false claim that it presents a choice between peaceful resolution of a dispute and war, as a consequence of not arranging and agreeing to a deal, will be a central part of the discourse and salesmanship that will confront us as Senators. Those opposed will potentially be labeled as war mongers.

It is good of us to remember something that was said by Winston Churchill leading up to World War II: Peace at any price does not lead to peace. It only lengthens the path for war with far greater consequences in terms of cost or blood.

So, for us, we are going to have to stand up to those who posit the false choice between peace and between war. We have a more difficult obligation of historic consequences, looking to the following decade. Such a duty must not be guided by party. It must not be guided by politics. It must not be guided by deference either to the White House, our own leadership or even our constituents.

We must look at each and every detail of any agreement presented to us to reach a judgment on whether this so-called deal with Iran will prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons capability. Then, and only then, we must decide on that basis whether to approve or reject the deal that will be presented to us by the President and his Secretary of State. To do anything less than fulfilling this obligation and this duty that each one of us has, will be a failure of our duty as a U.S. Senator, with historic consequences if we get it wrong.

My hope, prayer, wish, desire, and admonition is that each one of us sees this as something with historic consequences that will affect not only the future of our Nation and our people but will affect the future of the world. Therefore, we must give full attention and every ounce of our best wisdom and judgment in determining, not for political or party or any other reason—other than finding out and determining whether this deal is acceptable or not acceptable and make our yes be yes and our no be no and well reasoned, well judged, and well decided.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS DAY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this Saturday, June 27, marks Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder—or PTSD—Awareness Day.

This marks a critical opportunity to remind people about the prevalence of mental illnesses such as PTSD among our Active-Duty troops and our veterans. By generating more awareness, we can help remove the stigma about PTSD and encourage people to seek treatment and, in turn, save lives. PTSD is a serious problem affecting too many of our country's bravest individuals, and we must do more to help our heroes.

According to a study by the RAND Corporation, 20 percent of Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans report symptoms of PTSD and, of those, only about half actually seek treatment.

Our Nation made a promise to our men and women in uniform: When they come home from war and their time in service to our country, we will be there for them. We need to have the same concern for our servicemembers' mental health as we do for their physical health. For far too long, we have been focused on the physical wounds of war, but as many of our veterans know too well, the mental wounds also inflict great damage.

I am proud to serve as a Senator from a State with a rich legacy of service. I am proud to be the son of a U.S. marine. One in ten Montanans have proudly served in our Armed Forces, making the Treasure State home to more veterans per capita than almost any other State in our Nation. According to the VA, Montana is home to nearly 100,000 veterans, 75,000 of whom served our Nation during wartime.

As the son of a marine, I strongly believe we have a duty to ensure that the promises we have made to these men and these women are kept. There is no greater honor or responsibility than fighting for our veterans. We owe them our freedom. We owe them nothing but our best. Anything less is unacceptable.

I have had many conversations with the brave men and women who have gone overseas in the name of freedom, and one of the many concerns they have expressed is the negative stigma surrounding post-traumatic stress in our military. For too long, our service men and women have attempted to hide mental health issues from their superiors out of fear of being discharged. That is why I am committed to raising PTSD awareness to overcome the misinformation and the stigma surrounding these mental health challenges.

I am proud to be working on S. 1567 with GARY PETERS and THOM TILLIS to ensure due process for veterans who suffer from mental health illnesses and may have been erroneously given an administrative discharge rather than an honorable discharge. It helps ensure that Active-Duty servicemembers who

suffer from invisible wounds, like PTSD and traumatic brain injuries, also called TBIs, are not incorrectly administratively discharged, putting their hard-earned benefits at risk. This bill is just a small step that Congress can take toward ensuring that the stigma facing PTSD is lifted and hopefully allowing more veterans to seek out treatment for PTSD.

In the last few years, I am pleased to see that our country has taken steps to ensure that our troops and veterans get the mental health services they need upon their return home. More than ever, troops and veterans are seeking treatment. They are receiving timely diagnosis, they are getting needed care.

We have a long way to go. Too many veterans are taking their own lines and, unfortunately, Montana consistently ranks at the top for suicides in our country. One story from Montana particularly resonated with me. In fact, it occurred in my hometown of Bozeman. I went from kindergarten through college in Bozeman. On May 29, 2013, U.S. Army PFC Wade Christiansen took his own life. He was 23 years old. Private First Class Christiansen served his country as a paratrooper in the 82nd Airborne Division and was deployed to Afghanistan with his unit in 2009. During an ambush, he sustained severe injuries to his face and to his arms.

After his return to Montana, Wade struggled with both the physical and the mental healing process. Wade's brother Matt talked about how Wade's mood would change when he wouldn't be able to take his medication when the VA failed to get him his medications on time.

I wish I could stand here and tell you that Wade Christiansen's story is unique. Unfortunately, he is just one of the many veterans who committed suicide in my State that year. In fact, between 2004 and 2013, there were 566 suicides by Montana veterans. In Montana and across the Nation, too many of our veterans struggle with PTSD, they struggle with depression. Veteran depression not only affects the individual but also the loved ones closest to the veteran as well. The emotional toll on the family is immense. To have a loved one serve overseas, only to come back as a shell of what they once were is difficult.

PTSD Awareness Day invites us to face the larger issues of veterans who are suffering from post-traumatic stress. We do everything in our power to protect our servicemembers while they are overseas. We must do the same to address their needs once they return home. That includes reducing the stigma attached to PTSD and doing more to help our brave veterans find good-paying jobs and transition back into civilian life.

Now is the time to act to work toward real solutions that protect our veterans here at home. They are an embodiment of the ideals this Nation holds dear, and I believe it is our job to do everything in our power to protect them.

Before I end my remarks, I want to encourage everyone, if they or a loved one is struggling with mental illness or PTSD, there is help available.

You can visit www.ptsd.va.gov—www.ptsd.va.gov—where they will find resources that are available for our veterans.

Mental illness is not something anyone should have to go through alone. Seeking help is not a sign of weakness, but instead it is a testament to individual character.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I wish to begin by talking about two subjects. The first of those is the nuclear agreement that our Nation and five other nations are seeking to negotiate with Iran, and the second is I wish to do something we don't do often enough and thank some people, people who serve all of us, some folks in the Coast Guard.

But I wish to start with the agreement that we and part of the five permanent members of the Security Council, plus one—Germany—are attempting to negotiate with the country of Iran. We are closing in, I hope, on a historic nuclear agreement with Iran.

Today, the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, China, France, and Germany are hard at work trying to hammer out a final nuclear deal with Iran that will hopefully put an end to that country's pursuit of nuclear weapons. We have a key role to play in the fate of this potential nuclear deal.

If the P5+1 and Iran can forge a final deal, then Congress will have its chance to support or reject it by voting on a resolution that would prohibit lifting the sanctions against Iran. So it is my great hope that when Congress comes back from our Fourth of July recess—holiday recess—we will be returning to the news that the negotiators have succeeded in striking what they believe to be a fair deal.

We will then begin our job of considering whether that deal represents the best path forward for our Nation's security and the security of other nations, including our allies.

Should this agreement come together, I will assess the final nuclear deal on how it implements three key requirements that were articulated in last April's nuclear framework. Let me just take a moment and explain these three requirements.

First, any final agreement must block all of Iran's pathways to developing a nuclear weapon. The Iranians will have to agree to measures that prohibit them from acquiring weapons-grade plutonium, enriching enough uranium to build a bomb and developing a covert nuclear program.

Fortunately, as part of April's nuclear framework, the P5+1 agreed in principle to close off Iran's four pathways to a nuclear weapon, and here is how.

Iran would no longer have a source of weapons-grade plutonium, as the framework requires Iran's heavy water reactor to be redesigned so that it no longer generates a plutonium byproduct needed for a bomb.

Iran would lose one path to acquiring enough enriched uranium to build a bomb by being forced to reduce its current centrifuge inventory of almost 20,000 down to 5,000 units. Moreover, the remaining 5,000 centrifuges would be Iran's oldest and least capable variants, making it almost impossible for Iran to restart weapons-grade enrichment activities.

Under the framework, Iran would lose its other path to acquiring enough enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon. Iran will be required to dramatically reduce its stockpile of enriched uranium from 10 tons to just 300 kilograms and will not be able to enrich above 3.7 percent.

Lastly, the framework eliminates the ability of Iran to covertly develop a nuclear weapon by monitoring not just the declared facilities but also subjecting the country's entire nuclear supply chain to inspections and continuous surveillance.

If a final agreement makes good on these promises in a verifiable way—in a verifiable way—then it will earn my support.

Some have argued that a final agreement must require Iran to dismantle its entire nuclear infrastructure so that it cannot enrich uranium even for peaceful nuclear energy. This is an unnecessary requirement on Iran in my view. If that country agrees to these four roadblocks to a nuclear weapon, then Iran should be able to maintain an enrichment program that is verifiably limited to producing only peaceful nuclear energy.

That brings me to my second requirement. In any final agreement, Iran must submit to uncomfortable and intrusive inspections.

If weapons inspectors for the International Atomic Energy Agency identify a facility they suspect of housing illicit nuclear activity, then these inspectors should be granted access to these undeclared sites. If Iran fails to grant access to the inspectors, then Iran should be in violation of the agreement, and that should trigger expedited and appropriate consequences for Iran.

In the weeks since the announcement of the April framework agreement, we have heard some contradictory claims coming from Iran's Supreme Leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei. He has said that Iran will not allow inspections of military sites.

Well, perhaps the Supreme Leader is only playing to a hard-line domestic audience in Iran. Perhaps he is attempting to return and to rhetorically

walk back on the concessions his negotiating team promised to the P5+1 nations or perhaps he is just not being honest.

Whatever the case may be, I certainly do not trust the Iranian Supreme Leader nor do I want my acceptance of a deal to be based solely on his rhetoric. To borrow a phrase from President Reagan—a phrase we have heard in this Chamber hundreds of times since I came here 14 years ago—final deals should not be predicated on the mantra ''trust but verify.'' Rather they should embody the principle of ''distrust and verify.''

To that end, the final deal must have a system of consequences and incentives in place to ensure that Iran complies with its promises to submit to inspections.

Third, any lifting of sanctions against Iran must be conditional on the Iranians meeting and implementing core requirements of the nuclear deal. Iran must prove to us they are serious about following through on their commitments. If they live up to their promises, only then should they be rewarded with phased sanctions relief.

Fortunately, the administration has made this a sticking point in the negotiations. As the President said upon the announcement of the nuclear framework on April 2, ''[Sanctions] relief will be phased in as Iran takes steps to adhere to the deal. If Iran violates the deal, sanctions can be snapped back into place.''

Additionally, after announcing the nuclear framework, Secretary Kerry made clear that the Iranians will not get sanctions relief until they have implemented their obligation to the satisfaction of the international inspectors and the United States. These are the words of Secretary Kerry:

> Iran has a responsibility to get the breakout time to the one year . . . . When that is done and certified by the IAEA that [Iran] has lived up to that nuclear responsibility, and we make that judgment with them, at that point we would begin the phasing of sanctions relief.

Now, Secretary Kerry and President Obama are right to insist on this point. They are right to insist on this point. I imagine this is one of the details still being worked out in talks. But if Iran is serious about abandoning its nuclear weapons ambitions—I hope they are—they must agree to take action before being rewarded with sanctions relief.

For 2½ years—2½ years—our negotiating team has been working tirelessly to strike a deal with Iran that strengthens our Nation's security, our allies' security, and the security of the broader Middle East. Whatever the outcome next week, we owe these negotiators a debt of gratitude for their service and their dedication.

At the end of the day, however, I feel confident that we will reach a deal that blocks Iran's pathways to a bomb, subjects Iran to intrusive inspections, and only provides sanctions relief after Iran takes action.

If the final deal includes these three key provisions, then it will certainly have my support. Moreover, I think if each Senator and Representative evaluates this deal on its merits, forgets about the rhetoric, forgets about the preconceived notions and considers the alternatives, then this deal will enjoy broad support in this Congress.

Mr. President, I want to set these remarks aside now. Before our current Presiding Officer took the Chair, I mentioned to our colleague before him that I had a two-part address. This is like a day-night doubleheader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an extra 6 minutes.

May I prevail on the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PORTMAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his kindness.

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, over the past few months I have been coming to the floor to recognize the work of a few of the outstanding employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

There are over 200,000 men and women who work at the Department's 22 components. They secure our borders and secure our skies. They respond to natural disasters. They protect us in cyber space. Few other Federal agencies touch the lives of Americans on a daily basis more than the Department of Homeland Security.

Although the jobs they do every day may be diverse, all DHS employees go to work with one critical mission, and that is to ensure our country is a safe, secure, and resilient place where the American way of life can thrive.

Today I recognize the outstanding service of several officers from the U.S. Coast Guard. As a law enforcement agency and one of our Nation's five armed services, the Coast Guard has safeguarded our interests on the high seas for over two centuries.

The thousands of brave men and women who honorably serve our Nation at the Coast Guard dedicate their lives to its important missions. These missions range from maritime law enforcement and military operations to search and rescue and environmental protection.

MAX KACZMAREK, CHRIS LEON, AND MATTHEW WORDEN

Last month, Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson recognized three individuals from the Coast Guard for their valor: Petty Officer Max Kaczmarek, Petty Officer Chris Leon, and Petty Officer Matthew Worden. In pictures right here next to me are Petty Officer Matt Worden, Petty Officer Max Kaczmarek, and Petty Officer Chris Leon.

These three brave individuals have each demonstrated outstanding courage in the face of perilous circumstances, acting selflessly and without hesitation to render lifesaving aid to their fellow Americans. Simply put, they were, in the words of the Coast Guard motto, ''Semper Paratus''—''Always Ready.''

I want to extend my congratulations to these three officers, Petty Officers Kaczmarek, Leon, and Worden, and to all of the recipients of this year's DHS Valor awards. These devoted public servants are an inspiration for me, and I think for all of us, and I encourage my colleagues to learn more about their heroic stories.

JOSCELYN GREENWELL

For the 42,000 Active-Duty Coast Guard men and women, their mission may take them to ports and waterways across our country and around the globe. For Petty Officer Joscelyn Greenwell, her service with the Coast Guard has taken her from California to Hawaii to my home State of Delaware.

Originally from Cape Canaveral, FL, Petty Officer Greenwell, pictured here to my left, has served our country for over 7 years at three different Coast Guard units and stations. She first spent 3 years on the high endurance cutter Hamilton and home ported in San Diego, CA.

While aboard the Coast Guard cutter Hamilton, Petty Officer Greenwell was one of our many brave servicemembers assigned to provide disaster relief following the catastrophic 2010 Haiti earthquake, which we all remember. In Haiti, Petty Officer Greenwell and her fellow crew members transported clean drinking water and other resources to the island to save lives. She received a Unit Commendation award for her outstanding efforts in that mission.

After her time in San Diego, Petty Officer Greenwell spent 2 years aboard the patrol boat Galveston Island, home ported in Honolulu, HI.

Today Petty Officer Greenwell calls Lewes, DE, her home and now serves at the U.S. Coast Guard Station Indian River Inlet in Rehoboth Beach, DE. With summer in full swing, Delawareans and people from across the country—actually, from around the world—are flocking to our Nation's pristine five-star beaches. Thankfully, day and night, Petty Officer Greenwell and her crew stand diligent watch over parts of Delaware Bay, Rehoboth Bay, Indian River Bay, and the Atlantic Ocean. We Delawareans can rest assured that Petty Officer Greenwell and her unit stand ready to answer our call, if ever we need their assistance.

According to her superiors, Petty Officer Greenwell takes ownership of her responsibilities and is committed to the safety of the public. Her colleagues say that she always goes above and beyond what is expected of her.

For example, in addition to her usual responsibilities, Petty Officer

Greenwell received her certification as a boat operator, or coxswain, in just 1 year—a process that normally takes about a year and a half. Her colleagues say that she demonstrated an outstanding level of skill and professionalism throughout the rigorous certification process.

She has also served as a mentor to junior personnel and assisted multiple shipmates in receiving their qualifications as watch standers, boat crew members, boarding team members, and as coxswains. Petty Officer Greenwell's commitment to her team and the public she serves every day exemplifies—truly exemplifies—the Coast Guard's core values of honor, respect, and devotion to duty.

Petty Officer Greenwell, I just want you to know tonight that your service to our Nation has taken you around the world, and I know you will continue to go far—both literally and figuratively—in all your endeavors. Every day, you help to ensure the safety of your fellow Americans and the security of our Nation. From the bottom of my heart, I thank you for your tireless dedication, your invaluable service to the State and the Nation that we call home, and as we say in the Navy, ''Bravo Zulu.''

Finally, to the thousands of brave men and women across the Department of Homeland Security who dedicate their lives to serving and protecting America and Americans, please know that what you do every day is important. I hope it fills your work with meaning and your life with happiness. On behalf of the people we all serve together, thank you for your service.

Sometimes we ask people—whether the Coast Guard or Department of Homeland Security, any part of the Federal Government—what they would like. Sometimes people say they would like more money, they would like more of this, or they would like more of that. What more than half the people say, though, is, I would just like to be thanked.

So to all the people I mentioned tonight and those with whom they serve at the Department of Homeland Security, thank you, and God bless you.

I especially thank my colleague from Ohio for his generosity and kindness tonight.

To the leader, good work. ''Bravo Zulu'' on the good work done here this week.

I yield the floor.

TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise to commend my colleagues on passage of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015. This legislation provides timely extension of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA, Program, and preferential treatment for products from Haiti. And, this legislation finally reauthorizes the Generalized System of Preferences, or GSP, Program which has languished since July of 2013. I am very pleased we have been successful in this effort.

Trade preference programs are vitally important to the economies of the beneficiary countries, supporting economic and social development. And, these programs support production here in the U.S. as many of the goods eligible under preference programs are raw materials and inputs that fuel American manufacturing. These programs build a trading relationship that is the first stepping stone towards developing a full, bilateral trading relationship that will further grow and support the U.S. economy. Particularly for some of our trading partners benefiting under the AGOA Program, we look forward to our trading relationship developing to the next phase, full bilateral trade agreements, during this authorization of the program.

But none of this would have been possible without the dedicated work of many people. I would like to recognize the staff of the Senate Finance Committee. I would like to recognize Senator WYDEN and his staff, especially Joshua Sheinkman, Jayme White, Elissa Alben, Greta Peisch, and Anderson Heiman. Our work was supported by the outstanding efforts of the International Trade Commission and the Office of the United States Trade Representative. I would like to particularly thank Florie Liser, Constance Hamilton, Behnaz Kibria, Bill Jackson, and Ben Kostrzewa from the Office of the USTR.

I would like to especially thank my staff for all their dedicated work on this legislation. Our international trade staff has worked tirelessly on this legislation and I thank them for their efforts: Everett Eissenstat, Shane Warren, and Rebecca Eubank. We have had the excellent support of detailees from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Kevin Rosenbaum, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Andrew Rollo, as well as Sahra Park Su and Kenneth Schmidt. I would like to thank my senior staff: Chris Campbell, Mark Prater, Jay Khosla, Jeff Wrase, and Bryan Hickman.

We can all be proud of the broad support this bill has received in both Houses of Congress. This legislation demonstrates that trade is a bipartisan issue. I look forward to President Obama signing this legislation into law as soon as possible.

CONGRATULATING RAMSEY LEWIS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to congratulate a native son of Chicago who has earned worldwide acclaim as a jazz pianist and who will soon achieve a lifelong dream of conducting and soloing with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

Ramsey Lewis is a true American original—a virtuoso pianist and musical innovator who helped pioneer the sound many refer to as ''smooth jazz.'' Fifty-one years ago he and his band, the Ramsey Lewis Trio, recorded a song that became an instant sensation and which remains a definitive classic of the cool jazz genre. It's called ''The In Crowd.'' You know the refrain: ''I'm in with the in crowd. I go where the in crowd goes.''

That song was recorded live at Bohemian Caverns in Washington, DC, with almost no rehearsal. It sounds like a fable but it is true. That afternoon Ramsey and his bandmates—drummer Isaac ''Redd'' Holt and bassist Eldee Young—were sitting in a Washington, DC, coffee shop, debating what they could add to their set that night to make the recording stand out. Their waitress, a woman by the name of Nettie Gray, asked what was wrong. They explained their predicament.

Miss Nettie Gray walked over to the jukebox, dropped a coin in the slot and said: ''Listen to this.'' It was ''The In Crowd,'' sung by Dobie Gray—a popular hit at the time. The trio quickly worked out a jazz arrangement and used the song to end their set that evening. The crowd loved it. Audiences everywhere loved it. ''The In Crowd'' became the first of seven gold records by the Ramsey Lewis Trio.

What makes that story even more amazing is that ''The In Crowd'' was just one of four albums the Ramsey Lewis Trio recorded that year, 1964. Talk about prolific.

All told, this jazz legend has recorded 80 albums in an illustrious career that has spanned more than half a century. He has earned 3 Grammy Awards, 7 gold records, and hosted a nationally syndicated radio show and a 13-episode ''Legends of Jazz'' TV series on PBS.

In addition, he has served as artistic director of Jazz at Ravinia since 1992. He also helped organize Ravinia's Jazz Mentor Program. He serves on the board of trustees for the Merit School of Music in Chicago and The Chicago High School for the Arts. And a decade ago he created the Ramsey Lewis Foundation to help connect at-risk children to the world of music.

Many artists might decide that such a resume was long and impressive enough—but not Ramsey Lewis. At the age of 80, Ramsey Lewis is preparing to fulfill the dream of a lifetime. On August 8, he will serve as conductor and soloist with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra at the Ravinia Festival in Highland Park, IL, just outside of Chicago.

Ravinia is the oldest music festival in North America. Over the years it has hosted such musical giants as Louis Armstrong, Pablo Casals, Aaron Copland, Duke Ellington, Ella Fitzgerald, George Gershwin, Luciano Pavarotti, and Yoyo Ma. It is also the summer home of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

Ramsey Lewis' debut as conductor and soloist with the CSO is a testament to his musical genius and dexterity. It is also a testament to his ability to see beyond narrow expectations about what is possible for musicians of color.

Ramsey Lewis has been playing the piano since he was 4 years old. He knew at a young age that he wanted to play classical piano. But a music teacher told him when he was still a boy to give up that dream because the world of classical music was not open to musicians with skin the color of Ramsey's.

Fortunately for all of us, Ramsey Lewis had the good sense to know that was nonsense. He has played and recorded countless forms of music—and helped to invent new forms. In doing so, he has helped to create a world where every child is freer to pursue his or her own dreams.

Mr. Lewis' August 8 performance with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra at Ravinia is a continuation of what the Chicago Tribune has called a ''Ramsey Renaissance'' as a composer. His collaborator in this new chapter of his career is Ravinia president and CEO Welz Kauffman, who commissioned Mr. Lewis to write a piano concerto for his CSO debut. In recent years, Mr. Kauffman has commissioned Mr. Lewis to write other pieces, including a jazz ballet for the Joffrey Ballet Company, and ''Proclamation of Hope,'' a celebration of Abraham Lincoln on the bicentennial of his birth. Both works made their world premieres at Ravinia.

In 2002 Ramsey Lewis was chosen to carry the Olympic torch as it passed through Chicago on its run to Salt Lake City. With his debut with the CSO at Ravinia, Ramsey Lewis will light up the night sky again with his own special brilliance. What a joyous celebration it will be.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier this month, the Senate Judiciary Committee approved the PATENT Act with a strong bipartisan vote. As the Senate continues to consider this important, balanced legislation aimed at curbing abusive patent litigation practices, it is critical that the court of appeals that considers patent claims be at full strength. Legislation alone cannot solve the problems facing Main Street businesses from abuses of the patent system; we also need dedicated judges, such as Kara Farnandez Stoll, on the bench to faithfully apply the law.

Ms. Farnandez Stoll was first nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal circuit more than 7 months ago. Her hearing was held more than 3 months ago and 2 months ago she was unanimously reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. The American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary unanimously rated her ''well qualified'' to serve on the Federal circuit—its highest possible rating. The Hispanic National Bar Association, the Federal Circuit Bar Association, and the American Intellectual Property Law Association strongly support her confirmation. Once confirmed, Ms. Farnandez Stoll will be the first woman of color to serve on the Federal circuit. Yet her nomination has been languishing on the Senate Executive Calendar.

Nearly 6 months into this new Congress, the Republican leadership has scheduled votes to confirm only 4 district court judges. We have not confirmed a single judge this work period. Not one. This is simply unacceptable. In addition to Ms. Farnandez Stoll, there are 11 other consensus judicial nominations pending on the Senate Executive Calendar.

The other nominees pending on the calendar include five U.S. Court of Federal Claims, CFC, nominees. We are well past the 1 year anniversary of when each were first nominated and are closing in on the anniversary of all five having had hearings before they were first reported unanimously out of committee. The five CFC nominees were again reported out of committee unanimously at the beginning of this year. We have heard no opposition to any of these nominees, yet they have been in limbo for months and months because the Republican leader has refused to schedule a vote. The U.S. Court of Federal Claims is where our citizens go to seek redress against the Federal Government for monetary claims. The cases this court hears include claims of unlawful takings of private land by the U.S. Government without proper compensation under the fifth Amendment, claims of veterans seeking disability benefits for combat-related injuries, and vaccine compensation claims.

We are debating trade policy in the Senate, yet the nomination to fill one of four current vacancies on the U.S. Court of International Trade—CIT—has sat idle on the Senate Executive Calendar for months. Like the CFC nominees, the CIT nominee had a hearing last year, was favorably reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote last Congress, and again earlier this year.

Also pending on the calendar are nominees to fill vacancies on the Western District of Missouri, the Western District of New York, and three nominees to fill judicial emergency vacancies—two on the Eastern District of New York and one on the Eastern District of California, all but one of whom were first nominated last year.

There is nothing keeping the Senate from confirming all 12 nominees—nothing, except for the mindset of delay for delay's sake, which is unfortunately the hallmark of the majority's leadership on judicial nominations.

The Senate has a duty to consider judicial vacancies no matter which party holds the majority. In the 17 months I chaired the Senate Judiciary Committee during President Bush's first 2 years in office, the Senate confirmed 100 Federal circuit and district court judges. I also served as chairman during the last 2 years of the Bush administration and we confirmed another 68 district and circuit court judges.

In contrast to the 4 district judges we have confirmed this year, when the Democrats were in an equivalent position in the 7th year of the Bush administration, we had confirmed 18 judges—including 15 district and 3 circuit court judges—by June 24, 2007.

That's 18 judges under a Democratic majority compared to 4 under the Republican majority. That is nearly five times as many judges confirmed under a Democratic majority with a President of the opposite party than today's Senate Republican majority.

Nevertheless, the Republican majority continues to make excuses for their continued obstruction and delay on confirming President Obama's judicial nominees. Their excuse is that the Democratic majority was able to confirm those 18 judges by this date in 2007 only because those nominees were held over from the previous year. What the Republicans fail to note is that 6 of the 18 judges confirmed by June 24, 2007 first had their hearing in 2007, were reported out of committee without needless delay, and were confirmed promptly.

We began this Congress with 38 district and circuit court vacancies, including 12 vacancies deemed ''judicial emergencies'' by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. While 38 is the lowest number of vacancies during the entire Obama administration, it is still higher than the low of 28 district and circuit court vacancies during the Bush administration, which was achieved due to Democratic cooperation.

There are now 55 district and circuit court vacancies, including 27 that have been deemed ''judicial emergency'' vacancies. Of the 55 vacancies, 41 are in States with at least one Republican home State Senator. Of great concern to the timely administration of justice are four circuit court vacancies that are ''judicial emergencies''—two in Texas, one in Alabama, and one in Kentucky—that have each been vacant and without nominees for well over a year, including one Texas circuit court vacancy that has been vacant for nearly 3 years. These 3 States alone also account for 12 district court vacancies without a currently pending nominee, half of which are ''judicial emergency'' vacancies.

While I know that the senior Senator from Texas, who is also the assistant republican leader, likes to say that it is the President who ''has to nominate the judges,'' we are all well aware of the central role home State Senators have in making recommendations to the President to fill vacancies in our States. I urge all Senators to work meaningfully with President Obama to get these vacancies filled.

As we head into July 4 recess, the Senate Republican leadership should be allowing us to clear the calendar of the 12 noncontroversial consensus judicial nominees to let them get to work for the American people.

I would remind the current majority leader of his floor remarks from June

2008, the last year of the Bush administration when Democrats held the majority in the Senate:

On the issue of judicial confirmations, my good friend the majority leader and I discussed this matter publicly at the beginning of this Congress, and we agreed that President Bush, in the last 2 years of his term, should be treated as well as President Reagan, Bush 41, and President Clinton were treated in the last 2 years of their tenures in office because there was one common thread, and that was that the Senate was controlled by the opposition party.

I hope he stays true to the words he spoke when the shoe was on the other foot. I urge the majority leader to immediately schedule a vote for Kara Farnandez Stoll and the CFC and CIT nominees so they can get to work serving the American people.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, allows the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and levels in the budget resolution for legislation that would promote jobs in the United States through international trade. The authority to adjust is contingent on the legislation not increasing the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 to 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 to 2025.

I find that Senate amendment 2065 fulfills the conditions of deficit neutrality found in section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11. Accordingly, I am revising the allocation to the Committee on Finance and the budgetary aggregates to account for the budget effects of the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that this notice and the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVISION TO THE ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

(Pursuant to Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016	2016–2020	2016–2025
Current Allocation:			
Budget Authority	2,179,304	12,340,566	29,433,590
Outlays	2,169,584	12,321,005	29,408,581
Adjustments:			
Budget Authority	445	1,985	−5,414
Outlays	175	1,700	−5,382
Revised Allocation:			
Budget Authority	2,179,749	12,342,551	29,428,176
Outlays	2,169,759	12,322,705	29,403,199

BUDGET AGGREGATES BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016
Current Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,032,343
Outlays	3,091,098
Adjustments:	
Budget Authority	445
Outlays	175

BUDGET AGGREGATES BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS—Continued

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016
Revised Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,032,788
Outlays	3,091,273

BUDGET AGGREGATE REVENUES

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

$ Millions	2016	2016–2020	2016–2025
Current Revenue Aggregate	2,676,733	14,412,516	32,237,371
Adjustment	−766	3,398	−4,272
Revised Revenue Aggregate	2,675,967	14,415,914	32,233,099

SHULKIN CONFIRMATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the nomination of Dr. David J. Shulkin to be the next Under Secretary for Health for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

I was pleased that Dr. Shulkin's nomination was confirmed by the Senate last night. The Veterans Health Administration, which he will oversee, has not had a permanent leader for more than 1 year. In my view, it is important to have permanent leadership in place to address a number of ongoing issues at the Veterans Health Administration, including properly implementing the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, to give veterans the option of accessing care in their communities and ensure managers are held accountable for any lapses in customer service; improving care and support for victims of military sexual trauma; helping to eradicate homelessness among veterans; ensuring that veterans have access to timely and adequate mental health care; reducing the systemic problems with over-prescription of opioids; and providing appropriate gender-specific services for the growing population of women veterans.

Dr. Shulkin has roughly 20 years of experience serving in leadership roles at hospitals and health care systems. I hope he can use that experience to provide the stability and leadership needed to start overcoming the serious challenges that the Veterans Health Administration continues to face. Providing a permanent leader is a significant step in ensuring that the Veterans Health Administration is providing our Nation's veterans with the level of care and service they have earned and they deserve.

I thank my colleagues for their assistance in filling this important role at VA.

SHULKIN AND COUNCIL CONFIRMATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, last night, the Senate confirmed David Shulkin to be the Under Secretary for Health and LaVerne Council to be the Assistant Secretary for Information and Technology at the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA.

Let me begin by thanking Chairman ISAKSON for making the confirmation of Dr. Shulkin and Ms. Council a priority for this Congress.

Dr. Shulkin comes to the Veterans Health Administration, VHA, with significant experience managing complex health care organizations. Prior to being confirmed as Undersecretary of Health Dr. Shulkin was the president of Morristown Medical Center where he oversaw a 658-bed facility that has received countless awards for its excellence in care. During his confirmation hearing before the committee, Dr. Shulkin stated, ''We all agree that the status quo is simply not acceptable. I want to assure you that, if confirmed, it would be my sole mission each and every day to transform the VA health system into one that provides our veterans with the highest level of quality care.'' Given the challenges that face VA, I look forward to working with Dr. Shulkin to ensure the status quo does not persist. I am committed to ensuring VA provides high-quality care options to veterans.

Ms. Council has significant private sector experience in managing global information and technology programs, including service as the first global chief information officer at Johnson & Johnson and leading the consolidation of 250 operating companies across 57 countries in the world. I trust that her experience will allow her to navigate ongoing issues around health data interoperability between VA and DOD, and I look forward to collaborating with her to make this a practical reality for VA and DOD clinicians and veteran patients. At a time when data security is being tested by dramatic increases in malware and intrusion attempts, it is more critical than ever to have a permanent leader in place to remediate known security deficiencies and ensure that health and personal data remains secure in VA systems. I am committed to doing right by veterans on this critical issue.

VA continues to lurch from crisis to crisis, facing health care funding shortfalls, construction cost overruns, growing patient wait times, insufficient collaboration between VA and DOD, and a backlog of disability compensation claims and appeals. In the face of these crises, these nominees will assume two of the toughest jobs in government given all of the attention VA has received of late. VA's culture has been described as corrosive and nonresponsive, and there continues to be a need for a significant change in the culture at VA. I expect both Dr. Shulkin and Ms. Council to use their expertise and experience to make these changes and improve VA services for veterans.

Finally, I would like to highlight one additional area of concern. There are far too many key leadership positions at VA that remain unfilled. There are

still five positions requiring Senate confirmation that are occupied by officials serving in an interim or acting capacity. A permanent, Senate-confirmed leadership team is vital to make the significant and necessary changes to the culture of an organization of the size and scope of VA. The bottom line is VA needs permanent, Senate-confirmed leadership in place in order to meet the significant challenges that continue to face the Department. The Senate needs the names of qualified nominees to fill VA's many vacancies.

As the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I congratulate Mr. Shulkin and Ms. Council, and thank them for their willingness to serve the veterans of this great Nation.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE IN CABO VERDE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the 40th anniversary of Cabo Verde's independence, on July 5th, comes just one day after our country's own Independence Day. As we near Cabo Verde's 40th anniversary, this small country of 500,000 merits our recognition for its longstanding ties to the United States and for serving as a beacon for democracy in Africa.

While the existence of Cabo Verde's islands was first acknowledged by the Romans, it was not until 1456 that the uninhabited islands were rediscovered and settled by Portuguese explorers. Over the next several hundred years, as a colony of the Portuguese Empire, Cabo Verde was a lucrative trading post between Europe, Africa, and the Americas. Towards the end of the 18th century, many Cabo Verdeans came to New England, particularly Rhode Island and Massachusetts, where some found success working in the whaling industry. This immigration strengthened the ties between the United States and Cabo Verde and, in 1818, Cabo Verde became the site of the first U.S. consulate in sub-Saharan Africa. As a result of the 1974 Carnation Revolution in Portugal, and after centuries of colonial rule, Cabo Verde was able to formally gain independence on July 5, 1975, and soon established diplomatic ties with the United States.

Since that time, Cabo Verde has worked for a democratic government. It has made great strides in this regard and, today, Cabo Verde is a leader in good governance, receiving top marks from the Freedom House for political rights and civil liberties. Cabo Verde has also made significant economic and social progress in the past several years. Additionally, given Cabo Verde's strong ties to the United States and our shared commitment to democracy and economic freedom, Cabo Verde was awarded and successfully undertook a Millennium Challenge Corporation, MCC, compact for private sector, agricultural, and transportation reforms, and is currently implementing a second MCC compact in the areas of water, sanitation, and land management. Moving forward, Cabo Verde can build on these successes to continue to grow its economy as well as strengthen ties to the United States and other allies.

Rhode Island is fortunate to have one of the two largest Cabo Verdean-American populations in the country, and continues to be enriched by the heritage and contributions of Cabo Verde. I am very pleased that earlier this month, T.F. Green Airport in Rhode Island began welcoming direct flights from Cabo Verde, which will lead to greater exchange and new opportunities between Rhode Island and Cabo Verde.

As we near July 5th, I send my best wishes to all those of Cabo Verdean descent in Rhode Island and throughout the country on the 40th anniversary of Cabo Verde's independence.

COMBATTING ANTI-SEMITISM, RACISM AND INTOLERANCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as our Nation continues to mourn the tragic loss of life at the Mother Emmanuel AME Church in Charleston, I wish to discuss international efforts that can assist in addressing the prejudice and discrimination that fuels violence and acts of extremism in our country and abroad.

Following the horrific attacks in Paris and Copenhagen earlier this year, the president of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, Ilkka Kanerva, appointed me to serve as the assembly's first special representative on anti-Semitism, racism, and intolerance. As a Member of Congress, the U.S. Helsinki Commission, and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, I have long fought to counter prejudice and discrimination and to advance more effective measures against hate crimes. I was therefore extremely honored that President Kanerva entrusted me with this responsibility.

Given the breadth of my mandate, I am focusing my work this year on three areas: first, the urgent issue of anti-Semitism and community security; second, discrimination against Muslims and anti-Muslim backlash; finally, in light of events in our own country and the salience of these struggles for minorities in Europe, discriminatory policing.

As my first initiative, I visited the sites of the Paris and Copenhagen tragedies in April, where I met with people directly affected by the violence as well as government officials and civil society representatives. In my consultations with Jewish, Muslim, African-descent, and other community leaders, we discussed Jewish community security and civil society coalition efforts to combat all forms of prejudice and discrimination. The horrific attacks in those two capitals—simultaneously targeting Jewish communities and expressions of free speech—underscored the urgent need to address security threats to Jewish individuals and communities. The pervasiveness of anti-Semitism is one of the main reasons I last year called on the OSCE to hold a High Level Conference to mark the 10th anniversary of the seminal OSCE Berlin Conference on Anti-Semitism and adopt a ministerial decision calling on all 57 participating states of the OSCE to implement commitments to combat anti-Semitism. In this vein, I recently led efforts to provide funding for U.S. and European civil society to work with youth to combat anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance.

Of course, we must be vigilant to ensure that such efforts do not degenerate into anti-Muslim backlash. Measures that are framed in ways that fuel anti-Muslim prejudice will ultimately be counterproductive. Moreover, we need diverse coalitions working together to address the threats we face today. This month, fringe extremist parties from seven different countries formed a block in the EU Parliament. They are now eligible to receive EU money to disseminate toxic views that combine anti-Semitism with anti-Muslim bigotry.

I have also introduced legislation to end racial profiling in the United States. The End Racial Profiling Act, S. 1056, prohibits racial profiling by law enforcement, mandates law enforcement bias training, requires data collection on all police stops, and creates procedures for receiving, investigating, and resolving profiling complaints. Tragic events in Baltimore and New York, North Charleston and Ferguson, and elsewhere around the country have shown us that Federal legislation finally ending racial profiling is essential.

It is also essential that we restore confidence between communities and the police, and the criminal justice system at large. To that end, I have also introduced the ''Baltimore Act,'' S. 1610 named after my home city, to provide strategies and resources to strengthen police-community relations and restore justice.

Discriminatory policing is undoubtedly a challenge that many governments face. In some European countries, minorities are 10 times more likely to be stopped by the police than members of the majority. In France—the country with some of Europe's largest Muslim and Black populations—police officers were recently acquitted in connection with the death of two teenagers. That incident 10 years ago sparked riots across France; the acquittal this year has prompted protests and comparisons with Ferguson. In Germany, a human rights group is petitioning the government to end profiling after a Black student was arrested solely because his skin color led them to presume he was in the country illegally. In Slovakia, 10 police officers were acquitted in February of forcing Romani boys to strip and fight each other, even though this notorious incident was captured on cell phone

video. As we know from our own experience, racial bigotry, if unaddressed, only metastasizes.

The United States and our European partners have a lot to learn from one another. We have learned—and continue to learn—from the civil rights struggle and, as a country founded and built by people seeking freedom and opportunity, about immigration and integration. Many European countries are working hard to address discrimination and advance civil rights through the creation of national human rights institutions and targeted strategies. Additionally, there are many lessons learned from hate-based violence reduction and gun laws.

The United States and Europe have worked on both sides of the Atlantic to address issues of prejudice and discrimination and foster diversity, but on a largely ad hoc basis. I recently introduced provisions in the Senate for a Joint Action Plan between the United States and European Union to formalize and coordinate such consultations and ensure that the necessary experts and stakeholders from the public and private sectors are involved. It would also improve transparency and access to information generated by these exchanges. I have also urged the OSCE chair-in-office to convene a high-level conference on racism and xenophobia to elevate understanding of these issues and advance additional concrete steps by the OSCE participating states. The recent events in Charleston, Paris, and Copenhagen underscore the urgent need for shared efforts to combat hate and foster inclusion on both sides of the Atlantic.

In 1991, just days after the failed Moscow coup, the United States met in Russia with other OSCE participating states. Our countries agreed that ''issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law are of international concern, as respect for these rights and freedoms constitutes one of the foundations of the international order.'' Such matters are ''of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the state concerned.'' That is as true today as it was 20 some years ago. It is in that spirit that I will continue to work with other parliamentarians to combat anti-Semitism, racism, and other forms of intolerance—in the United States and elsewhere in the OSCE region.

REMEMBERING MARGUERITE McKAY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a great Rhode Islander, Marguerite K. McKay, who passed away last month at the age of 96.

Marguerite Katherine McCrudden was born in Providence on September 15, 1918, and grew up in the Smith Hill neighborhood of the city. One of six children, she attended St. Patrick's High School in Providence and graduated from Bryant College in 1938.

Marguerite spent much of her professional life dedicated to the city of Providence. She began her career in the Building Inspector's Office, and later moved to the Providence School Department, where she worked until she retired.

Marguerite married Franklin Richard McKay in 1950, and together they had one child, Bernard. Franklin served as a city councilman and city solicitor in Attleboro, MA, and both he and Marguerite were active in the Attleboro community and their church parish, St. John the Evangelist.

After Franklin's passing in 1968, Marguerite spent her time living in Barrington, RI, and on Prudence Island in Narragansett Bay. She enjoyed cooking, gardening, swimming, and following politics. In her retirement, she traveled extensively and remained active in her church, St. Luke's in Barrington. In 2005, she moved to Reston, VA to be closer to her family.

Marguerite passed away in Reston in May. Her funeral was held on June 20 at her childhood church, St. Patrick's, in the Smith Hill neighborhood of Providence. She was predeceased by her beloved grandson Brendan, who passed away last year.

I would like to offer my heartfelt condolences to Marguerite's son Bernard and his wife Mary; her grandchildren Patrick, Conor, and Rosemary; her three great-grandchildren; and her two surviving siblings, Cornelius Bernard McCrudden and Mary McCrudden Broome. Marguerite led a life of service to her community, and our State is better for it. I know her example of good will and selflessness will continue to sustain and inspire her family.

ALZHEIMER'S & BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. I wish to commemorate Alzheimer's & Brain Awareness month. The impact of Alzheimer's is felt in families and communities across Virginia and the Nation, and this month provides an opportunity to stand with those suffering from Alzheimer's and other brain diseases to raise awareness. I am also proud to cosponsor S. 857, the Health Outcomes, Planning, and Education, HOPE, for Alzheimer's Act today.

The challenges Alzheimer's poses for families are real. Financially and emotionally, Alzheimer's disease has a devastating impact as patients need to navigate medical information, access community services and prepare for living with this disease. In Virginia there are over 130,000 people living with Alzheimer's and that number is expected to grow to as many as 190,000 by 2025. Alzheimer's does not only impact the individual patient, but also changes the lives of family caregivers. In 2014, an estimated 452,000 family caregivers provided 514 million hours of care for individuals with Alzheimer's disease and dementia in Virginia.

The cost is also significant for the Federal Government. Nearly one in every five Medicare dollars is spent on someone with Alzheimer's or dementia, and by 2050, it will be nearly $1 of every $3. In the years between 2015 and 2050, caring for people with Alzheimer's will cost our country $20.8 trillion. Research funding is critical, and action is needed to provide to support for newly diagnosed patients and families.

The HOPE for Alzheimer's Act would ensure patients and their families have access to a care planning session with their doctor to help them understand the diagnosis, treatment options, and what medical and community services are available. Studies have shown that providing patients and families with a full range of information and support results in better outcomes for those living with Alzheimer's, including higher quality of care, increased use of needed community services, reduced patient behavioral and psychiatric symptoms, and reduced caregiver stress and depression. According to the Alzheimer's Association, only 45 percent of people with Alzheimer's disease or their caregivers report being told of their diagnosis.

This legislation provides for Medicare coverage for comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services. While Medicare covers Alzheimer's disease diagnostic services, it currently does not provide coverage for comprehensive care planning following a diagnosis. These critical services will allow patients and families to understand the diagnosis, receive information about medical and non-medical options for ongoing treatment, services and supports and how to access care.

As a member of the Committee on Aging, I am committed to working with my colleagues to raise awareness about this devastating disease, and thank the Alzheimer's Association and other advocates for their strong voices during June and throughout the year.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO WALLACE ''WALLY'' RENEY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor one of New Hampshire's most respected, accomplished, and beloved citizens, Wallace ''Wally'' Reney, as he enters into retirement. I am proud to recognize his illustrious professional career and continued service to many communities across the Granite State and our country.

Originally from Bellows Falls, VT, Wally has been a resident of Surry, NH for the past five decades. During his 50-year career as a community banker, Wally has helped thousands of Granite Staters become homeowners, serviced their financial needs, and helped strengthen and develop the Monadnock Region. Before becoming a business leader in the community, Wally spent 8 years in the U.S. Marine Corps. Serving

overseas in Japan for 2 of those years as a court stenographer, he took the time to learn the language, culture, and customs—demonstrating an appreciation for serving people and a knack for communication that would lend itself to Wally's own work and character years later.

Wally tells everyone he meets that he has what money cannot buy. He is revered as one of the most generous and selfless individuals who has devoted his life to giving back, not just to the community, but to others who gave him the opportunity to be successful in life. Wally lent his time and energy to over 50 nonprofits and has been a member of the Lions Club for over 40 years. He sent dozens of children to summer camp, often paying for their experience himself. Since 1969, Wally has helped expand the local Toys for Tots program, where he has donated gifts and toys to ensure a joyful holiday season for all children.

Wally Reney embodies the true spirit of the American dream, and, in turn, has encouraged countless others to achieve their own dreams. Wally has improved the quality of life in the Granite State and epitomizes the great New Hampshire tradition of being a good neighbor. I am extraordinarily proud to recognize and celebrate Wally. I wish him the best for a happy and healthy retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO RALPH SHOWER

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to honor Ralph Shower of St. Louis, MO, on his upcoming 100th birthday on July 6, 2015. As a dedicated family man, heroic World War II veteran, and successful business professional, he has made his family, community, and the entire State of Missouri proud to call him one of our own.

Born and raised in St. Louis, Mr. Shower attended Soldan High School, where he participated in varsity track and field. His dad ran a hotel and restaurant supply business, and in his younger years, he worked with his father at the family business.

As mentioned before, Mr. Shower honorably served in the U.S. Army's 517 Signal Company, 17th Airborne Division, during World War II. While serving, he suffered from serious injuries in a paratrooper glider accident from which he fully recovered, and he has continued to live a full and healthy life. To this day, he has remained actively involved in his community through the local veterans service organizations.

After leaving the Army, Mr. Shower began a career in public relations management, serving various charity organizations, including the Leukemia Guild of Missouri and the City of Hope Hospital in Durate, CA.

Even with his military and professional successes, Shower has always prioritized his family above all else. He and Ethel, his late wife of 70 years, had three children. Michael Shower, his son, held an esteemed position as the executive secretary and counselor to the executive director of UNICEF up until his passing in 1994. Mr. Shower has two beloved daughters, Suzanne Shower and Michelle Proctor, along with two granddaughters and five great-granddaughters.

Forty-seven of Mr. Shower's relatives will be traveling to the St. Louis area to celebrate his long and accomplished life. It sounds like it will be a truly special celebration.

Ralph Shower has touched the lives of so many people over the past century, and his service to his country and community deserves our recognition and appreciation. I congratulate Ralph Shower for his service to his family, community, and this great country. Happy Birthday!●

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM E. ''BRIT'' KIRWAN

● Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as you know, when Senators converse in the cloakroom between votes, we often claim bragging rights—who represents the State with the best crab cake, which State has the best hiking trails, and which baseball team will win the American League East division for example. Everyone likes to chime in and claim his or her State as the best in some regard. But if anyone mentions leaders in higher education, the conversation just stops. Every Senator knows what the senior Senator from Maryland and I are going to say—Dr. William E. ''Brit'' Kirwan. That ends the competition right there. Today I wish to honor this man who can rightfully be called one of the Nation's most respected leaders in higher education.

After 51 years in the field of education—spending 25 years as a faculty member and administrator at the University of Maryland, College Park, president of both the University of Maryland, College Park and The Ohio State University, and now as the chancellor of the University System of Maryland for the past 12 years—Dr. Kirwan will be retiring on June 30, 2015.

Under Dr. Kirwan's extraordinary leadership, the University System of Maryland has thrived. Our State's universities are among the best in the Nation, with cutting-edge research programs which support the work of private businesses and Federal agencies located nearby, internationally renowned academic programs, and diverse student bodies. Dr. Kirwan also paved the way for innovative solutions to cut the university system's costs while improving quality, expanding educational access for minorities, and initiating other successful strategies, such as the University System of Maryland's ''Closing the Achievement Gap'' program.

Outside of Maryland, Dr. Kirwan's expertise has been sought by Presidents of both parties and the U.S. Congress to offer his input on national higher education efforts. Even after he announced his retirement, Dr. Kirwan cochaired the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education, and currently serves as the cochair of the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics; chair of the College Board's Commission on Access, Admissions, and Success in Education; a member of the Business Higher Education Forum and as chair of the National Research Council Board of Higher Education and the Workforce.

His work is not without recognition by the citizens of our State. Among his many accolades but not an exhaustive list after his numerous years of service, Dr. Kirwan is the recipient of the TIAA-CREF Theodore M. Hesburgh Award for Leadership, the Carnegie Corporation Leadership Award, the 16th recipient of the Maryland House of Delegates Speaker's Medallion in recognition of his contributions to the State of Maryland, the Maryland Senate First Citizen Award in recognition of his ongoing commitment and service to our State, the Lifetime Achievement Award in Education from the Tech Council of Maryland, the Champion of Children Award from the Maryland State Department of Education, the Regional Visionary Award of the Greater Baltimore Committee, and the Public Service Award from the Maryland Chamber of Commerce.

As impressive as Dr. Kirwan's resume may be, it does not define who he is as an individual. Dr. Kirwan is a man of integrity and loyalty who maintains a passion for ensuring access to a quality education for all. He has been visionary in all things academic and believer in the well-being of young men and women. I would also like to thank Dr. Kirwan's family for the support they have given to him throughout his academic career and for allowing him to so greatly share his talents with the people of Maryland.

Dr. Kirwan's efforts have left the University System of Maryland and the State of Maryland both stronger academically and better prepared to educate students for the challenges of tomorrow. He has made social justice a genuine priority, which has elevated the university system even further. Through his vision and actions to establish the then Center for Academic Innovation at the University of Maryland, College Park, and the legacy of the newly commissioned William E. Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation will advance the priorities of Dr. Kirwan to address barriers to a college education for decades to come.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Kirwan on his well-deserved retirement and thanking Dr. Kirwan for his service and commitment to higher education.●

NATIONAL ROOFING WEEK

● Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize the National Roofing Contractors Association, NRCA, headquartered in Rosemont, IL,

and support its efforts to designate the week of July 5–11, 2015 as National Roofing Week.

As the first line of defense against natural elements, such as rain, snow or wind, the roof is one of the most critical features of any home or business. Yet, despite its importance, it is often taken for granted until it falls into disrepair. National Roofing Week is a valuable reminder of the significance that quality roofing has on our communities and honors the thousands of contractors in the roofing industry across the United States.

NRCA's 3,800 members, located across all 50 States, play a significant role in the installation and maintenance of roofing systems. With a vast network of roofing contractors and industry-related members, NRCA handles a majority of new construction and replacement roof systems on commercial and residential structures in America. However, the organization's activities extend beyond its construction duties.

National Roofing Week provides an opportunity to recognize the thousands of NRCA members and their commitment to supporting their local communities. As part of its outreach efforts last year, NRCA members worked together to raise funds and repair the roof for a local nonprofit organization that provides health services and housing options for mistreated and abused children in Chicago. I commend the NRCA and the vital role the organization and its members play in every community and I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging their contributions during National Roofing Week.●

REMEMBERING TROOPER JAMES A. MOEN AND RECOGNIZING MEGAN PETERS

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on Thursday, the Alaska State Troopers will pause to recognize the 14th anniversary of the loss of Trooper James A. Moen. Trooper Moen, assigned to fish and wildlife protection duties, was killed in an aircraft accident while on law enforcement patrol near Lake Iliamna, AK. Trooper Moen was piloting the single-engine Piper Cub float plane when it crashed for unknown reasons. His remains were recovered by troopers who hiked in to the scene. Trooper Moen had served with the Alaska State Troopers—fish and wildlife protection for over 18 years and had over 4,000 hours of flight time as both a military and civilian pilot. He was survived by his wife and four children.

One of Trooper Moen's children is Megan Peters, a spokesperson for the Alaska State Troopers. Megan's name is perhaps better known among Alaskans than her father's was. But one thing that Alaskans may not know is that Megan plays a leading role in organizing the Alaska police memorial ceremony each May. While all Alaska's law enforcement officers who gave their lives in the line of duty are recognized in this ceremony, the emphasis is on honoring those who passed in the preceding year.

There is a certain irony to Megan's involvement in all this. During Police Week, Megan devotes her energy to comforting the families of other fallen officers. But who is there to recognize and comfort Megan, herself a survivor of a law enforcement tragedy? That irony was not lost on Mallory Peebles, a reporter from KTUU Television in Anchorage. During the 2013 ceremony, Mallory devoted a segment of Channel 2 News to telling Megan's story—then and now.

So this year, through this message in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is my intention to honor both father and daughter. The legacy of Trooper James A. Moen very much lives on in the work of his daughter Megan. I didn't know Trooper Moen, but I have to believe that he would be very proud of Megan's work.

My staff and I rely on Megan throughout the year for information on public safety issues in Alaska. She is the go-to person and gets us the answers we need on short deadline. We appreciate her knowledge and diligence, but rarely do we think to take a moment to say thank you.

I ask unanimous consent that Mallory Peebles report on the work of Megan Peters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Channel 2 News, May 20, 2013]

LOST IN THE LINE OF DUTY: A STATE TROOPER'S STORY 12 YEARS LATER

(By Mallory Peebles and Photojournalist Shawn Wilson)

ANCHORAGE, AK.—When a service member or civilian in uniform makes the ultimate sacrifice, they are officially considered lost in the line of duty. Channel Two is looking back at three Alaskans and their families who have paid the ultimate price. On May 10, The State of Alaska recognized Peace Officers Memorial Day. It's a somber yet iconic event to mark and mourn Alaska's law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. This year the annual event was organized by State Trooper spokeswoman Megan Peters. For Peters it's more than just a work assignment, it's personal. ''My dad was a fish cop, fish and wildlife. So he was a brown shirt,'' Peters said. Peters said growing up she always knew her father did important work with the Alaska Troopers—sometimes even dangerous work—but as a child she didn't focus on the dangers of the job. ''He would go out on the boat all the time. He loved flying,'' Peters said. ''People say yeah, it's something that you know could happen but I was a little kid, and my dad was a trooper the whole time, so why would something happen?'' When Peters was just 18-years-old something did happen. Her father was flying on a routine sport fishing patrol near Iliamna when his plane crashed. It was May 25, 2001. Megan was studying abroad in Finland when her mother called with the news. ''I was just walking down the street, and I'll never forget the first thing she said was 'I'm so sorry Megan,' '' Peters said. ''I don't remember anything after that phone call. I don't remember packing. I didn't have to change my plane tickets because I was already leaving. I just came home, and it was a different life.'' It was a life without a father who had meant the world to her. ''When he wasn't working he was always taking us out. We had a boat and we had our own plane in high school,'' Peters said. ''My dad loved Alaska and that's why he came up here. He came up with the intent on wanting to be a State Trooper.'' James Arthur Moen was a productive Alaska State Trooper. For 18 years he served The State of Alaska. A member of the Special Emergency Response Team, SERT and dive unit, Moen assisted in numerous rescues and recovery missions. Today, he is still remembered for his contributions across the state. A trooper boat is named after Moen and still operates out of Petersburg. While serving Alaskans, Moen also served as a strong role model for his daughter. She decided to follow in her father's footsteps and is now working with the State Troopers. Peters joined the Troopers in 2007 where she is tasked with writing a press release each time a plane crashes in Alaska and troopers respond. Just like her father's hat that sits on her desk in the office, each press release serves as a constant and often painful reminder of the high cost of duty. ''I might not understand what it is that the troopers are doing every single day and what they're facing but I grew up around it enough to know what their jobs do entail,'' said Peters, ''and to know what it's like to be in that environment.'' Alaska Peace Officers Memorial Day serves as a stark reminder of the life and death situations law enforcement officers face every day while on duty. The harsh realities that come along with the responsibilities of duty in Alaska can mean it's possible they may not come home. Moen's name was added to this memorial more than a decade ago and joins many like it. This year 40-year-old State Trooper Tage Toll of Talkeetna had his name added. He died only two months ago when Helo-One crashed while executing the rescue of a stranded snowmachiner. Village Public Safety Officer Thomas Madole also had his named added to the memorial this year. He was shot and killed while responding to a 911 call in Manokotak. All the names added serve as a reminder of the lives sacrificed for a job, country and state they loved. ''My dad was a trooper and a pilot and he loved both, and you could see it every day when he came home,'' Peters said. ''He was happy, he loved his life.''

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Very touching story. This year, once again, we reflect on the service of Trooper James A. Moen to our State. At the same time we recognize the continuing contributions of his daughter, Megan, without whom we would not know as much about the triumphs, the risks and the sacrifices made by the troopers who keep Alaskans safe.●

RECOGNIZING CONVERSATIONS

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses have the unique ability to recognize emerging service gaps in their local economies. Often, these small businesses fill these unique service gaps in targeted, innovative ways. One such entity is this week's Small Business of the Week, Conversations of New Orleans, LA.

In 2010, Megan Hargroder noticed a lack in social media and online engagement consulting for startups, small businesses, and nonprofits in the greater New Orleans area. Eager to fill the

niche, Hargroder founded the media consulting company Conversations. Through Conversations, Hargroder's team provides targeted, easy-to-implement strategies for entities to connect with clients and future clients across a variety of online media platforms. Conversations has been an integral component in the online presence of hundreds of local organizations, businesses, and campaigns, such as the Junior League of New Orleans, the League of Women Voters, Tobacco Free Living, and former New Orleans Saints safety Steve Gleason. Additionally, the Conversations team maintains an online journal and steady calendar of speaking engagements in their quest to continually educate and engage folks in social media outreach techniques.

Like many startups, Hargroder initially struggled with transforming her innovative ideas into a profitable, effective business. She turned to the Greater New Orleans Region's Louisiana Small Business Development Center, LSBDC, which helped her navigate the nuances of starting and maintaining a healthy, thriving business. In the years since, Conversations' five-person team of bright and driven innovators in the realm of media consulting has transformed online media engagement in the State—creating economic opportunities for scores of businesses in Louisiana and beyond.

Congratulations again to Conversations for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your commitment to help local small businesses connect with clients and customers and foster economic growth.●

TRIBUTE TO HERBERT COLLINS

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to one of my constituents. Mr. Herbert Collins, a native member of the Caroline County community, has dedicated his life to the protection and preservation of the unique history of the region and of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Collins is a historian who served as a curator for the Smithsonian Institution here in Washington, DC. During his time at the museum, he was the executive director of the National Museum of American History. He also helped found the National Postal Museum, established a security system for the National Philatelic Museum, and was integral to the establishment of the National Museum of the American Indian.

Mr. Collins has committed his life to serving the United States, both as a member of the U.S. Army in his youth and in his service as a historian. This is exemplified in the transformation of his historic home into a personal museum, furnished with dozens of historic artifacts and antiques open to the public. Mr. Collins has also developed relationships with Presidents dating back to President Harry Truman. He contributed his military uniform, complete with his laundry mark, for the funeral service of President Dwight Eisenhower, who had requested to be buried in full military dress, and toured the country raising funds for a museum honoring President John F. Kennedy after the President was assassinated. Mr. Collins has undoubtedly left his mark on the Commonwealth, and I am honored to celebrate his achievements. I know that many throughout Virginia will join me in congratulating him on his service to the Nation and this great State.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate 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 message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 805. An act to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition.

H.R. 893. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1190. An act to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

H.R. 1626. An act to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1633. An act 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.

H.R. 1637. An act 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.

H.R. 1640. An act 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.

H.R. 1646. An act 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.

H.R. 1698. An act to amend design and content requirements for certain gold and silver coins, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2390. An act to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2576. An act to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2620. An act to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 5:45 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 615. An act 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.

H.R. 2146. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1190. An act to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1626. An act to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1633. An act 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; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1637. An act 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; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1640. An act 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; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1646. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how certain commercially available small and medium sized unmanned aerial systems could be used in an attack, how to prevent or mitigate the risk of such an attack, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1698. An act to amend design and content requirements for certain gold and silver coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2390. An act to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2028. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Thiram; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9928–82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2029. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Biorefinery, Renewable Chemical, and Biobased Product Manufacturing Assistance Program'' (RIN0570–AA73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2030. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2031. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John M. Bednarek, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2032. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a delay in submission of a report relative to the inventory of contracts for services for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2033. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William T. Grisoli, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2034. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Ronnie D. Hawkins, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2035. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Office of the General Counsel, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Commission Guidance Regarding the Definition of the Terms 'Spouse' and 'Marriage' Following the Supreme Court's Decision in United States v. Windsor'' (17 CFR Parts 231, 241, 271, and 276) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2036. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''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)'' (RIN3170–AA48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2037. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, with respect to North Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2038. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, with respect to the Western Balkans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2039. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2040. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the acceptance of gifted land in Tulare County, California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2041. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Edits'' (RIN1024–AE25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2042. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2043. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report on External Quality Control Review''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2044. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2045. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Child Care and Development Fund Report to Congress for Fiscal Years 2012 through 2013''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2046. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Partnership Transactions Equity Interests of a Partner'' ((RIN1545–BM35) (TD 9722)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2047. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Benefits Under the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act of 2014'' ((RIN1545–BM73) (TD 9723)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2048. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates - July 2015'' (Rev. Rul. 2015–15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Finance .

EC–2049. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Probability of a Deceased Spousal Unused Exclusion Amount'' ((RIN1545–BK74) (TD 9725)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2050. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration 2015 Section 45Q Inflation Adjustment Factor'' (Notice 2015–44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2051. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rulings and Determination Letters'' (Rev. Proc. 2015–37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2052. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Child Welfare Outcomes 2010–2013: Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2053. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14–050); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2054. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015–0067—2015–0072); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2055. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; TBHQ'' (Docket No. FDA–2014–F–

0364) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2056. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Gamma-Linolenic Acid Safflower Meal'' (Docket No. FDA–2010–F–0537) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2057. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts A and B Supplemental Funds for Fiscal Years 2011 through 2014''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2058. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2012–2013 Report to Congress on Organ Donation and the Recovery, Preservation, and Transportation of Organs''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2059. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Performance Report for fiscal year 2014 for the Generic Drug User Fee Amendments; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2060. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to compliance by the United States courts of appeals and district courts with the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2061. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Ferroalloys Production'' ((RIN2060–AQ11) (FRL No. 9928–66–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2062. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Adoption of Control Technique Guidelines for Offset Lithographic Printing and Letterpress Printing; Flexible Package Printing; and Adhesives, Sealants, Primers, and Solvents'' (FRL No. 9929–39–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2063. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone and 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter Air Pollution Affecting Visibility'' (FRL No. 9929–38–Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2064. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9925–88–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2065. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Revision to Allegheny County Regulations for Esablishing Permit Fees'' (FRL No. 9929–40–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2066. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Ohio PM2.5 NSR'' (FRL No. 9928–57–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2067. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Alternative Monitoring Plan for Milton R. Young Station'' (FRL No. 9928–81–Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2068. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Permits for Construction and Major Modification of Major Stationary Sources for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration'' (FRL No. 9929–34–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2069. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments'' (RIN2120–AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2070. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace; Jupiter, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–0794)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2071. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class E Airspace; Lexington, TN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0969)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2072. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of VOR Federal Airways; Northeastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1650)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2073. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class E Airspace; Forrest City, AR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0879)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2074. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Eufaula, AL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0970)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2075. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Clark, SD'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0724)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2076. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Restricted Areas R–4501A, R–4501B, R–4501C, R–4501D, R–4501F, and R–4501H; Fort Leonard Wood, MO'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0640)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2077. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Clarksburg, WV'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2078. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (23); Amdt. No. 3641'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2079. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (47); Amdt. No. 3643'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2080. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of

Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (110); Amdt. No. 3644'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2081. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (169); Amdt. No. 3646'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2082. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (3645)'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2083. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (254); Amdt. No. 3642'' (RIN2120–AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2084. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Exclusion of Tethered Launches From Licensing Requirements'' (RIN2120–AJ90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2085. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Services Surveys: BE–I80, Benchmark Survey of Financial Services Transactions Between U.S. Financial Services Providers and Foreign Persons'' (RIN0691–AA84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2086. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Lease and Interchange of Vehicles; Motor Carriers of Passengers'' (RIN2126–AB44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2087. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procurement, Management, and Administration of Engineering and Design Related Services'' (RIN2125–AF44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2088. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Examiner's Certification Integration'' (RIN2126–AB40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2089. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Closure of Purse Seine Fishery in the ELAPS in 2015'' (RIN0648–XD972) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2090. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2015–2016 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments'' (RIN0648–BF08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2091. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 29'' (RIN0648–BE55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2092. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; the Highly Migratory Species Fishery; Closure'' (RIN0648–XD945) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2093. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pacific Island Fisheries; 2014–15 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures; Main Hawaiian Islands Deep 7 Bottomfish'' (RIN0648–XD082) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2094. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Blueline Tilefish Fishery; Secretarial Emergency Action'' (RIN0648–BE97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2095. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Effort Limits in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015'' (RIN0648–BF03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2096. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0584)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2097. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0464)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2098. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1570)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2099. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0646)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2100. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; ATR—GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0568)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2101. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1937)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2102. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1936)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2103. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0489)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2104. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0756)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2105. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0575)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2106. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0342)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2107. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0754)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2108. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0227)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2109. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0493)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2110. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Type Certificate Previously Held by Schweizer Aircraft Corporation) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–1020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2111. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–1003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2112. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines Reciprocating Engines (Type Certificate Previously Held by Textron Lycoming Division, AVCO Corporation)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0940)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2113. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Slingsby Aviation Limited Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1737)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2114. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2014–0386)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2115. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Seats France (formerly Sicma Aero Seat) Passenger Seat Assemblies'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–1282)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 282. A bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–71).

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016'' (Rept. No. 114–72).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 728. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the ''Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 891. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the ''Floresville Veterans Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1326. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the ''Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office''.

H.R. 1350. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the ''Herman Badillo Post Office Building''.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration.

*Steven M. Wellner, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*William Ward Nooter, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PERDUE:

S. 1655. A bill to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under that Act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. KING):

S. 1656. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 1657. A bill to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect employees in the building and construction industry who are participants in multiemployer plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REID, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1659. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1661. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1662. A bill to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1663. A bill to better protect, serve, and advance the rights of victims of elder abuse and financial exploitation by encouraging States and other qualified entities to hold offenders accountable, enhance the capacity of the justice system to investigate, pursue, and prosecute elder abuse cases, identify existing resources to leverage to the extent possible, and assure data collection, research, and evaluation to promote the efficacy and efficiency of the activities described in this Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1664. A bill to count revenues from military and veteran education programs toward the limit on Federal revenues that certain proprietary institutions of higher education are allowed to receive for purposes of section 487 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1665. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize local educational agencies and schools to carry out child sexual abuse awareness and prevention programs or activities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the election to accelerate the AMT credit in lieu of bonus depreciation for 2015 and 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1667. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the special rules for accident and health plans of certain governmental entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEE, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COATS, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1668. A bill to restore long-standing United States policy that the Wire Act prohibits all forms of Internet gambling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 1669. A bill to reform the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1670. A bill to amend the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 to authorize appropriations to provide assistance for domestic and foreign programs and centers for the treatment of victims of torture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 1671. A bill to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 1672. A bill to authorize States to enter into interstate compacts regarding Class A commercial driver's licenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1673. A bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1674. A bill to amend and reauthorize certain provisions relating to Long Island Sound restoration and stewardship; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1675. A bill to amend certain appropriations Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, to provide for a report on the potential transfer of Plum Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1676. A bill to increase the number of graduate medical education positions treating veterans, to improve the compensation of health care providers, medical directors, and directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. Res. 211. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding Srebrenica; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 212. A resolution condemning the attack on Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, and expressing encouragement and prayers for all affected by this evil assault; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. REID, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 213. A resolution designating October 30, 2015, as a national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Con. Res. 19. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 310

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 310, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data

stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 574

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 574, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 667, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 711

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 711, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Service Health Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 713

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 861

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 861, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 885

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 885, a bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place in the United States Capitol a chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

S. 891

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 891, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to facilitate the administration and enforcement of antidumping and countervailing duty orders, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 991

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 991, a bill to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to end the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1203

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1203, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa feeds in certain situations.

S. 1324

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1387

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1387, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 1445

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1445, a bill to improve the Microloan Program of the Small Business Administration.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1455, a bill to provide access to medication-assisted therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from

Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1524

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1524, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 1576

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1576, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prevent fraud by representative payees.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance taxpayer rights, and for other purposes.

S. 1598

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1598, a bill to prevent discriminatory treatment of any person on the basis of views held with respect to marriage.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes.

S. 1634

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1634, a bill to amend the Federal antitrust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1651, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1652

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1652, a bill to designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 200

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 200, a resolution wishing His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama a happy 80th birthday on July 6, 2015, and recognizing the outstanding contributions His Holiness has made to the promotion of nonviolence, human rights, interfaith dialogue, environmental awareness, and democracy.

S. RES. 204

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 204, a resolution recognizing June 20, 2015 as ''World Refugee Day'' .

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REID, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1659. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversaries of the March from Selma to Montgomery and the passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act. Passage of the Voting Rights Act was the result of the blood, sweat, and tears of so many brave Americans who marched for justice—and the decades-long work of countless other men and women committed to seeing our country live up to its promise of equality and justice for all. Their actions transformed our Nation. On this 50th anniversary year, we pay special tribute to their legacy, but there is still work to be done. Each generation must contribute to the fight for equality. Each of us must answer the call to move this Nation toward a more perfect union.

In the coming weeks there will be continued celebrations of the passage of the original Voting Rights Act. Unfortunately, two years ago, the Supreme Court voted to dismantle a core piece of that vital legislation. In Shelby County v. Holder, five Republican-appointed justices on the Supreme Court drove a stake through the heart of the Voting Rights Act. Under Section 5 of the Act, the Federal government has the authority to examine and prevent racially discriminatory voting changes from being enacted before those changes disenfranchise voters in covered jurisdictions. By striking down the coverage formula that determined which States and jurisdictions were subject to Federal review, the Court effectively gutted Section 5. And in holding that the formula was based on outdated information, the Roberts Court disregarded thousands of pages of testimony and evidence from nearly 20 congressional hearings held when the law was reauthorized in 2006.

Within weeks of the Supreme Court's devastating ruling, Republican governors and State legislatures exploited the Shelby County decision. Several States with a documented history of racial discrimination in voting implemented sweeping laws that disproportionately suppressed the voting rights of minorities, the elderly, and young people.

For example, Texas immediately implemented the most restrictive photo identification law in the country. Although, a Federal judge found the law to be an ''unconstitutional poll tax'' that could disenfranchise up to 600,000 voters and disproportionately impact African Americans and Latinos, the law was allowed to disenfranchise voters this past election.

In North Carolina, the Republican legislature and Republican governor passed a far-reaching bill that restricted its citizens' right to vote. The bill cut early voting down from 17 days to 10 days, eliminated teenagers' ability to preregister before their 18th birthday, and eliminated same day voter registration. It also enacted a strict photo identification requirement, which is currently being challenged in court.

These are just a few of the numerous discriminatory voting restrictions that have been enacted since Shelby County was decided. We cannot sit by as the fundamental right to vote is systematically undermined. We must not retreat from our commitment to civil rights and the great accomplishments we celebrate this year. As my friend Congressman JOHN LEWIS has stated, voting ''is the most powerful, nonviolent tool we have to create a more perfect union.''

Similarly, in 1962, Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered a speech at the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston—the scene of the horrific tragedy last week—where he noted that voting rights was the key to achieving the American dream for all. Their statements are as true today as they were fifty years ago, and that is why we

must do all we can to protect that right for all Americans.

I challenge anyone to claim that racial discrimination no longer exists. Even Chief Justice Roberts acknowledged in the Shelby County decision that ''voting discrimination still exists; no one doubts that.'' The Court further said that Congress may respond with legislation based on current conditions. The bill we introduce today, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015, is that response. It reflects the very real, current conditions that Americans face when trying to participate in our democracy.

We have heard from Americans across the country whose voting rights have been diminished and suppressed since the Shelby County decision. We have also heard from numerous voting rights experts and civil rights leaders who have called for strong legislation that would fully restore the protections gutted by the Court's decision. The legislation we are introducing today responds to those calls from the grassroots and the community leaders on the ground who are today's foot soldiers for justice. This bill also represents the hard work and commitment of civil rights organizations like the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, the Brennan Center for Justice, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Educational Fund, Asian Americans Advancing Justice, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Native American Rights Fund, the Alaska Federation of Natives, the National Congress of American Indians, LatinoJustice, the Advancement Project, and many others. I thank all of these organizations and the tireless individuals who have helped us shape this legislation.

This bill is a voting rights bill for all Americans. It is a bill for the next generation, and helps protect the legacy of the previous generation who fought so hard five decades ago for these voting rights protections.

Under this bill, all States and local jurisdictions are eligible for Section 5 protections under a new coverage formula, which is based on a finding of repeated voting rights violations in the preceding 25 years. Significantly, the 25-year period ''rolls'' or continuously moves to keep up with ''current conditions,'' as the Supreme Court stated must be a basis for any new coverage provision. States that have repeated and persistent violations will be covered for a period of 10 years, but if a State establishes a clean record moving forward, it emerges from preclearance coverage. In addition, the existing bailout provision would still be available so that States or local jurisdictions that establish a clean record can also emerge from coverage.

The bill also establishes a nationwide, targeted preclearance process for a limited set of voting changes that have historically been found to discriminate against minority voters. For example, a racially diverse county that seeks to change a single-member district seat into an at-large seat will require preclearance because that kind of change has historically been used to marginalize minority voters. Racial gerrymandering, annexations that dilute minority voting strength, strict photo identification requirements, reduction of multilingual voting materials, and the elimination of polling locations in jurisdictions that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse, will also receive greater scrutiny under this bill.

Our bill would also improve the Voting Rights Act to allow Federal courts to bail-in specific jurisdictions where the effect of a particular voting change is to deny citizens their right to vote. Under this provision, a Federal court could subject to preclearance any State or local jurisdiction that the court determines violated the Voting Rights Act or any other Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group.

The bill we introduce today will also ensure that voters are made aware of changes in laws affecting their right to vote. Justice Brandeis once observed that sunlight is the best disinfectant and I believe that applies here as well. Transparency is a strong deterrent to voting discrimination. Under our bill, the public must be notified of late-breaking changes to standards and voting procedures in Federal elections. Information on polling place resource allocation for Federal elections must also be made public, including information about accessibility for persons with disabilities. Finally, information on changes to electoral districts must be made available to the general public. This includes demographic information, to prevent racial gerrymandering, impermissible redistricting, and infringement on minority voters at the Federal, State and local levels.

The bill makes other commonsense improvements, such as amending current law to allow the Attorney General to request Federal observers in those jurisdictions where racial discrimination in voting remains a serious threat. It revises the preliminary injunction standard for voting rights actions to recognize the principle that oftentimes, obtaining relief after the election has already concluded is too late to vindicate the individuals' voting rights. Thus, such temporary relief may be obtained where the complainant raises a ''serious question'' that—on balance—the hardship the voting change imposes on the complainant outweighs the hardship imposed upon the state or jurisdiction.

In addition, this bill addresses the unique challenges that Native American and Alaska Native voting populations encounter by: allowing for more accessible polling locations and voter registration agencies; permitting absentee voting where polling locations are too remote; and ensuring ballots are translated into all written Native languages where current law already requires bilingual voting materials.

We are introducing this bill today because the persistent and evolving forms of voting discrimination require a strong response. I am proud to be joined by so many lawmakers from both sides of the Capitol and all parts of the country. I am joined by Senator DURBIN, who worked with me in 2006 to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. We are also joined by Senator COONS, Leader REID, all Democratic Senators on the Judiciary Committee, and many others. In addition, the House of Representatives is today introducing a companion bill, led by my friend JOHN LEWIS and leaders of the House Tri-Caucus—Representative TERRI SEWELL of the Congressional Black Caucus, Representative LINDA SÁNCHEZ of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and Representative JUDY CHU of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus.

I hope that Senate Republicans will join us soon as well. The Voting Rights Act has always been bipartisan. In 2006, when we last reauthorized the Voting Rights Act, I worked closely with the Republican chairmen of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees—former Senator Arlen Specter and Representative JIM SENSENBRENNER. Past reauthorizations have been signed into law by Republican presidents. Yet over the past year, I have not found a Republican in the Senate willing to join me in proposing a meaningful reinstatement of voter protections.

In marking the 50th anniversary of the march in Selma this past March, President Obama issued a call to action on the Voting Rights Act. He observed that: ''One hundred members of Congress have come here today to honor people who were willing to die for the right to protect it. If we want to honor this day, let that hundred go back to Washington and gather four hundred more, and together, pledge to make it their mission to restore that law this year. That is how we honor those on this bridge.''

I agree with the President. The best way we can honor those individuals and the countless others who gave so much to make this a more perfect union is not with platitudes or long overdue symbolic gestures. No, we must act—just as they did. We must continue to agitate, to organize, to educate, and to build momentum so that this legislation becomes law. This bill, just as the Voting Rights Act before it, is necessary if we believe in a democracy that reflects our ideals of equality and justice. This legislation will protect the constitutional rights of all Americans and advance the principles of those who marched a generation ago.

Much attention is focused on the Supreme Court this week as it is poised to

hand down decisions that will affect millions of Americans. The decisions of those nine women and men will impact the security of our health care, the sanctity of our marriages and the quality of the air we breathe. What the Supreme Court does matters. Its decisions affect us all. Nowhere in recent years has that been more clear than in its Shelby County decision. That destructive ruling made the fundamental right to vote vulnerable. It is long past time for Congress to respond with meaningful action.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 211—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SREBRENICA

Mr. CARDIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 211

Whereas July 2015 will mark 20 years since the genocide at Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Whereas, beginning in April 1992, aggression and ethnic cleansing perpetrated by Bosnian Serb forces resulted in a massive influx of Bosniaks seeking protection in Srebrenica and its environs, which the United Nations Security Council designated a ''safe area'' within the Srebrenica enclave in Resolution 819 on April 16, 1993, under the protection of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR);

Whereas the UNPROFOR presence in Srebrenica consisted of a Dutch peacekeeping battalion, with representatives of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the humanitarian medical aid agency Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors Without Borders) helping to provide humanitarian relief to the displaced population living in conditions of massive overcrowding, destitution, and disease;

Whereas, early in 1995, an intensified blockade of the enclave by Bosnian Serb forces deprived the entire population of humanitarian aid and outside communication and contact, and effectively reduced the ability of the Dutch peacekeeping battalion to deter aggression or otherwise respond effectively to a deteriorating situation;

Whereas, beginning on July 6, 1995, Bosnian Serb forces attacked UNPROFOR outposts, seized control of the isolated enclave, held captured Dutch soldiers hostage and, after skirmishes with local defenders, took control of the town of Srebrenica on July 11, 1995;

Whereas an estimated one-third of the population of Srebrenica at the time, including a relatively small number of soldiers, attempted to pass through the lines of Bosnian Serb forces to the relative safety of Bosnian-government controlled territory, but many were killed by patrols and ambushes;

Whereas the remaining population sought protection with the Dutch peacekeeping battalion at its headquarters in the village of Potocari north of Srebrenica, but many of these individuals were with seeming randomness seized by Bosnian Serb forces to be beaten, raped, or executed;

Whereas Bosnian Serb forces deported women, children, and the elderly in buses, but held over 8,000 primarily Bosniak men and boys at collection points and sites in northeastern Bosnia and Herzegovina under their control, and then summarily executed these captives and buried them in mass graves;

Whereas Bosnian Serb forces, hoping to conceal evidence of the massacre at Srebrenica, subsequently moved corpses from initial mass grave sites to many secondary sites scattered throughout parts of eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina under their control;

Whereas the International Commission for Missing Persons (ICMP) deserves recognition for its assistance to the relevant institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina in accounting for close to 90 percent of those individuals reported missing from Srebrenica, despite active attempts to conceal evidence of the massacre, through the careful excavation of mass graves sites and subsequent DNA analysis which confirmed the true extent of the massacre;

Whereas the massacre at Srebrenica was among the worst of many atrocities to occur in the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina from April 1992 to November 1995, during which the policies of aggression and ethnic cleansing pursued by Bosnian Serb forces with the direct support of the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic and its followers ultimately led to the displacement of more than 2,000,000 people, more than 100,000 killed, tens of thousands raped or otherwise tortured and abused, including at concentration camps in the Prijedor area, with the innocent civilians of Sarajevo and other urban centers repeatedly subjected to traumatic shelling and sniper attacks;

Whereas, in addition to being the primary victims at Srebrenica, individuals with Bosniak heritage comprise the vast majority of the victims during the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina as a whole, especially among the civilian population;

Whereas Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide defines genocide as ''any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group'';

Whereas, on May 25, 1993, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 827 establishing the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), based in The Hague, the Netherlands, and charging the ICTY with responsibility for investigating and prosecuting individuals suspected of committing war crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity and grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions on the territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991;

Whereas the ICTY, along with courts in Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as in Serbia, has indicted and in most cases convicted approximately three dozen individuals at various levels of responsibility for grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, violations of the laws or customs of war, crimes against humanity, genocide, and complicity in genocide associated with the massacre at Srebrenica, most notably Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, whose trials are ongoing;

Whereas both the ICTY and the International Court of Justice (ICJ) have ruled that the actions of Bosnian Serb forces in Srebrenica in July 1995 constitute genocide;

Whereas House Resolution 199 (109th Congress), passed on June 27, 2005, expressed the sense of the House of Representatives that the aggression and ethnic cleansing committed by Serb forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina meets the terms defining genocide according to the 1949 Genocide Convention;

Whereas the United Nations has largely acknowledged its failure to fulfill its responsibility to take actions and make decisions that could have deterred the assault on Srebrenica and prevented the subsequent genocide from occurring;

Whereas some prominent Serbian and Bosnian Serb officials, among others, have denied or at least refused to acknowledge that the massacre at Srebrenica constituted a genocide, or have sought otherwise to trivialize the extent and importance of the massacre; and

Whereas the international community, including the United States, has continued to provide personnel and resources, including through direct military intervention, to prevent further aggression and ethnic cleansing, to negotiate the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (initialed in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21, 1995, and signed in Paris on December 14, 1995), and to help ensure its fullest implementation, including cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia as well as reconciliation among all of Bosnia and Herzegovina's citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that the policies of aggression and ethnic cleansing as implemented by Serb forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995 meet the terms defining the crime of genocide in Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide;

(2) condemns statements that deny or question that the massacre at Srebrenica constituted a genocide;

(3) urges the Atrocities Prevention Board, a United States interagency committee established by the President in 2012, to study the lessons of Srebrenica and issue informed guidance on how to prevent similar incidents from recurring in the future, paying particular regard to troubled countries, including Syria, the Central African Republic and Burundi;

(4) encourages the United States to maintain and reaffirm its policy of supporting the independence and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina, peace and stability in southeastern Europe as a whole, and the right of all people living in the region, regardless of national, racial, ethnic or religious background, to return to their homes and enjoy the benefits of democratic institutions, the rule of law, and economic opportunity, as well as to know the fate of missing relatives and friends;

(5) recognizes the achievement of the International Commission for Missing Persons (ICMP) in accounting for those missing in conflicts or natural disasters around the world and believes that the ICMP deserves justified recognition for its assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina and its relevant institutions in accounting for approximately 90 percent of those reported missing after the Srebrenica massacre and 70 percent of those reported missing during the whole of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(6) welcomes the arrest and transfer to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) of all persons indicted for war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide and grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, particularly those of Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, which has helped strengthen peace and encouraged reconciliation between the countries of the region and their citizens;

(7) asserts that it is in the national interest of the United States that those individuals who are responsible for these crimes and breaches should continue to be held accountable for their actions, and that the work of the ICTY therefore warrants continued support until all trials and appeals have been completed; and

(8) honors the thousands of innocent people killed or executed at Srebrenica in Bosnia and Herzegovina in July 1995, along with all individuals who were victimized during the conflict and genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992 to 1995, as well as foreign nationals, including United States citizens, and those individuals in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and other countries of the region who risked and in some cases lost their lives during their brave defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and advocacy of respect for ethnic identity without discrimination.

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—CONDEMNING THE ATTACK ON EMANUEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND EXPRESSING ENCOURAGEMENT AND PRAYERS FOR ALL AFFECTED BY THIS EVIL ASSAULT

Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 212

Whereas on June 17, 2015, a horrific mass shooting took place during a Bible study class at ''Mother Emanuel'', the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, where 9 innocent lives were ended in bloodshed;

Whereas the people of the United States mourn the loss to the community and to our Nation of the individuals taken that night: State Senator Rev. Clementa Pinckney, Rev. DePayne Middleton-Doctor, Rev. Daniel Simmons Sr., Rev. Sharonda Singleton, Cynthia Hurd, Susie Jackson, Ethel Lance, Tywanza Sanders, and Myra Thompson; and

Whereas the church, community, and State have come together to offer support, faith, and prayers for those lost and for those who will work to soothe this terrible wound and overcome the hatred and racism that led to this attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the attack of June 17, 2015, on Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina and the hate and racist bigotry that motivated it;

(2) offers condolences to the families and loved ones of those killed and to the staff and congregation of Mother Emanuel; and

(3) supports community efforts towards healing from this terrible crime and nationwide efforts to overcome hatred, bigotry, and violence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 30, 2015, AS A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 213

Whereas, since World War II, hundreds of thousands of men and women, including uranium miners, millers, and haulers, have served the United States by building nuclear weapons for the defense of the United States;

Whereas dedicated workers paid a high price for developing a nuclear weapons program at the service, and for the benefit of, the United States, including by developing disabling or fatal illnesses;

Whereas the Senate recognized the contributions, services, and sacrifices that those patriotic men and women made for the defense of the United States in—

(1) Senate Resolution 151, 111th Congress, agreed to May 20, 2009;

(2) Senate Resolution 653, 111th Congress, agreed to September 28, 2010;

(3) Senate Resolution 275, 112th Congress, agreed to September 26, 2011;

(4) Senate Resolution 519, 112th Congress, agreed to August 1, 2012;

(5) Senate Resolution 164, 113th Congress, agreed to September 18, 2013; and

(6) Senate Resolution 417, 113th Congress, agreed to July 9, 2014;

Whereas a national day of remembrance time capsule has been crossing the United States, collecting stories and artifacts of nuclear weapons program workers relating to the nuclear defense era of the United States, and a remembrance quilt has been constructed to memorialize the contribution of those workers;

Whereas the stories and artifacts reflected in the time capsule and the remembrance quilt reinforce the importance of recognizing nuclear weapons program workers; and

Whereas those patriotic men and women deserve to be recognized for the contributions, services, and sacrifices they made for the defense of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 30, 2015, as a national day of remembrance for the nuclear weapons program and uranium enrichment workers of the United States, including the uranium miners, millers, and haulers; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to support and participate in appropriate ceremonies, programs, and other activities to commemorate October 30, 2015, as a national day of remembrance for past and present workers in the nuclear weapons program of the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 19

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, June 25, 2015, through Friday, July 3, 2015, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Tuesday, July 7, 2015, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, June 25, 2015, through Friday, July 3, 2015, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 7, 2015, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after concurrence with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Lessons Learned from Past WMD Negotiations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2015, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Demanding Results to End Native Youth Suicides.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SD–562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Work in Retirement: Career Reinventions and the New Retirement Workscape.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 644

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HATCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. STABENOW conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1177

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Tuesday, July 7, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 63, S. 1177, the Every Child Achieves Act of 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, July 7, at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 81; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; and that following disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVOKING THE CHARTER OF INCORPORATION OF THE MIAMI TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 533 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 533) to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 533) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about what just happened on the floor, which was passing in the Senate the trade promotion authority for the President of the United States and for our good country to be able to get out there and expand markets for our exporters and for our farmers, our workers, and our service providers.

This is a significant change because for the last 8 years the United States of America has not been engaged in opening up these markets. While other countries have completed these trade agreements, we have not been able to. So this gives us as a country the ability to be able to open up markets. That is a good thing, and it is significant and will have an impact on our economy that is positive because exports mean not only more jobs but better jobs. So we will see more jobs that are, on average, 15 to 18 percent higher pay and have better benefits, and we will be able to compete more globally. This is important to get America off the sidelines.

There is also a benefit of getting us back involved in trade because it enables America to be able to set some of the rules of trade rather than other countries. And while we have not had this ability to be able to open up new markets, what has happened? Other countries have been completing agreements, shutting us out—our farmers, our workers, our service providers—but they also have been setting the rules of

trade. We want to be able to set them because we are a country that believes we ought to have a rules-based system, that it ought to be fair, that there ought to be the rule of law, and that the standards we have—which are high standards in terms of getting tariffs down but also not being able to unfairly send imports to another country—that those are upheld. So this is a positive step.

What I am also really happy about is that after we passed the trade promotion authority for the first time in 8 years, sending it for signature to the President, which he has indicated he will sign, we then passed legislation with regard to trade adjustment assistance, which is extending benefits to people who are displaced. So if someone in any particular trade agreement loses a job or a company gets hurt, they have the ability to get the worker retraining they need, get the help they need to be able to get the skills they need to find a job and to get themselves back on their feet. So trade adjustment assistance is important.

But within trade adjustment assistance there is something even more interesting. We included an amendment which Senator BROWN—my colleague from Ohio—and I had promoted previously. This is to help all of our workers all around America because it enables us to have the ability to go after countries that send their products to us unfairly, meaning that they subsidize them, which is not fair under the rules of trade, or that they dump them, meaning they sell them at below their cost, which is also unfair.

So this is a very important amendment. We call it the leveling the playing field amendment because as we are expanding exports—which we, of course, should do because that creates more good jobs in my home State of Ohio and around the country—we should also be sure that we are more aggressively enforcing the trade laws that are in place, the international rules and our domestic rules. This amendment that just passed the Senate tonight enables us to do that.

I am excited about it because it gives us the chance to be able to compete. It gives the steelworker in Ohio who is playing by the rules and doing all the right things—being more efficient, being more productive—and companies that are using technology to our advantage the chance to be productive, not to be undercut when other countries dump their products—say, their steel products, their tubes, and other products, structural steel—into the United States of America because they want to get market share. We are going to be able to stop that with this amendment because it enables us to be able to not just file lawsuits against these countries but actually get them resolved more quickly.

Right now, my concern is that too often with these trade laws, by the time you bring a case and are successful at it, you have lost so many jobs that, in effect, although you get a remedy that is winning a trade case and getting higher tariffs on that product, it is too late. This is a really important amendment, the leveling the playing field amendment.

I want to thank my colleagues for supporting it. I know there were some concerns and questions about it. We spent the last couple of months talking about it. Tonight it actually passed. I am told that legislation is now going to go to the House and that it will be passed in the House. I am told that Speaker PELOSI has said today that she is going to support that legislation. This is the trade adjustment assistance legislation with the leveling the playing field amendment as a part of it.

Finally, as part of the TAA, there is another really important measure that I appreciate my colleagues supporting. It is one that I offered in committee, and I have offered it over the years in committee. It is to help workers who were left behind. Back when it was necessary for the U.S. Government to intervene and help our auto companies, there were some people who weren't helped.

This provides a health care tax credit to those individuals who through no fault of their own lost health care and lost pensions. This is when their plans went into the PBGC. This includes Delphi workers in my home State of Ohio. There are several thousand of them. It includes some United Steelworkers. It includes some other employees who were left behind when other workers were given their pensions and given their health care.

Every year we have fought for this. We have now been able to put in place an extension of the health care tax credit they desperately need. For most of these people, it is to provide them the ability between the age they are now—say, in their late 50s—and when they get on Medicare. It is a critical time for them to be able to have this bridge and to be able to provide health care for themselves and for their families.

The health care tax credit is part of this broader TAA, or trade adjustment assistance, legislation that was passed here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I thank my colleagues for working with me on this over the past several years but also over the past several weeks with regard to this specific provision. Again, that will go to the House now, and we are told that will pass the House as it is. In other words, the House will take up this exact bill and pass it and send it to President for signature.

This is also a really important opportunity for us to reach out to people who are hurting today through no fault of their own and to provide them the health care tax credit they deserve.

In the legislation that we passed this afternoon, we also did something else really important that we have never done before, and that is to help protect Israel from discrimination. We included language in the trade bill itself that Senator CARDIN and I had championed in the committee. It is the part of the bill that says that countries that engage in boycotts or sanctions or divestment of Israel in a trade agreement with the United States of America would not be able to get the benefits of trade with us.

We think this is incredibly important leverage to help protect Israel from what, unfortunately, is happening around the world too often now, which is a double standard—telling the State of Israel that somehow it is going to be treated differently than other countries are treated.

I think it is part of a larger effort to try to delegitimize the State of Israel, and it is one where the United States ought to stand up. Why is this being done in the context of trade? Because it works. It is an area where we do have leverage.

When I was U.S. Trade Representative, I had the honor to be able to negotiate agreements with various countries. One was Oman, one was Bahrain, and one was Saudi Arabia. In all three cases, we were able to make great progress in the case of boycotts of Israel by telling those countries: If you want to do business with the United States and have a free-trade agreement with us, then you have to treat all countries fairly. You have to follow the MFN, or most favored nation status, which means you treat countries fairly and you don't discriminate against countries.

Initially, they would say: No, gosh, politically that is too hard for us. But after discussions and after the United States stood tall with Israel, we were able to succeed in all three cases: Bahrain and Oman with trade agreements and Saudi Arabia with regard to their accession agreement to the World Trade Organization. I know it works. I have seen it.

Again, that is in the legislation that was passed today here on the floor of this Senate. I am proud of us because we are actually doing some of this work on a bipartisan basis to help our country, to help our workers, to help our service providers, our farmers but also to ensure that these rules of trade are fair globally.

Finally, I will say that we are not done. There is another bill that we were told would be part of this whole package. It is currently being negotiated in conference after this afternoon because we named conferees between the House and Senate. It is the Customs bill.

In that legislation, there are additional provisions that I think are very important that we passed, including one called the ENFORCE Act. This is to avoid the situation where a country is told: You are dumping products in the United States or you are subsidizing your product in the United States, and you can't do that anymore. Instead, they figure out a way to divert their product to another country and

still send it to the United States using the same unfair trade practices.

We need to be sure that we are putting in place provisions that allow us to stop that diversion as well. That is what the ENFORCE Act does. That is in the Customs bill, as one example. There are other important provisions in the Customs bill, as well.

I would urge my colleagues to work with us to get that conference done as quickly as possible because the House and Senate versions are a little bit different and to be sure that we can come up with a way to resolve those differences and bring that back to the floor as part of this package.

The final one in that package is something that is very important to manufacturers in my State. This is to enable us to bring products in from overseas that were not made anywhere in America under what is called miscellaneous tariff bill. This is something that we have not had the opportunity to do in several years because there are concerns about earmarks. I agree with those concerns. We should not have earmarks, whether it is in trade or whether it is in appropriations or elsewhere.

We have resolved that issue by not having it be earmarked under the definition we have in the House and Senate but rather have it go through the International Trade Commission and have them be the ones that determine whether a particular product fits within a miscellaneous tariff bill or not.

This will help in terms of adding employment in America, reducing the cost to consumers, making our economy more productive and more efficient, and adding economic growth. It is another example that when once we complete this package, it includes expanding exports, which was very important. We had to do that today because America has been sitting on the sidelines for too long. We were losing market share for our farmers, our workers, our service providers. We needed to get back in the game and send more products stamped ''Made in America'' around the world. That creates jobs here. That is good.

Second, we need to be sure that we have a level playing field, that we work on this issue of currency manipulation, which has some unprecedented language, and also on these other issues we talked about today with the level the playing field amendment to ensure that products are not being sold unfairly and that we do provide workers with trade adjustment assistance.

Then finally, we move forward with this final bill called the Customs bill to ensure that we include all these provisions which are so important as a package and to make sure that yes, we are expanding exports at the same time and we are letting people know that they are going to get a fair shake. When they work hard and play by the rules here in America, our workers are going to be told: You are in the global marketplace; we are going to watch your back. That is important. It is important to me. It is important to my State. It is important to the people who send us here, who expect us to set the conditions in place for more exports but also to ensure that is more fairly done.

Again, I thank my colleagues for the work that has been done today, and I also urge my colleagues to move quickly, passing trade adjustment assistance in the House and then passing the conference report on the Customs bill so we can keep this package together and actually give our economy a shot in the arm and give American workers the chance to compete.

If they are given that chance, we have the best work force in the world. We will be able not just to compete but to win the global competition.

I yield back my time.

Mr. President, I have been asked to do the closing script, and then the Senator from Massachusetts will be recognized.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2015

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:50 a.m., Thursday, June 25; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the first hour be equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator MARKEY and Senator SHAHEEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

ALZHEIMER'S & BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, June is Alzheimer's & Brain Awareness Month—an opportunity to join the global conversation about this equal opportunity killer, Alzheimer's.

Everyone with a brain is at risk to develop Alzheimer's. Worldwide right now there are 47 million people living with Alzheimer's and with other dementias. Without a change, these numbers are expected to grow to 76 million people globally with Alzheimer's by the year 2030.

In 1998, my mother passed away from Alzheimer's. That is the year that I created the bipartisan Congressional Alzheimer's Task Force. The reason I did it was that it is very hard—as people who have an Alzheimer's patient in their family know—to deal with this disease while my mother had it. But for me, it became something very important, something that I felt that Congress had a responsibility to deal with. For 13 years, my mother just stayed in our living room, being cared for by my father. My mother was quite fortunate because my father had been a milkman. The right arm of a milkman carrying milk bottles for decades is the strongest right arm you can have. My father could care for my mother. My father could keep my mother in our home. But not every family has a strong right arm of a milkman.

Keeping an Alzheimer's patient at home is a difficult task. We have to accept the fact that statistically, we now have more than 5 million Americans with Alzheimer's. Let me say that again: 5 million Americans, as we gather here on the Senate floor, have Alzheimer's in our country, but that is before all the baby boomers have retired. By the time all of the baby boomers in America have retired, 15 million of them are going to have Alzheimer's. Like my family, someone else in each one of those families is going to have Alzheimer's as well because they will be the family caregiver. That will be about 30 million people by the time all the baby boomers have retired whose principal reality in life will be this one disease.

How big is this disease as a drain on our country? This year we are going to spend in Medicare and Medicaid dollars $153 billion on Alzheimer's patients.

I will say that again. This year in America, with 5 million people with the disease, we are going to spend $153 billion. How big is that number? While we are debating the Defense bill for our country—how big is the Defense bill to protect our entire country here and overseas? It is $560 billion. One disease, Alzheimer's, is going to cost us $153 billion. By the time all 15 million baby boomers have the disease, the amount of Federal money in Medicare and Medicaid that we will be spending will be equal to the entire defense budget of our country. That is obviously not sustainable.

We have to find a cure for Alzheimer's not just for our country but for every other country in the world. We have to be the leader. Our caregivers are the heroes today, but even heroes need help. As the true neurological wasting effects take hold of the next generation of Alzheimer's patients, the costs to our society will mount unless we make the smart investments to treat and defeat this disease. We have an opportunity here in the Senate to provide the leadership.

For every $27,000 in 2015 that we are going to spend from the U.S. Senate on Alzheimer's out of the Medicare and Medicaid budget, the National Institutes of Health invests $100 in trying to find a cure. That is right. You heard me correctly. For every $27,000 of Federal money this year on an Alzheimer's patient, we are spending $100 to try to find a cure.

The NIH budget has to increase, and it has to increase dramatically because in the long run we cannot balance the Federal budget if in 30 years one disease is going to consume as much Federal money as the entire defense budget in our country.

Every 67 seconds, someone new in this country develops Alzheimer's. In my State of Massachusetts, 12 percent of all seniors have Alzheimer's.

We need a breakthrough in research. Research is medicine's field of dreams from which we harness the findings that give hope to families so that one day children will have to look to the history books to find that there ever was such a disease as Alzheimer's.

Right now is not the time to cut funding at the National Institutes of Health. They are not only the National Institutes of Health, they are also the national institutes of hope, and we must give that hope to American families that we can find a cure. We cannot cut that budget. We cannot allow sequestration to come in and slash the NIH budget once again. In 2015, NIH has buying power that is 20 percent lower than it was 10 years ago. This is at a point where it should be ramped up 20 percent higher, not lower.

This is a debate which we should be having. The terrorist call that people fear is that some doctor will call their house to them that yet another member of their family has Alzheimer's or some other tragic disease.

We need to increase the NIH budget. We need to give that hope to American families. And that is why Senator CRAPO and I worked to pass the Alzheimer's Accountability Act into law. It requires the Director of NIH to submit an annual budget directly to Congress outlining what resources are needed to meet the goal of preventing and treating Alzheimer's disease by 2025. That is why my colleagues, Senator STABENOW, Senator COLLINS, Senator CAPITO, and I introduced the Hope for Alzheimer's Act, which will allow Medicare beneficiaries to receive comprehensive care-planning services when they are diagnosed with Alzheimer's. That is also why Senator WYDEN and I included the Independence at Home Program as part of the Affordable Care Act. This program allows chronically ill Medicare beneficiaries, such as those with Alzheimer's, to receive primary care services in the comfort of their home. Independence at Home allows teams of doctors and nurses to continue to care for severely ill Medicare patients in their home by bringing the house calls of the yesteryear physicians into the 21st century.

Just last week, some game-changing data was released on the success of the first year of this program. We learned that when implemented properly, the Independence at Home Program has the potential to save $21 billion of Medicare money over the next decade, and at the same time it also improves the quality of care for Medicare beneficiaries. This is a win-win situation. It is possible to design Medicare so that it works smarter, saves money, and improves the lives of beneficiaries.

Patients want to be cared for in their living rooms, not in the emergency room. That is what my father, John Markey the milkman, was able to provide for my mother with Alzheimer's. That is what the Independence at Home Program does. It is a program where nurse practitioners, physicians, and nursing homes are able to say: We are going to help to keep your loved one at home. We will give you the help that makes that possible.

Independence at Home is steering our health care system toward a focus of quality and not simply the quantity of care.

As we build a future free of Alzheimer's disease, Congress and the American people need a blueprint on how to be more effective at prioritizing Federal resources to reach our goal. When America makes a plan, America can do great things. We need an action plan to cure Alzheimer's and to care for those who suffer from it.

In the 1960s, President Kennedy called for a mission to the Moon, and we accomplished great things to make that happen. In the 21st century, it is not a mission to the Moon, it is a mission to the mind which is our challenge, and we must make the same kind of investment in research that was made in the 1960s.

We did not allow the Soviet Union to dominate. We cannot allow this disease to devastate 15 million lives with Alzheimer's in this baby boom generation. The legacy we should be leaving is that we found the cure. It was first identified more than 100 years ago. We now have to make sure that our legacy in the 21st century is that we have been able to build the momentum to fund the research that ensures families in our country have hope.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

U.S. AND EUROPEAN SUPPORT FOR ALLIES THREATENED BY RUSSIA

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, last week I returned from 3 days in Poland and Latvia. I participated in the global security forum in Wroclaw, Poland, where I met with key foreign leaders from Eastern Europe in particular. I also visited U.S. and allied forces participating in military exercises in Latvia.

For the first time since the end of the Cold War, the West is confronted by an armed aggressor directly challenging the principle of a Europe whole, free, and at peace. European officials I spoke with see Russian President Vladimir Putin as opportunistic, determined to expand Russia's sphere of influence, and ready to exploit any vulnerabilities in nearby European countries.

Our friends on the frontlines in Central and Eastern Europe want more than words of solidarity from the European Union, NATO, and the United States; they want a more robust response and concrete actions to counter the Russian threat and deter further Russian aggression.

The crucible for this effort must come in Ukraine. With the Euromaidan Revolution of 2013 and the subsequent election of President Petro Poroshenko, the Ukrainian people have made it clear that their future is with the West, with democracy, with responsive and transparent governance. President Putin responded by invading eastern Ukraine, annexing Crimea, and destabilizing the entire Ukrainian State.

Ukraine today is a symbol of democratic Europe's resistance to Russian domination in the same way that Berlin was in 1948. The Ukrainian army has performed commendably under incredibly challenging circumstances, but it is no match for Russia's military.

However, as we witnessed throughout the Communist era in Eastern Europe, military power is not the only kind of power, nor does it necessarily always prevail. There is also the moral power of those who dare to resist, people like Andrei Sakhorov, Vaclav Havel, and Lech Walesa. As dissidents, they didn't command armies; instead, they commanded immense moral authority. They stood for freedom, and ultimately they triumphed.

Last Friday, at that forum in Wroclaw, I had the privilege of presenting Freedom Awards to Ukrainians who embodied their nation's courageous resistance and indomitable spirit. One of the awardees was Nadiya Savchenko. She has been well known in Ukraine for many years as one of the first women to serve as a pilot in the Ukrainian Air Force. In 2014, she joined a volunteer battalion to fight separatist forces in the country's east.

Nadiya Savchenko was not present to receive her Freedom Award because tragically, outrageously, this hero of the fight for Ukrainian independence is imprisoned in a Russian jail. At every turn, Nadiya Savchenko has been courageous and unbowed—the embodiment of Ukraine's defiance of Russian aggression.

Captured while fighting in the east, she was handcuffed to a metal pipe, surrounded by armed men, and interrogated. When asked who was fighting the pro-Russian separatists, she answered, ''All of Ukraine.''

Held as a prisoner in Russia, she went on an 83-day hunger strike. Appearing

in a cage inside a courtroom, she refused to speak Russian, wore a T-shirt that displayed the Ukrainian trident, and held up a sign that read ''I was born Ukrainian, and I die Ukrainian.''

President Poroshenko awarded her the title ''Hero of Ukraine,'' and her fellow citizens elected her to Parliament. But, truly, she is a hero to all of us who seek to restore a Europe that is whole and free.

I presented the second Freedom Award to the Donetsk National University. Last year, pro-Russian separatists seized the city of Donetsk and declared a Soviet-style people's republic. Armed rebels took over the Donetsk's national university, the region's most prestigious college. They ousted the school's Ukrainian rector, ordered the Russification of the curriculum, and destroyed any semblance of academic freedom. Rather than submit, the rector and core faculty members left Donetsk and they transplanted the school roughly 500 miles to the west. Donetsk National University became Ukraine's first university in exile. It has been a struggle to survive, but this university has become a proud symbol of both academic freedom and Ukrainian independence.

The attack on Ukraine has not only galvanized Europe, it also focused the attention of Congress on European affairs like no other event perhaps since the end of the Cold War, certainly like no other event since I have been in the Senate.

On a bipartisan basis, Members of Congress admire and support Ukraine's stand for universal values and independence, and Congress has responded. In December, we passed the Ukraine Freedom Support Act authorizing the President to provide defensive military assistance to Ukraine and to tighten economic sanctions against Russia.

Through the European Reassurance Initiative, the administration has pledged $1 billion to bolster U.S. military deployments, to increase our training exercises, and to step up our partnerships with allies, including the Baltic States, Poland, Ukraine, Moldavia, and Georgia as they strengthen their own defenses. I was pleased to learn last week that the administration is planning to preposition tanks and other heavy weaponry in the Baltic States and in Eastern Europe to support training with regional allies and to show resolve in the face of Russian threats.

These are all important steps forward, but they are not sufficient. Within the Transatlantic Alliance and NATO, the United States remains the indispensable Nation. If there is going to be a renaissance of the alliance in the face of the Russian threat, then the United States must lead it with our European allies.

The United States must mobilize the alliance, our European partners, and international financial institutions, such as the IMF, to provide generous economic support to Ukraine because no amount of security assistance can offset an economic collapse in Kyiv.

We also must recognize that the challenge for Mr. Putin is not only geopolitical; it is ideological. He has mobilized a vast propaganda campaign against what he calls ''decadent'' Western values and Western-style democracy. The United States, along with our allies, must go on the offensive to champion our values and our democracy. Just as we did during the Cold War, we must develop a 21st-century United States Information Agency and a Radio Free Europe-style campaign to counter Russia in the information space, including in the competition of ideas and values.

While American leadership is essential, our European allies must also step up. NATO leaders made important spending pledges at the Wales Summit last September. Now we all need to make good on those commitments, including increasing defense budgets to respond to Russian threats.

As we confront a newly aggressive Russia, we should also take heart from the Transatlantic Alliance's remarkable track record of achievement, thanks in large part to American leadership. Over the last seven decades, we have risen to every major challenge—rebuilding Europe after World War II; maintaining a united front during the Cold War; liberating the captive nations of Eastern Europe and integrating them into a Europe whole and free; and today, standing united against the challenges of terrorism, Russian aggression, and a nuclear Iran.

The Russian threat to Eastern and Central Europe is very real. President Putin is an autocrat whose popularity is based largely on his determination to reassert Russia's domination over its neighbors. But we have the means to counter this threat.

To support Ukraine and other frontline states, we need vigorous U.S. leadership of the Transatlantic Alliance, we need a robust mobilization of the alliance's military and financial resources, and we need to engage Vladimir Putin aggressively in the competition of ideas and ideals.

Our friends in Ukraine are already in this fight. Our allies elsewhere in Central and Eastern Europe fear that they could be next. For the West to rise to this new challenge, the United States once again must be the indispensable Nation, and I know that here in the Senate we support that effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:50 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:50 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:53 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 25, 2015, at 9:50 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

KENNETH J. KOPOCIS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE PETER SILVA SILVA, RESIGNED.

JANET GARVIN MCCABE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE REGINA MCCARTHY, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL H. SHIELDS

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. VICTOR J. BRADEN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RICHARD P. BRECKENRIDGE

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 47:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. CHARLES D. MICHEL

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JANE E. BOOMER
SETH R. DEAM
JOSEPH F. DENE
ROBERT S. HALL
ROBERT S. HUME
JULIE J. R. HUYGEN
JOSEPH S. IMBURGIA
MATTHEW T. JARREAU
JOHN C. JOHNSON
RICHARD H. LADUE, JR.
LINELL A. LETENDRE
DEBRA A. LUKER
MATTHEW J. MULBARGER
MYNDA L. G. OHMAN
SHELLY W. SCHOOLS
SUZETTE D. SEUELL
SHANNON L. SHERWIN
MATTHEW D. VAN DALEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRANDON R. ABEL
ALICIA D. ABRAMS
LUIS J. ADAMES
GEORGE E. ADAMS
ISAAC E. ADAMS
JOHN F. ADAMS, JR.
BRIAN S. ADCOCK
JOHN T. AGNEW
ROBERT A. AIKMAN II
DANIEL O. AKEREDOLU
ADAM T. AKERS
JAMES D. AKERS II
MICHAEL S. ALBERS
MELISSA M. ALBLINGER
JOHN E. ALDERMAN
JAMES D. ALDRICH
STEPHEN C. ALDRIDGE
DAVID S. ALEXANDER
GARRY J. ALEXANDER
KERRI V. ALEXANDER
PERRY D. ALEXANDER
DANIEL M. ALFORD
PERRY G. ALFRED
BILLY S. ALLEN
CHRISTOPHER B. ALLEN
CHRISTOPHER IAN ALLEN
CHRISTOPHER W. ALLEN
KYLE S. ALLEN
JEARL C. ALLMAN
LANCE P. ALLRED
BRADLEY D. ALTMAN
MARK A. AMENDT
MATTHEW B. AMIG
CRAIG A. ANDERS
KELLY S. ANDERSON
MATTHEW E. ANDERSON
RYAN J. ANDERSON
STEPHEN G. ANDERSON
TODD R. ANDREWSEN
CHRISTOPHER J. ANGLIN

CASSANDRA P. ANTWINE
JAYVIN L. ARBORE
STEPHEN P. ARNOTT
SETH W. ASAY
ALBERT J. ASHBY
GEOFFREY MICHAEL ASHBY
SAMUEL L. ASTON
MICHAEL L. AUL
JENNIFER M. AUPKE
JAMES H. AUSTIN
NELSON AVILESFIGUEROA
GABRIEL C. AVILLA
GERRED J. AYRES
FRANK A. AZARAVICH
PAUL T. BABIARZ
MARCOS MANUEL BACA
NANCY L. BACCHESCHI
ERIC D. BADGER
JAMES A. BADGETT
NANCY E. BADGETT
JASON F. BAGGETT
JOHN M. BAKER
JUDD W. BAKER
MICHAEL B. BAKER
MICHAEL BALLAK
WILLIAM H. BALLARD
JUSTIN D. BALLINGER
RICKIE A. BANISTER
AARON B. BANKS
BENJAMIN P. BARBOUR
JEFFREY L. BARKER
JOSEPH F. BARNARD
NATHAN E. BARRETT
TRACIE A. BARRETT
SUZANNE M. BARROQUEIRO
JASON R. BARTA
JASON R. BARTELS
CAROLYN R. BARTLEY
DAVID R. BARTLEY III
ZACHARY D. BARTOE
CHARLES J. BARTON
JAMES R. BARTRAN II
PATRICK J. BASS
MICHAEL T. BATCHELOR, JR.
CLIFFORD M. BAYNE
RICHARD A. BAYSINGER
JONATHAN R. BEACH
JOSEPH DELANE BEAL
ROBERT J. BEAL
THOMAS M. BEAN
CHRISTOPHER J. BEATTIE
JOHN DONALD BEATTY
WILLIAM M. BEAUTER
CHRISTOPHER D. BEAVER
PETER L. BECK
BRIAN D. BEECHER
BRANDON C. BEERS
MEREDITH S. BEG
JOHNATHAN E. BENNETT
JOHN D. BENSON
ASHLEY J. BERG
MET M. BERISHA
DAVID BERRIOS
ANDREW P. BERVEN
SHAWN P. BESKAR
MIRCEA M. BIAGINI
ERNEST T. BICE
STEPHEN F. BICHLER
JOSHUA M. BIEDERMANN
TIMOTHY S. BIGGS
GARRET J. BILBO
RONNIE H. BIRGE, JR.
GARY L. BISHOP II
KEVIN J. BISHOP
SCOTT P. BLACK
EDMUND J. BLANCHET
MICHAEL J. BLAUSER
JAMES J. BLECH
ZAK S. BLOM
NATHAN D. BOARDMAN
PAUL A. BOBNOCK
TODD F. BODE
RYAN A. BODGE
MICHAEL DAREN BOE
JAMES T. BOEHM
STEVEN M. BOFFERDING
JASON M. BOISVERT
JOSEPH S. BOOKER, JR.
JEFFREY K. BOSQUE
JASON M. BOSWELL
MICHAEL L. BOSWELL
CARL B. BOTTOLFSON
JORDAN T. BOUNDS
JASON T. BOWDEN
ARNOLD H. BOWEN
GEOFFREY G. BOWMAN
JAMES D. BOYD
RONALD G. BOYD
JOE T. BOZARTH IV
WESLEY P. BRADFORD
KENNETH C. BRADLEY
JEFFERY R. BRANDENBURG
BROOKE K. BRANDER
SCOTT D. BRANDIMORE
ANTHONY BRANICK
MICHAEL J. BRANNON
GEOFFREY R. BRASSE
SEAN C. BRAZEL
MARK W. BREED
DAVID K. BREGAND
MATTHEW A. BRICE
DAVID S. BRISTOW
JACOB A. C. BRITTINGHAM
MATTHEW F. BROCKHAUS
TIMOTHY J. BRONDER
BENTLEY A. BROOKS
FRANK BROOKS
NATHAN D. BROSHEAR
STEVEN M. BROUSSARD
MARK EDWARD BROW
AARON B. BROWN
GABRIEL C. BROWN
KEVIN L. BROWN
LEROY BROWN, JR.
RHETT W. BROWN
JAMES R. BROWNING
PHILIP N. BROYLES
MATTHEW P. BRUNO
CHRISTOPHER L. BRYANT
PHILIP A. BRYANT
MATTHEW J. BUBAR
DOUGLAS C. BUCHHOLZ
BOBBY D. BUCKNER, JR.
JOHN T. BUCKREIS
HANS NICHOLAS BUCKWALTER
CHERYL N. BUEHN
JONATHAN J. BUIE
TRACY A. BUNKO
DONALD S. BURKE
BRYON J. BURKS
MATTHEW M. BURY
KEVIN R. BUSH
TOMMY R. BUTLER
BRIAN E. BUTSON
STEVEN S. BYRUM
EMERSONN C. CABATU
JOSHUA A. CADICE
JARED R. CAFFEY
PATRICK D. CAIN
PAUL J. CALHOUN
SEAN M. CALLAHAN
SEAN M. CALLAHAN
RICARDO L. A. CAMEL
LOUIS M. CAMILLI
KEVIN F. CAMPBELL
CHRISTOPHER C. CANNON
PEGGY L. CANOPY
KATHRYN RHONDA CANTU
ELLEN T. CANUPP
JUSTIN RICHARD CAPPER
CHRIS E. CARDEN
JONATHAN J. H. CARLE
RANDALL E. CARLSON
MARISSA ANNE CARLTON
KENNETH R. CARMICHAEL
JENNIFER A. BRANIGAN CARNS
ANDREW D. CARR
RENE N. CARRILLO
MICHEAL CARRIZALES
BENJAMIN L. CARROLL
PATRICK G. CARROLL
THOMAS M. CARSON
JOHN D. CARTER
RYAN D. CARVILLE
MATTHEW S. CASPERS
DAVID J. CASWELL
JONATHAN B. CATO
KRISTEN L. CAVALLARO
DAWN RENEE CECIL
JOHN M. CHAMBERLIN V
MARK D. CHANG
MARK A. CHAPA
GEORGE L. CHAPMAN
MICHELLE M. CHARLESTON
CHRISTOPHER M. CHASE
ANNALAURA CHAVEZ
STEPHEN J. CHENELLE
MICHAEL V. CHIARAMONTE
LOYD G. CHILDS
JASON C. CHISM
MYRON LEE CHIVIS
KELII H. CHOCK
PAUL J. CHOI
LISA H. CHRISTENSEN
MICHAEL WAYNE CHRISTENSEN
SCOTT D. CHRISTENSEN
TRAVIS E. CHRISTENSEN
TY CHRISTIAN
JOHN A. CHRISTIANSON
ALEXANDER C. CHRISTY
DONOVAN CIRINO
CORY L. CLAGETT
MICHAEL D. CLAPPER
NATHAN D. CLARK
THOMAS B. CLARK
MATTHEW R. CLAUSEN
WILLIAM J. CLAYTON III
JASON D. CLENDENIN
MICHAEL R. CLINE
SCOTT D. CLINE
RONALD V. CLOUGH
JASON E. CLUCHE
BRETT W. COCHRAN
KEVIN W. CODRINGTON
STEVEN L. COFFEE
DANIEL J. COIL
ANTHONY C. COLELLA
HECTOR L. COLLAZO
STEPHEN F. COLLETTI
JOHN M. COLLIER
JORDAN S. COLLINS
MATTHEW L. COLLINS
RAYMOND S. COLLINS
JEREMY W. COLVIN
ANDREW B. CONGDON
MICHAEL A. CONLAN
KIT R. CONN
WILLIAM G. CONNELLY, JR.
TIMOTHY J. COOK
TODD M. COOK
JAMES A. COOPER
CHRISTOPHER J. COPE
BRIAN L. COPPER, JR.
PAUL E. COPPER
JESSICA C. COREA
JOHN W. CORNETT
JESUS M. COSME
LOREN M. COULTER
CLAUDIO G. COVACCI
ANDREW P. CRABTREE
DANIEL A. CRAIG
BARRY A. CROKER
BRIAN O. CROOKS
BARRY D. CROSBY
RAY E. CROTTS II
JAMES S. CRUM
KAVERI T. CRUM
ERNEST CSOMA
PEDRO CUADRA III
RUSSELL B. CUENCA
ANDREW J. CULLEN
DEVIN J. CUMMINGS
SHANNON CHRISTOPHER CUMMINS
CHRISTOPHER K. CUNNINGHAM
JAMES A. CUNNINGHAM
ROBERT M. CURETON
DOUGLAS M. CURRAN
ROBERT D. CURRAN
BRENT W. CURTIS
KATRINA L. CURTIS
DAVID M. CZESAK
JUSTIN T. DAHMAN
KENNY W. DAILEY
TIMOTHY D. DALBY
DAVID C. DAMMEIER
JOHN J. DAMRON
TRACY A. DANIEL
ERIC C. DANIELSEN
MARY B. DANNER JONES
SEPTEMBER SHANNON DASILVA
KEVIN J. DAVIS
LINDA L. DAVIS
MARK E. DAVIS
MATTHEW T. DAVIS
ROBERT D. DAVIS
JERRY ALVIN DAVISSON
MINDY A. P. DAVITCH
JEFFERY H. DAY
TIMOTHY J. DAY
KENNETH A. DECHELLIS
DANIEL DEVON DECKER
STEPHAN R. DEHAAS
DELFIN ARIEL C. DELACRUZ
CIRO E. DELAVEGA III
ARMANDO DELEON, JR.
NORA E. DELOSRIOS
JEFFREY R. DENNIS
SCOTT E. DENNY
RANDALL D. DEPPENSMITH
SCOTT WILLIAM DERENZY
ANDREW C. DESANTIS, JR.
NATHAN K. DEVONSHIRE
KEVIN G. DEWEVER
HEIDI L. DEXTER
WILLIAM T. DEXTER
RICARDO M. DIAZ
ROBERT L. DIAZ
NICHOLAS K. DICAPUA
JACK T. DICKENSON
JUSTIN L. DIEHL
VIRGINIA MARIE DIEHL
BEAU EUGENE DIERS
HOLLIE N. DIESSELHORST
JEFFREY T. DIGSBY
MAXWELL D. DIPIETRO
WAYNE K. DIRKES
KURT J. DISTELZWEIG
JAMES J. DO
LEROY J. DOBY
GENE DOLLARHIDE
BRANDON L. DONALDSON
PETER J. DONNELLY
ABION C. DORHOSTI
TRACE E. DOTSON
JOSHUA R. DOTY
CURTIS W. DOUGHERTY
KYLE W. DOUGLAS
NATHANIEL J. DOUGLAS
BRANDON K. DOW
DAVID J. DRASS
MATTHEW S. DROSSNER
EPHANE B. DUBOSE
PATRICK O. DUGAN
JOHN E. DUNLAP
STEPHEN R. DURAN
ERIK L. DUTKIEWICZ
BRET ECHARD
JOHN F. ECK, JR.
DANIEL A. EDGAR
COREY K. EDMONDS
ALEX C. EDWARDS
NICHOLAS S. EDWARDS
SHAY L. EDWARDS
ANAMARIA ORTEGA EHRLER
STEPHEN T. EIDE
ADELEKE O. EKUNDAYO
BRIAN ELLIS
ELLEN M. ELLIS
MICHAEL P. ELLIS
BRIAN A. ELMERICK
WENDY A. EMMINGER
JONATHON C. ENGEMANN
ROCKWELL T. ENTWISTLE
MICHAEL J. EPPER
MATTHEW D. ERNEST
RICHARD D. ERNEST
DAVID R. ERPELDING
JOSHUA M. EVANS
SEAN M. EVANS
KEITH W. EVELAND
JOSE E. FADUL

CHARLES A. FALLON
OLUYOMI T. FAMINU
KENNETH C. FANN
SCOTT S. FANN
JAMES R. FARROW
TIMOTHY W. FAST
JOHN J. FAY, JR.
STACEY L. FERGUSON
KENNETH H. FETTERS
JASON A. FEURING
JEFFREY C. FEURING
ROBB B. FIECHTNER
CLARENCE FIELDER, JR.
JASON N. FIELDS
MICHAEL E. FIELDS
JESUS R. FIGUEROA
SHANA S. FIGUEROA
AARON W. FINKE
ANDREW J. FINKLER
SHAWN R. FINNICUM
BRETT W. FISH
ANDREW T. FISHER
DUANE L. FISHER
GARRETT C. FISHER
JOHN J. FLORKO
BRYAN R. FOLEY
ROBERT D. FOLKER, JR.
CHRISTOPHER J. FONTANA
JOHN V. FONTEJON
MATHEW L. FONTINEL
TIMOTHY J. FORBES
ROBERT B. FORE
JENNIFER L. FORMELL
TIMOTHY P. FOSTER
GRANT M. FOWLER
JOHN D. FOWLER
KIMBERLY A. FOX
JOHN D. FOY
JOSHUA T. FRAKES
DERRICK R. FRANCK
JERRY L. FRANKLIN, JR.
PAUL A. FRANTZ
PAUL W. FREDIN
NATHAN P. FREDRICKSON
JAMES A. FREEMAN
RACHEL G. FREESTROM
ANDREW M. FREY, JR.
FRANCIS D. FRIEDMAN
SAMUEL A. FRIEND
TIMOTHY J. FRITZ
BRIAN J. FRY
IAN FRYMAN
CHRISTIAN M. FULLER
KATHRYN K. GAETKE
JARRETT R. GAFFORD
DAVID E. GALLAGHER
JEFFREY E. GALLAGHER
BRENT K. GALLANT
FREDRICK GALLEGOS
MICHAEL L. GALLUCCI
ERIC C. GAMAUF
JOSEPH M. GAONA
ANDREW M. GARCIA
EVAN H. GARDNER
JEFFREY A. GARNER
VIDAL S. GARZA
JONATHAN J. GAUSTAD
LESLIE K. M. GEBHARDT
THOMAS J. GEFFERT
CHRISTOPHER D. GEISEL
MEGAN L. GENTRY
BLAKE H. GEORGE
JASON ROBERT GERARD
MICHAEL P. GERMANY
CHRISTOPHER G. GIBBS
ANDREW P. GILBERT
JONATHAN M. GILBERT
JUSTIN M. GILBRETH
KENDALL D. GILLESPIE
PATRICK D. GILLETTE
JASON F. GINEZ
JAMES M. GINGRAS
ROBERT G. GIOVANNETTI
JEFFREY A. GIPSON
ANDREW J. GLASS
ARCHIE E. GODWIN
SPENCER E. GODWIN
JOSEPH E. GOLDSWORTHY
MICHELLE L. GOMBAR
THOMAS E. GONZALEZ
SEAN C. GOODE
ADAM E. GOODPASTURE
PAUL A. GOOSSEN
EARTHAN J. GOULDING
MICHAEL E. GRAFF
ANNIE JENKINS GRAHAM
NICHOLAS C. GRAHAM
PAUL R. GRAHAM
SHARONDA L. GRAHAM
MONICA DZIUBINSKI GRAMLING
AARON T. GRAY
ANDREW J. GRAY
MARK C. GRAY
STEPHEN E. GRAY
BRIAN M. GREEN
JASON H. GREEN
JOHNNIE C. GREEN
JOSEPH GREEN
MATTHEW B. GREENWOOD
ROGER T. GREENWOOD
SCOTT A. GREGG
CASEY M. GRIDER
CHRISTIAN L. GRIMM
JONATHAN P. GRIMM
JEFFREY T. GRITTER
JOHN A. GROFF
MICHAEL A. GROWDEN
CHAD M. GUGAS
ERIK R. GUSTAFSON
ERICA MARIE L. HAAS
CURT A. HAASE
CHRISTOPHER HAGEMEYER
AARON S. HAGER
CARMEN JAIME HALE
DOUGLAS R. HALE
AMY N. HALL
DAVID MICHAEL HALL
JENNIFER H. HALL
LEVI B. HALL
TIMOTHY S. HALL
ZACHARY G. HALL
JAMES D. HALLAGIN
KENNY W. HAMLETT
JOHN S. HAMPEL
ERIN L. HANCOCK
LANCE C. HANNAN
CHRISTOPHER M. HANSON
MARK A. HANSON
MATTHEW E. HANSON
MICHAEL O. HANSON II
MATTHEW D. HARGIS
WILLIAM R. HARGROVE
THOMAS P. HARLEY
KENNETH M. HARNEY
JARED R. HARRIS
NATHAN S. HARRIS
CARINA R. HARRISON
MELISSA A. HARRISON
JAMEY L. HARTSEL
DAVID W. HATTON
JASON A. HAUFSCHILD
JESSICA M. HAUGLAND
JOSHUA B. HAWKINS
BRIAN D. HAWS
CASEY P. HAYDEN
ROBERT W. HEBERT
JEFFREY L. HEDGPETH
DANIEL H. HEIL
CHRISTIAN P. HELMS
FREDDIE L. HELTON
JASON W. HELTON
MARTIN D. HEMMINGSEN
RICHARD W. HENDERSON
CONSTANCE D. HENDRIX
CARMAN E. HENRY
HENRY G. HEREN IV
SCOTT J. HERMANN
CARLOS A. HERNANDEZ
TAYLOR O. HERRON
MICHAEL P. HETHCOCK
RANDALL J. HEUSSER
ELIA B. HICKIE
MARK M. HICKIE
NATHAN A. HIGGINS
GREG A. HIGNITE
GENE H. HILDEBRAND
NEAL H. HINSON
KRISTIN B. HIPPS
BRIAN G. HOBBS
SHAWN HOBBS
STEPHEN A. HOBBS
HAROLD E. HOBGOOD
KELLY K. HOBGOOD
GARRETT K. HOGAN
JEFFREY N. HOGER
MCARTHUR HOGLUND
ANDREW J. HOISINGTON
COURTNEY R. HOLLAND
TREVOR C. HOLLIS
JOSHUA M. HOLMES
KENNETH W. HOLMES
DAMION L. HOLTZCLAW
PATRICK J. HOOK
ROBERT E. HORN
ERIC M. HORST
DANIEL C. HOSLER
DOUGLAS H. HOUSE
BRAD N. HOWELL
GARY L. HOWELL II
LISA M. HOWELL
JAMES W. HUDSON
BRAD S. HUEBINGER
JAMES D. HUGHES
JASON G. HUGHES
RYAN J. HUGHES
SCOTT T. HUGHES
GREGORY P. HUHMANN
MATTHEW J. HUIBREGTSE
RICHARD J. HULUN
CLAY J. HUMPHREYS
STEPHEN M. HUNT
ANDREW P. HUNTER
RONALD D. HURT
AMY S. HUSMANN
JAMES M. HUSO
ALLEN D. HUSTED
DAVID D. HUSTON
ANDREW W. HYATT
MILO W. HYDE IV
JASON W. IDLEMAN
ROBERT D. IHRIG
RYAN C. INGLE
MICHAEL A. INGRAM
MATTHEW L. INSCOE
JOHN J. ISACCO
RYAN W. ISOKANE
TRACEY L. IVERSON
DERRICK J. IWANENKO
GREGORY L. IZDEPSKI
DEAN R. JACKSON
JANELLE T. H. JACKSON
JOSHUA A. JACKSON
MARCUS J. JACKSON IV
MARK D. JACOBSEN
HAYLEY S. JAMES
JOHN W. JANSHESKI
RODGER A. JENNRICH
BENJAMIN DENMARK JENSEN
JAMES C. JENSEN
MATTHEW V. JENSEN
COREY A. JEWELL
MICHAEL J. JEWELL
WILLIAM D. JIMENEZ
PETER F. JOHNCOUR
BENJAMIN A. JOHNSEN
BENJI L. JOHNSON
CHARLES C. JOHNSON
CREG A. JOHNSON
LEONARD W. JOHNSON, JR.
NICHOLAS J. JOHNSON
SCOTT C. JOHNSON
WILLIAM R. JOHNSON
JEREMY A. JOHNSTON
ROBERT L. JOHNSTON
CHRISTOPHER JONES
DAVID NATHANIEL JONES
HENRY L. JONES, JR.
NEVAH M. JONES
SEANA ARNETTE JONES
MICKEY JORDAN
THOMAS A. JOYNER
MICHAEL J. JUNGQUIST
BENJAMIN S. KALLEMYN
BENJAMIN A. KAMINSKY
DINA L. KAMPA
ASHOK N. KAPADIA
CHRISTOPHER S. KAPP
MIROSLAV P. KARAMARINOV
ANDREW S. KARAS
NATHANAEL L. KARRS
WILLIAM R. KASTNER
DAVID M. KAYA
MICHAEL A. KEARNEY
NATHAN T. KEETHLER
LANCE M. KEITHLEY
ELIZABETH GAYLE KELLER
GREGORY G. KELLER
MATTHEW D. KELLEY
BROOKE C. KELLY
MICHAEL S. KELLY
PAULA A. KELLY
DEBORAH A. KENDALL
ROME E. KENNEDY
ANDREW J. KENNEY
PHYLLIS H. KENT
JOSHUA J. KENYON
CHRISTOPHER G. KEOWN
CHRISTOPHER D. KETTERER
THOMAS R. KETTLES, JR.
UMAR M. KHAN
KORY S. KIEFER
TERRENCE R. KILGORE
NATHANIEL D. KILIAN
JOHNPAUL KILKER
KATHRYN M. KILKER
CHRISTOPHER J. KILLEEN
MARK E. KIMBALL
KYLE F. KIMBERLIN
JENNIFER L. KIMBROUGH
RICHARD K. KIND
BARBARA A. KING
NORBERT A. KING II
TERESA A. KING
WAYNE C. KINSEL
DOUGLAS KISBY
CHARLES E. KISTLER
JOHN M. KLOHR
JULIE A. KNECHTEL
DANIEL J. KNERL
SCOTT F. KNERR
JASON D. KNEUER
DAVID M. KNIGHT
DENNIS W. KNIGHT
EMILY A. KNIGHT
JANELLE L. KOCH
PATRICK J. KOLESIAK
JOSEPH J. KOMENSKY, JR.
BRANDON D. KOONCE
JOHN K. KOSOBUD
ALEXANDER J. KOUTSOHERAS
SETH M. KOVASKITZ
MATTHEW C. KOZAK
SHERI L. KRAUS
ANDREW B. KREBS
CHAUNCY V. KROL
JOSHUA L. KUBACZ
JASON E. KULCHAR
PAUL B. KULPA
AARON S. KUSTER
MEHTAP KUYKENDALL
ERIC J. LACOUTURE
CHRISTOPHER R. LAIRD
ZACHARY M. LAIRD
DANIEL S. LAMBERT
RODNEY W. LAMMERT
ROBERT E. LAMONTAGNE
KRISTINA L. LAMOTHE
KAREN ANNEFISHER LANDALE
MARK M. LANDEZ
JAMES E. LANDRETH
CHRISTOPHER M. LANDWEHR
AARON M. LANE
ERIC S. LANE
ADAM V. LANGBORGH
TREVOR J. LARIBEE
CRAIG D. LARSON
REID ALLEN LARSON
CHAD J. LASSERE
JOSE L. LASSO
CRAIG P. LAUDERDALE, JR.
CLAYTON R. LAUGHLIN

JONATHAN M. LAWSON
DARRYL M. LAYE
ANDREW T. LAZAR
DUNG T. LE
JEREMY D. LEACH
JOHN R. LEACHMAN
SEAN A. LEAMAN
JONATHAN A. LEATHERWOOD
ADAM T. LEE
ANDY C. LEE
JONATHAN C. LEE
ROBERT A. LEE, JR.
DEREK ANTONIO LEGGIO
CHRISTOPHER N. LEHTO
BRANDON R. LEIFER
ELLIOTT J. LEIGH
PETE A. LEIJA
SHANE LENSGRAF
SEANNA M. LESS
ANGELA M. LEWIS
SCOTT S. LEWIS
SEAN R. LEWIS
SUSANNAH B. LEWIS
RYAN B. LEY
MATTHEW J. LIEBER
DEREK L. LIGON
BRANDON J. LINGLE
DAVID M. LINTON
RICHARD C. LINTON
JUSTIN D. LITTIG
GIBB P. LITTLE
JOSEPH O. LITTLE
NEKITHA M. LITTLE
WARDRIAS D. LITTLE
MORGAN PARK LOHSE
ANTHONY B. LOMEDICO
JAMES EDWIN LONG III
JEFFREY D. LONG
ANDRES I. LOPEZ
ERICK DEAN LORD
SUSAN M. LOVELAND
BRIAN S. LOVELESS
STEVEN R. LOVETT
PATRICK R. LOWE
CRAIG A. LOWERY
KARALYNE SUZANNE LOWERY
RYAN E. LUCERO
ALFREDO LUGO
JOSHUA D. LUNDEBY
DOUGLAS C. LUNDIN
WILLIAM D. LUTMER
CHARLES W. LUTTER III
MICHAEL D. LYNN
STEPHEN G. LYON
AUDRA LYONS
FRANCIS R. LYONS IV
MASON E. MACGARVEY
JEFFREY M. MACK
ADAM S. MACKENZIE
SALLY C. MADDOCKS
ROBERT P. MAGEE
DANIEL L. MAGRUDER
MAX T. MAI
VALENTIN MALDONADO III
LISA W. MANDES
MATTHEW R. MANNING
MICHAEL J. MANNING
BRIAN J. MANSFIELD
DAVID W. MARCE
SHANE C. MARCHAND
NATHAN P. MARESH
FRANCIS R. MARINO
ADAM T. MARKEL
MICHAEL A. MARLATT
JEFFERY S. MARLER
KENNETH MARSHALL
TOMMY V. MARSHALL II
LEO A. MARTIN, JR.
MELVIN A. MARTIN
SCOTT C. MARTIN
TRACIE L. MARTIN
DIMITRI C. MARTINI
JOHN P. MASTERSON
BENJAMIN D. MATHER
ROBERT G. MATHIS
DAMON C. MATLOCK
CHARLES W. MAUZE
CARL WILLIAM MAYMI
DAVID A. MAYS
CHRISTOPHER M. MAZZEI
JOHN S. MCAFEE
CHRISTOPHER R. MCALEAR
JOSEPH D. MCCANE
BETHANY JOY MCCARTHY
MICHAEL A. MCCARTNEY
PATRICK K. MCCLINTOCK
SEAN R. MCCLUNE
ROBERT C. MCCONNELL
JESSE S. MCCULLOCH
CRAIG A. MCDOWELL
ROBERT J. MCFARLAND
MICHAEL P. MCFEETERS
JENNIFER A. MCGEE
JOSEPH A. MCGILL
KEVIN T. MCGLONE
RYAN S. MCGOUGH
DAVID J. MCGRAW
MATTHEW S. MCGUINNESS
BRYAN T. MCGUIRE
DANIEL J. MCGUIRE
DOUGLAS P. MCHAM
JEFFREY A. MCKIERNAN
SAMUEL L. MCKINSEY
ZACHARIAH D. MCKISSICK
WILLIAM J. MCLAUGHLIN III
DOUGLAS R. MCLEAN
KEAGAN L. MCLEESE
MICHAEL L. MCLEOD
KEVIN A. MCMAHON
BRIAN R. MCMENAMY
CHARLES L. MCMULLEN
PETER R. MCWILLIAM
CLIFFORD ALAN MEADOWS
WILLIAM P. MEDLICOTT
STANLEY MEDYKOWSKI
TIMOTHY J. MEERSTEIN
MARIE L. MEIHLS
STEPHEN L. MEISTER
RYAN T. MENATH
ANDREW S. MENSCHNER
LACRESHA A. MERKLE
TREVOR T. MERRELL
MATTHEW D. MESHANKO
ANGELA M. MESSING
CLINT A. MICHAELSON
KENT T. MICKELSON
ALEX D. MIGNERY
JAMES A. MIKES
BENJAMIN A. MILARCH
CARL F. MILLER
CHRISTOPHER J. MILLER
MICHAEL A. MILLER
NATHANIEL J. MILLER
PAUL A. MILLER
ROBERT D. MILLER
SAMUEL R. MINK
ADAM L. MINNICH
CLINTON P. MINTZ
ANDREW C. MISCISIN
MELODY H. MITCHELL
ROBERT B. MITCHELL
CARY D. MITTELMARK
MERRELL D. MOBLEY
KYLE A. MOE
CHRISTOPHER L. MOELLER
JOSEPH E. MONACO
VINCENT J. MONTANO, JR.
KELLY M. MONTIER
DAVID P. MONTMINY
KELLI R. MOON
BRAD W. MOONEY
CRISTINA M. MOORE URRUTIA
CHRISTOPHER M. MOORE
GARY J. MOORE
NICHOLAS J. MOORE
ROBERT L. MOORE
THOMAS R. MOORE
JAMES E. MORAN
CRAIG L. MORASH
MATTHEW R. MORELLO
BRYAN K. MORGAN
NATHAN L. MORGAN
TODD J. MORIN
BRADLEY J. MORRELL
MICHAEL R. MORRIS
PAUL J. MORRIS
WYATT E. MORRISE
JAMIE R. MORRISON
ARTHUR L. MORSE III
MATTHEW R. MOUNTCASTLE
CHRISTOPHER P. MULDER
ERIC C. MULLER
PAUL L. MULLER
CREIGHTON A. MULLINS
ZENSAKU M. MUNN
DENNIS P. MURPHY II
JONATHAN D. MURPHY
PAUL B. MURPHY
NATHAN M. MURRAY
JAMIL I. MUSA
ERIC M. MUSIC
SEAN S. MUSIL
DAVID W. MYRICK
MICHELLE I. NASH
JEFFERY A. NAYLOR
ANGELIQUE NELSON
THOMAS A. NELSON
JENNIFER R. NERIS
PAUL N. NETCHAEFF
SEAN D. NEYLON
JOSEPH EMRON NICHOLAS
TYLER A. NIEBUHR
MATTHEW J. NIENDORF
RONALD F. NIGRO
JAMES K. NILSEN
WILLIAM H. NODINE, JR.
MEERA ANNE DAROY NOE
DANIEL J. NOEL
RANDALL B. NOEL
SCOTT E. NOKE
TREVOR C. NOLAN
RONALD E. NOLTE
BRIAN M. NOVCHICH
GEORGE B. NUNO
MATTHEW E. NUSSBAUM
MARK D. NYBERG
MATTHEW B. OBENCHAIN
CHRISTOPHER OCCHIUZZO
THOMAS P. OHARA
STEVEN K. OHLMEYER
ANDREW D. OILAND
AMANDA L. OKESON
KENDALL W. OKESON
JASON K. OKUMURA
JEREMY V. OLDHAM
STEPHEN T. OLEARY
JAMAL OLIVER
DOUGLAS J. OLSON
DUSTIN E. OLSON
MATTHEW T. OLSON
ROBERT BRYAN OLVIS
TARA L. OPIELOWSKI
JAMES R. ORD
WILFRED G. OREILLY
HECTOR M. ORTEGA
MICHAEL L. ORTEGO
RICHARD C. ORZECHOWSKI
NATHANIEL S. OSBORNE
COREY C. OTOOL
WILLIAM F. OTT, JR.
JERRY OTTINGER
NATHAN L. OWEN
RYAN K. OWEN
JEREMY J. OWENS
GRANT M. PAAP
ERICK PACHECO
MICHAEL S. PADILLA
CHRISTOPHER M. PALACIOS
DOUGLAS J. PALAGI
LAUREN W. PALAGI
CLINTON N. PALMER
MAXX E. PALMER II
SILA PANG
JEREMY PANKOSKI
JOHN J. PANTAGES
SCOTT R. PAPINEAU
JORGE A. PARGAS
SEAN PARK
JASON H. PARKER
STEVEN J. PARKER
ANTHONY J. PARKINSON
STEPHEN R. PARKS
MELISSA M. PARRY
JOSEPH J. PARSONS
ALAN J. PARTRIDGE
JEREMIAH W. PARVIN
JAMES M. PASQUINO
MICHAEL PASTUZYN
JAMES A. PATE
AANAN N. PATEL
JASON VICTOR PAUL
MICHAEL W. PAULUS
PAUL R. PAWLUK
WILLIAM P. PEARSALL
JOHN M. PECARINA
ALEXANDER J. PELBATH
RANDAL W. PENDLETON
DAVID PENNINGTON
DAVID PENUELA
WILHEM A. PEREZ
PAUL A. PERRY
SABINE U. PETERS
ANDREW S. PETERSON
GINA A. PETERSON
NICHOLAS J. PETREN
DAVID J. PETRUCCI
NICOLE M. PETRUCCI
JASON F. PFLUG
NICOLE L. PHELAN
ROBERT A. PHELPS
WILLIAM W. PHILLIPS
BRYAN MICHAEL PICKETT
MICHAEL V. PICKETT
JOHN W. PICKLESIMER
APRIL D. PIERCE
TROY B. PIERCE
JESSE A. PIETZ
NATHAN J. PIFER
LOUIS S. PINE
JASON T. PINKERTON
RALPH E. PIPER II
STEPHEN G. PIPPEL
EDUARDO H. PIRES
CARL B. PITTS
JON A. PITTS
THOMAS B. PLACE
MICHAEL C. POCHET
BRADY J. POE
WILLIAM J. POGUE
ANGELA M. POLSINELLI
MATTHEW L. POMMER
MICHAEL S. PONTIUS
JEFFREY MICHAEL POPLIN
NEIL B. POPPE
JON W. PORATH
ALEC E. PORTER
ANTHONY J. POSADA
RANDALL R. POULIOT
DAVID A. POUSKA
MICHAEL WILLIAM POVILUS
TRAVIS RICHARD PRATER
JUSTIN K. PRESTON
MELANIE M. PRESUTO
MICHAEL D. PROVINS
ANDREW GRAHAM PRUE
KRISTOPHER A. PRUITT
MATTHEW A. PSILOS
TOMASZ A. PUDLO
LANDON E. QUAN
JEFFREY J. QUICK
KEITH E. QUICK
WENDY L. QUICK
ERIC B. QUIDLEY
JOSEPH A. QUINN
QAIS RABADI
MATTHEW R. RABE
JOHN R. RACZKOWSKI
TRIGG E. RANDALL
MICHAEL F. RASINSKI
TIMOTHY DANIEL RAY
STEVEN W. READY
PATRICK M. REAGAN
JOHANNA KATHRYN REAM
EMIL LAWRENCE REBIK
KARL H. RECKSIEK
RICHARD J. REED
CARRIE E. REGISTER
JESSICA L. REGNI
CHRISTOPHER R. REHM
JEREMY R. REICH
SCOTT J. REIN

MICHAEL S. RELLICK
STACIE A. REMBOLD
KARIN E. REYNOLDS
MATTHEW E. REYNOLDS
ERIK PAUL RHYLANDER
PRESTON L. RHYMER
DUANE E. RICHARDSON
LLOYD S. RICHARDSON IV
JAMISON L. RIDDLE
PATRICK D. RIENZI
JOHN J. RIESTER
DANIEL C. RIGSBEE
EDWARD T. RIVERA
JOEL RIVERA
ERIC J. RIVERO
JEFFREY J. RIVERS
TERESA D. RIVERS
NEAL R. ROACH
TYLER W. ROBARGE
BRIAN V. ROBERTS
MICHAEL L. ROBERTS
GREGORY C. ROCKWOOD
BREANNE C. ROECKERS
SHANE D. ROGERS
ALAN T. ROHRER
MARK C. ROMAN
JASON B. ROOKS
DEREK A. ROOT
DARNELL ROPER
ALFRED J. ROSALES
DOMINIC A. ROSS
JASON F. ROSSI
CARL B. ROTERMUND
STEWART L. ROUNTREE
FRANK W. ROVELLO
ADAM C. RUDOLPHI
BEN M. RUDOLPHI
DANIEL E. RUETH
NICOLE K. RUFF
WILFREDO RUIZ
AARON L. RUONA
KAREN P. RUPP
ANGELINDA D. RUSH
CON A. RUSLING
JEREMY J. RUSSELL
NICHOLAS J. RUSSO
KYLENE L. RUTH
JEFFREY L. RUTHERFORD
ANDREW R. RUTKOWSKI
JESSICA N. RUTTENBER
TIMOTHY M. RYAN
CHRISTOPHER J. RYDER
ROBERT W. RYDER, JR.
WILLIAM R. RYERSON
REBECCA SADLER
TROY R. SAECHAO
DON R. SALVATORE
DALE S. SANDERS
JEREMIAH B. SANDERS
LEE T. SANDUSKY
RYAN A. SANFORD
TRACI A. SARMIENTO
JACQUELINE A. SARTORI
MARTHA J. SASNETT
LUKE M. SAUTER
JOSHUA M. SCHAAD
JESSI R. SCHAEFER
JOHN R. SCHANTZ
JOSH C. SCHECHT
BENJAMIN SCHEUTZOW
JAMES E. SCHIESER
NICHOLAS S. SCHINDLER
TRACY A. SCHMIDT
ERNEST R. SCHMITT
ROBERT N. SCHOENEBERG
ANDREW SCHOFIELD
MATTHEW KENNETH SCHROEDER
SCOTT J. SCHROEDER
GREGORY N. SCHULKE
PAUL D. SCHULTZ
AVERY D. SCHUTT
KARL R. SCHWENN
GEORGE W. SCONYERS III
AMANDA K. SCOUGHTON
CLIFFORD N. SCRUGGS
JONATHON S. SEAL
CHRISTOPHER G. SEAMAN
JUSTIN D. SECREST
WILLIAM A. SEEFELDT
JASON L. SEELHORST
ANTHONY EDWARD K. SEKI
LESLIE L. SEMRAU
NEIL R. SENKOWSKI
ADAM J. SERAFIN
CARLOS A. SERBIA
RYAN D. SERRILL
BRIAN R. SERVANT
BRENDAN M. SHANNON
RICHARD R. SHARPE
ROBERT R. SHAW, JR.
ADAM W. SHELTON
NATHAN G. SHELTON
FRANKLYN K. SHEPHERD, JR.
JOHN C. SHERINIAN II
MICHAEL J. SHIELDS
BORIS SHIF
DAN J. SHINOHARA
MATTHEW P. SHIPSTEAD
JOSHUA N. SHONKWILER
MATTHEW R. SHRULL
JEFFREY D. SHULMAN
JOSEPH H. SHUPERT
WESLEY R. SIDES
PAUL D. SIEGLER
MICHAEL S. SIMIC
CHRISTOPHER E. SIMMONS
JEFFREY D. SIMMONS
RYAN S. SIMMS
MICHAEL ANDREW SIMONICH
MICHAEL J. SIMONS
BRYAN P. SIMPSON
CHAD S. SITZMANN
MARK D. SKALKO
JACK SKILES III
ROBERT J. SKOPECK, JR.
CHRISTOPHER A. SKOW
JAMES SLATON
MARTIN J. SLOVINSKY
JONATHAN R. SMITH
PETER M. SMITH
RACHEL K. SMITH
REGINALD L. SMITH
ROBERT SHELBY SMITH
ROCHELLE D. SMITH
SCOTT E. SMITH
WILLIAM CHARLES SMITH
SOL R. SNEDEKER
RYAN E. SNIDER
SAMUEL M. SNODDY
DAVID N. SNODGRASS
MATTHEW P. SNYDER
JASON G. SOMERS
PAUL N. SOMERS
THOMAS E. SONNE
PAUL RUSSELL SORTOR
LEWIS G. SORVILLO
WILLIAM G. SOTO
JOEL R. SOUKUP
BOONE C. SPENCER
KENDALL W. SPENCER
RAYMOND H. K. SPOHR
BRIAN J. SPORYSZ
JULIE SPOSITO SALCEIES
ZAN A. SPROLES
BERNARD R. SPRUTE
JEREMY E. ST LOUIS
CHEO F. STALLWORTH
DAWN STANDRIDGE
MATTHEW F. STANLEY
STUART A. STANTON
EDWARD J. STAPANON III
BROC L. STARRETT
BRUCE A. STAUFER
TROY T. STAUTER
CHAD J. STEEL
ERIC D. STEELE
MICHAEL D. STEFANOVIC
TRAVIS H. STEPHENS
KAREN L. STEVENS
ROBERT D. STEVENS
HELEN STEWART
ZACHARY ROY STEWART
MICHAEL J. STOCK
ERIK STEVEN STOCKHAM
JAMES L. STONE
SCOTT J. STONE
RANDON L. STORMS
JEFFREY P. STRANGE
BRIAN K. STRICKLAND
RICHARD R. STRINGER
MATTHEW D. STROHMEYER
PAUL B. STROM
CHRISTOPHER S. STROUP
PAUL D. STUCKI
JACQUELINE M. SUKHLALL
DAVID A. SULHOFF
JOEY P. SULLIVAN
MARK A. SULLIVAN
MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN
JOSE R. SURITA, JR.
TIMOTHY P. SUTTON
WALTER B. SWAIN III
MICHAEL DAVID SWARD
LAYLA M. SWEET
RICHARD W. SWENGROS
JENNIE A. Y. SWIECHOWICZ
MARK T. SZATKOWSKI
EDWARD V. SZCZEPANIK
YURI P. TAITANO
JOHN A. TALAFUSE
KATHERINE A. TANNER
DARIN R. TATE
THOMAS M. TAUER
YOLANDA S. TAYLOR
BRANDON J. TELLEZ
BRIAN S. TEMPLE
LINDA J. THIERAUF
JASON T. THIRY
ILLYA K. THOMAS
JAMES J. THOMAS
JEREMEY T. THOMAS
WILLIAM D. THOMAS
MICHAEL A. THOMPSON
SHAUNDAL T. THOMPSON
WILBUR L. THOMPSON
LEE C. THOMSON
SCOT A. THORNHILL
PAUL B. THORNTON
DYLAN G. THORPE
JOSEPH W. TIMBERLAKE
DAVID W. TIPTON
JOSEPH C. TOBIN
JUSTIN C. TOLLIVER
PHOENIX L. TORRIJOS
LINDSAY M. TOTTEN
KELLY R. TRAVIS
KEVIN M. TREAT
BRIAN J. TREBOLD
ROBERT J. TREST
JOSHUA J. TROSCLAIR
JOSHUA W. TULL
THOMAS A. TURNER
MATTHEW L. TUZEL
MARK C. UBERUAGA
MICHAEL S. UEDA
VINCENT N. ULLOA
JEFFREY M. ULMER
JOHN M. URSO
VHANCE V. VALENCIA
KEITH W. VANDERHOEVEN
GEORGE H. VANDEVERE
LANCE A. VANN
RYAN M. VANVEELEN
JONATHAN A. VAROLI
CLINTON B. VARTY
LEWIS M. VAUGHN III
JAVIER VELAZQUEZ
PETER J. VENTRES, JR.
MARTIN D. VERMEULEN
STEVEN L. VESTEL
ANTHONY L. VIEIRA
JOSEPH R. VIGUERIA
DERRICK S. VINCENT
SETH K. VOLK
PAUL K. VOSS
ANDREW R. VRABEC
ERIC S. WADDELL
JOHN P. WAGEMANN
JEREMY C. WAGNER
TERRY L. WAGNER
TIMOTHY S. WAGNER
ROBERT D. WAIDER
STEVEN D. WALD
CORY WILLIAM WALDROUP
IAN N. WALKER
THOMAS V. WALKER
JOSEPH D. WALL
BRIAN D. WALLER
BRYAN J. WALTER
ERIC J. WARD
ROBERT A. WARD
RANDY D. WARREN
DAVID L. WASHER
ANGELA MARIE WATERS
RICHARD H. WATERS
JOSEPH P. WATSON
JUSTIN T. WATSON
ERIN OWENS WEATHERLY
BARRY S. WEAVER
JEFFREY S. WEBB
TIMOTHY R. WEBB
JESSICA A. WEDINGTON
MARK A. WEGER
KRISTIN J. WEHLE
SHANE A. WEHUNT
HAYES J. WEIDMAN
JOSEF R. WEIN
JEFFREY E. WEISLER
CHRISTOPHER M. WELCH
JOSHUA N. WENNRICH
CARRIE E. WENTZEL
DANIEL C. WERNER
JOHNNY L. WEST
KELLY WEST
DANIEL L. WESTER
INGEMAR S. WESTPHALL
GLENDON C. WHELAN
JENNIFER L. WHETSTONE
DOUGLAS W. WHITE
TIMOTHY G. WHITE
TANDY R. WHITEHEAD
JASON A. WHITFORD
BENJIMAN C. WHITTEN
NICHOLAS J. WHRITENOUR
RYAN M. WICK
TONY M. WICKMAN
RAY BLAINE WIDDISON
DORSEY C. WILKIN
MICHAEL J. WILLEN
JASON P. WILLEY
DAVID W. WILLHARDT
CRAIG L. WILLIAMS
EDWARD C. WILLIAMS, JR.
KELLEN M. WILLIAMS
RYAN R. WILLIAMS
SCOTT J. WILLIAMS
TIMOTHY S. WILLIAMS
TODD C. WILLIAMS
DEREK L. WILLIAMSON
CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIS
SHAWN M. WILLIS
WILLIAM S. WILLIS
BILLY R. WILSON, JR.
JOHN D. WILSON
LARA L. WILSON
STEPHANIE Q. WILSON
STEPHEN W. WILSON
THOMAS K. WILSON
JEREMY D. WIMER
JAMES L. WINKELHAKE
TRAVIS M. WINSLOW
CYNTHIA E. WITTNAM
JASON B. WOLFF
BRYAN K. WONG
RYAN M. WONG
KRISTEN N. WOOD
MICHAEL R. WOODRUFF
MARC A. WOODWORTH
WILLIAM D. WOOTEN
BRADLEY R. WORDEN
DAVID A. WRAY
STEVEN P. WYATT
REBECCA A. WYFFELS
DAVID J. WYRICK
MICHAEL L. YAMZON
ROBERT J. YATES III
ROWDY E. YATES
EDWARD F. YONCE
MATTHEW J. YOUNGMEYER
FERNANDO L. ZAPATA
GREGORY M. ZELINSKI

JASON M. ZEMLER
NICHOLAS G. ZERVOS
MATTHEW J. ZIEMANN
JOHN C. ZINGARELLI
BARBARA L. ZISKA
CAROLOS J. ZOURDOS
BRANDON A. ZUERCHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

AFSANA AHMED
KENNETH A. ARTZ
ANDREW R. BARKER
CHELSEA L. BARTOE
PETER THOMAS BEAUDETTE, JR.
NAOMI PORTERFIELD DENNIS
LAUREN N. DIDOMENICO
PAUL E. DURKES
SEAN M. ELAMETO
TODD J. FANNIFF
MICHAEL J. FELSEN
THOMAS A. GABRIELE
BRIAN R. GAGNE
CHARLES J. GARTLAND
JAMES G. GENTRY
RYAN A. HENDRICKS
MATTHEW EDWARD HILL
SCOTT A. HODGES
MICHAEL TODD HOPKINS
CHRISTOPHER DAVID JONES
JACK M. JONES, JR.
JASON F. KEEN
TYSON D. KINDNESS
MICHAEL G. KING
MATTHEW T. LUND
AMER MAHMUD
KRISTIN K. MCCALL
MATTHEW N. MCCALL
NICHOLAS WILLIAM MCCUE
SARAH M. MOUNTIN
JOHN MERRITT PAGE
TRACY A. PARK
LISA M. RICHARD
DAVID R. SCHICHTLE
CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH SCHUBBE
PATRICK M. SCHWOMEYER
JUSTIN A. SILVERMAN
MAXWELL S. SMART
JACQUELINE M. STINGL
FELIX I. SUTANTO
SARA A. SWART
BRIAN D. TETER
GREGORY J. THOMPSON
SCOTT A. VAN SCHOYCK
ROBERT EUGENE VORHEES II
CHARLES G. WARREN
DANIEL J. WATSON
REGGIE D. YAGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHN C. ROCKWELL
NEIL L. SCHWIMLEY

To be major

TRAVIS A. ARNOLD LLOYD
JENNIFER J. BARTLETT
MAX M. CHAE
CHARLES H. CHESNUT III
JOONE H. CHOI
MELANIE E. DEYSS
PHILIP V. PARRY
CRAIG S. POSTER
KEVIN J. RYCYNA
MARION M. SWALL
STEPHEN J. TORRES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ANA M. APOLTAN
ALDO TTINOCO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRIAN H. ADAMS
RONALD SCOTT ADAMS
BRADLY ADAM CARLSON
MARC G. CARNS
ANDREA R. CARROLL
MARK E. COON
HEATHER NOELLE CORROTHERS
TERRY LEE COULTER
ALLISON ANNE DEVITO
HUGH HAMMOND DUBOSE III
CHRISTOPHER M. DYKSTRA
PHILLIP LEE ERVIE
BENJAMIN D. FORD
ERIC HOWARD FRENCK
NICHOLAS C. FROMMELT
KEVIN WAYNE GOTFREDSON
ANDREW G. HALLDIN
AIMEE ROCHELLE HANEY
JEFFREY J. HANNON
JASON MICHAEL HARLEY
THERESA LYNN HILTON
NOEL E. HORTON
CHRISTIE A. JONES
KELBY DANIEL KERSHNER
AARON DOUGLAS KIRK
DEAN W. KORSAK
SARAH LORETTA KRESS
MALCOLM LAFRANCE LANGLOIS
JEFFREY JOSEPH LOREK
ALEXANDER LEONARDO LOWRY
KURT ALAN MABIS
MEGAN CRAMER MALLONE
JACOB ROBERT MARSHALL
MICAH MCMILLAN
TED ADAM NEWSOME
MICHAEL EDWARD OBRIEN
STELLA JEAN PHILLIPS
BRIANNE ELIZABETH RAHN
MATTHEW WALLACE RAMAGEWHITE
JACOB ALLEN RAMER
MATTHEW GAYLORD REAM
CHRISTOPHER LANE SANDERS
MICHAEL ALAN SCHRAMA
RICHARD JOSEPH SCHRIDER
MICHAEL AARON SCHWARTZ
LAURENANN L. SHURE
JEREMY NATHANIEL SNYDER
JAMES RONALD STEELMAN III
JARROD H. STUARD
JESSICA L. SWITZER
ROBERT MATHEWS THOMPSON
RACHEL LYNNE VAN MAASDAM
MATTHEW D. VAN MAASDAM
MELVIN ARTHUR VAUGHN II
KARL JEFFREY VOGEL
DAVID LEE WALKER
MARY JEAN WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JESSE L. JOHNSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DAVID G. JONES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

RAYMOND L. PHUA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

JOHN M. BRADFORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

STEVE J. CHUN
CHRISTOPHER J. COCHRANE
BRYAN S. NEWBROUGH
LUCKEY C. REED
BENJAMIN R. SIEBERT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

STEVEN L. ISENHOUR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JOSEPH D. GRAMLING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MARK S. SNYDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KEITH J. MCVEIGH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

LISA M. STREMEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

MICHAEL N. CLEVELAND
MICHAEL W. SUMMERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MATTHEW H. BROOKS
JAY D. HANSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

GIL A. DIAZCRUZ
DAVID S. RASMUSSEN
YESENIA R. ROQUE
RICHARD T. SCHUTE, JR.
SOLIMAN G. VALDEZ

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

THOMAS F. MURPHY III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

ARSLAN S. CHAUDHRY
ANDREW D. SILVESTRI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BENJAMIN M. BOCHE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

MICHAEL J. ELLIOTT

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 6222:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHN R. BARCLAY

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CHARLES C. ADAMS, JR., OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND.

MARY CATHERINE PHEE, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN.

NANCY BIKOFF PETTIT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA.

GREGORY T. DELAWIE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO.

IAN C. KELLY, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GEORGIA.

JULIETA VALLS NOYES, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ANNE ELIZABETH WALL, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING COMCAST FOUNDER RALPH ROBERTS

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great man, Ralph Roberts, who passed away last week at 95.

Mr. Roberts is a true example of the American Dream. He was born to a family of Russian immigrants, and grew up watching his father manage a chain of drugstores in New York City. He inherited his father's work ethic, and following his service in the Navy, he bought a small cable company in 1963 and founded Comcast.

Today, Comcast is headquartered in Philadelphia, and many of my constituents are proud Comcast employees. It's the largest Internet, cable, and telephone service provider to residential homes in our country, and has led the way in the telecommunications industry.

Mr. Roberts' spirit will live on not only in his successful business, but in his legacy of charity and generosity in the Philadelphia area. He was truly a remarkable and inspiring man, and he will be sorely missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LEADERSHIP AND INGENUITY OF STEVEN LEVESQUE

HON. BRUCE POLIQUIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Steven Levesque on earning the prestigious Community Excellence Award. I join the Association of Defense Communities (ADC) in recognizing Mr. Levesque's tireless efforts to cultivate business and employ Mainers at the former Naval Air Station Brunswick, now known as Brunswick Landing, and the former Topsham Annex, now known as the Topsham Commerce Park.

As Executive Director of Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority (MRRA), Mr. Levesque has worked with an exceptional team to swiftly transform the base property from military to civilian functionality.

The success of MRRA's Reuse Master Plans for the former military installation serves as a model for innovative business practice in the state of Maine and beyond. Already, Mr. Levesque and MRRA have helped to bring 72 total businesses to Brunswick Landing and the result of their extraordinary efforts is 617 new Maine jobs. In addition to the Brunswick Landing, the Topsham Commerce Park provides residential space as well as office, retail and civic uses for residents.

Although the surrounding community of this project is not in my Congressional district, I recognize how critical the work of Mr. Levesque and MRRA is to my Second District constituents, the businesses that employ them, and the overall health of Maine's economy.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Levesque on his leadership and ingenuity as the Executive Director of MRRA. Our great state thanks and applauds Mr. Levesque for his hard work as he accepts the Community Excellence Award.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. NICK MANGANARO ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Mr. Nick Manganaro as he celebrates his 90th birthday. Nick began working at Medico Industries at the young age of 13, and he has continually served my local community in his duties at the company's Hanover Township facility.

The son of Italian immigrants, Nick graduated from Pittston High School in 1943. He proudly went on to serve in the Navy during WWII and was stationed in Panama until 1946. Upon returning to Pittston, Nick immediately resumed his work at Medico Electric Motor Company.

To this day, Nick is still employed by Medico Industries, where he has worked for 77 years. His work ethic is unparalleled. A wearer of many hats, Nick has worked on the rigging crew, operated cranes, drove tractor trailers, and maneuvered all of the construction equipment. Within the company, Nick is considered to be a father figure to many employees, always willing to provide support and guidance to those in need. He is admired by his coworkers and customers for his bright attitude, modest demeanor, and dedication to the company.

Though he cannot perform all the job functions he once could, Nick continues to work seven days per week—a habit that is indicative of his tireless, hard-working character. He still lives at the Manganaro family homestead, where he resides next door to his sister, Maria Capolarella Montante. The two have one living brother, Joe Manganaro. Outside of work, Nick is a member of St. Rocco's Parish in Pittston, and is a life-long member of the San Cataldo Society in Pittston, a social organization that is united in celebrating its member's Italian heritage, familial values, and religious principles.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mr. Nick Manganaro on this important milestone, and I admire his diligent work ethic and sense of commitment. I thank Nick for his service to our country and community, and I hope that he will celebrate this year in the company of his family and friends.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY JOHN DUNCAN

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Executive Assistant U.S. Attorney John Duncan. Duncan bravely served our nation as a soldier in the U.S. Army before serving our nation in the U.S. Attorney's Office for 27 years. As Mr. Duncan retires, it is my honor to recognize such a distinguished citizen and civil servant.

Assistant Attorney Duncan, after graduating from the University of Buffalo in 1969, served in the U.S. Army from 1969 through 1972, being stationed at the White House from 1970 to 1972. During his time in the military, Duncan earned the Presidential Service Medal and the Joint Service Accommodation Medal.

Following his time in the military, Assistant Attorney Duncan attended Syracuse University Law School where he is still heavily involved today as an adjunct professor. Following his graduation from Syracuse University Law, Duncan began working in private practice in 1975 and continued through 1978. He then moved to the public sector working in the Onondaga County District Attorney's office as the Chief Assistant District Attorney from 1978 through 1988 and was named the Chief Homicide Prosecutor in 1985 and served until 1988. Duncan then moved to the U.S. Attorney's office as an Assistant U.S. Attorney until 1999 when he was promoted to Executive Assistant.

Assistant Attorney Duncan has received numerous commendations and awards throughout his career in Central New York, including: an Onondaga County Sheriff's Department Commendation for the prosecution of People v. Billy Blake in 1987, the U.S. Department of Justice, Executive Office of United States Attorneys Director's Award for Outstanding Performance in Law Enforcement in 1994, the Above and Beyond the Call Award from CONTACT Community Services for leadership and volunteer service to community substance abuse prevention in 1996, the Edward J. Speno Award from the New York State Federation of Professional Health Educators for distinguished community service in support of substance abuse prevention programs in 1996, a Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General commendation for the prosecution of Oneida Research Services, Inc. in 1998, the American Bar Association Division for Public Education Award for commitment to Youth Court Programs in 2004, the American Probation and Parole Association award for outstanding service to Youth Courts in 2005, the U.S. District Court Recognition Award for support to the Open Door to Justice Program in 2006, and a Syracuse Police Department Commendation for the prosecution of the "Elk Block" Syracuse street gang in 2006.

During his career, Assistant Attorney Duncan has played an active role in the community through his board and chair memberships of several organizations and commissions, such as: the United Cerebral Palsy Association, the Onondaga County Criminal Justice Advisory Board, the City of Syracuse and County of Onondaga Drug and Alcohol Abuse Commission, the Onondaga County Youth Court Advisory Board, and the Town of Dewitt Police Commission.

Executive Assistant U.S. Attorney John Duncan has gone well beyond the call of duty while serving and protecting the 24th district. I wish Mr. Duncan well in his retirement and would like to thank him for his years of hard work, dedication, and service to our community.

IN MEMORY OF CHARLES RYLAND REVERE

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on the life of Charles Ryland Revere, known by most as ''Charlie,'' a native son and lifelong resident of Middlesex County in Virginia's First District. It was a privilege to be among the hundreds upon hundreds of admiring friends who joined Charlie's family in celebrating his life on June 7, 2015, in what many congregants noted to be perhaps the largest funeral gathering in the history of Lower United Methodist Church, a sanctuary that has stood across four centuries in Hartfield. As Charlie's eulogist noted, his lifelong contributions to his family, his community, and his beloved church were ''incalculable.'' Another of Charlie's grateful friends observed, ''Charlie's passion for life and his Christian compassion for others were beyond measure.'' Charlie's dedication to humbly serving, uplifting, and caring for others took many forms—Army officer, county supervisor, hospital board chair, youth league booster, free health clinic advocate, volunteer firefighter, bank board member, farmer, employer, and church leader, to name a few. His commitment to the professional men and women of Revere Gas touched thousands of families over the more than 50 years of operation. Charlie did not allow tragedy or any adversity to deter his loving embrace of life and all those who were blessed to know him. As a person of extraordinary humor yet humility, Charlie was never concerned with accolades or recognition. His life certainly reflected a notion often associated with Presidents Reagan and Truman—that there is no limit to what can be accomplished and the good that can be done when we don't worry about who gets the credit. We in the First District will miss him dearly but we will long note and take heart from his selfless devotion to his community, his country, his family, and his faith. I submit the text of an article from the Southside Sentinel that gives a small glimpse of the impact of the lives of Charlie and his remarkable wife, Sally Gayle.

[From the Southside Sentinel, Apr. 18, 2012]

''FRIENDS TO THE COMMUNITY''

(By Tom Chilemmi)

HARTFIELD.—Many stories were told about Charles and Sally Gayle Revere of Hartfield during last Saturday's 14th annual Pride of Middlesex award banquet. Most involved good-natured ribbing. Sprinkled among the humor were heartfelt affirmations of a grateful community.

Sallie Belle Benedetti, a longtime friend, shared memories of their college years at the University of Richmond, where Charles and Sally Gayle met.

On a serious note, Benedetti said, ''You've shared your time and talent so unselfishly. You have touched us in so many ways and we are better for knowing you.''

Benedetti closed with a quote she said describes the Reveres so well. ''The real purpose of our existence is not to make a living, but to make a life . . . a worthy well-rounded useful and loving life. If anyone has done that well, I think Sally Gayle and Charlie have.''

Johnny Fleet of Hartfield, who grew up with Charles, told several stories. However, he also had this to say. ''The word 'generous' comes to mind when I think about Charlie and Sally . . . generous, not just in monetary things. In today's world, generosity is better judged by the time spent and time given. And it truly applies to them. I don't know how they keep up. They are absolutely tireless in their efforts and the time they spend with their family and this community for all the things they are involved in.''

Fleet made a point of noting Sally Gayle's many acts of kindness. ''She has made more visits, sent more cards, sent more birthday acknowledgments, sent more get-well cards and more food than anyone I can imagine.''

The Reveres are ''friends to the community,'' said Fleet.

In selecting the Reveres, the Middlesex Rotary Club ''brought the cream to the top,'' said Jimmy Pitts of Urbanna. ''No two better people could have been picked for what they've done for the county of Middlesex and all of us in it. We thank you so much.'' Charles Bristow of Urbanna said, ''I don't know of anyone else that is more deserving.''

The Pride of Middlesex (POM) award is given annually to recognize and honor individuals or groups that exemplify the Rotary motto of ''Service Above Self.''

In accepting the award, Charles said, ''It's very humbling to be recognized by your peers. It's an honor and we do appreciate this more than you know.''

Charles said his family is thankful to live in Middlesex where there is a true sense of community. ''This county has some very kind people. They are very, very generous when there is a need, and they all have the best interests of the county and the community.''

Sally Gayle thanked all those involved in the event. ''We're very humbled to receive this honor. Thank you so much.''

Charles also recognized the 37-year career of Reverend Chauncey Mann, Jr., who recently retired as pastor of Grafton Baptist Church. Rev. Mann, a Rotarian, was the emcee of the banquet, which was held in the Hartfield Firehouse pavilion.

''Chauncey is someone I admire,'' said Charles. ''He's always been a great friend, he's always been community minded, he always puts the best interest of the county forward, and he's worked tirelessly for the county. He's just been a model citizen for our county. We are going to miss you.''

The Reveres selected two organizations to receive a charitable donation from the proceeds of the Pride of Middlesex award banquet. Donations will be given to the Grafton Baptist Church's after-school program and the Northern Neck Free Health Clinic, which also serves Middlesex County.

BACKGROUND

Charles Revere, a native of Middlesex, graduated from Middlesex High School. He attended the University of Richmond where he met and married Sally Gayle Shepherd. Sally Gayle grew up in Lynchburg and is a graduate of E.C. Glass High School. She attended Westhampton College of the University of Richmond, and graduated from Phillips Business College.

After Charles graduated from the University of Richmond and completed infantry training in the U.S. Army, the couple moved to Fort Ord, California, until Charles completed his two-year military obligation. Charles elected to participate in the National Guard program for four years after which he was discharged as a captain.

Upon returning to Middlesex, Charles joined Revere Gas, a business his father started as Middlesex Bottled Gas in 1942 by delivering bottled gas from Richmond to a few Middlesex customers. Today, Revere Gas serves customers in 17 counties from six locations. Revere Gas is a family business. Sally Gayle is the firm's secretary/treasurer and for many years she handled the payroll. Both of the Reveres' sons, Craig and Carlton, work for the company.

In 1999–2000, Charles was president of the National Propane Gas Association. During the same period, Sally Gayle was chairman of the Scholarship Foundation of the National Propane Gas Association. Charles has continued the family interest and service to the Hartfield Volunteer Fire Department. His father was one of the five original founders.

Charles was a member of the Middlesex Board of Supervisors from 1980 to 1988. He is a past president of Middlesex Lions Club, and is currently a director on the boards of EVB Bank, Riverside Health System, Riverside Tappahannock Hospital (chairman), and the Northern Neck Free Health Clinic.

Sally Gayle's past services include: president/chair of American Cancer Society (Middlesex); chair of the first Middlesex Relay for Life; president of Middlesex Junior Woman's Club; volunteer work with the Middlesex YMCA (Middlesex Capital Campaign); RGH Hospital volunteer; president of the Middle Peninsula Community Concert Association; chair of the first county rescue squad drive; and a volunteer at the Northern Neck Free Health Clinic and with Red Cross Bloodmobiles.

Charles and Sally Gayle have and continue to serve and support Lower United Methodist Church in many capacities.

Previous POM recipients have included the following notable county residents and organizations: Louise Gray, Sherman Holmes, Ruth Barr, Middlesex Volunteer Fire Department, Middlesex Volunteer Rescue Squad, Joe Fears, Jack Fackler, Tom Hardin, Charles Bristow, Dave and Linda Cryer, sisters Rachel Norris Bridger and Ruby Lee Norris, and Aubrey and Margie Hall.

POLICY INITIATIVE ON IRAN: BREAKING THE STALEMATE, ENGAGING WITH THE IRANIAN OPPOSITION

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, with a long history of serving the American people and the U.S. national interest, we stand together today to call for a new approach in our country's policy toward Iran and the Iranian opposition.

Ours is an independent initiative, motivated by our concerns for United States national security, as well as justice and opportunity for

millions of Arab and Persian citizens whose futures are being shaped by current events, and the unending suffering of the Iranian people, who have been deprived of their most fundamental rights for over 35 years under the tyrannical regime ruling Iran.

We are also concerned about the safety and security of the approximately 2,500 Iranian opposition members trapped in Camp Liberty in Iraq, whom our government, through its military, has pledged in writing to protect. Their safety while being processed for onward relocation by the United Nations remains a moral obligation for the United States, arising not only from our written guarantee but also from the valuable help and intelligence—including information about Iran's nuclear program—provided by these opposition members. Our country's failure to uphold its solemn promises to these defenseless men and women is inexcusable, and is a by-product of our government's misreading of the Iranian regime's intentions.

We are united in our understanding of the nature of the regime in Iran, a subject about which many of our colleagues in Washington seem uncertain. While we share the goal of seeking an end to Iran's nuclear weapons activities through diplomacy if such an outcome can be negotiated, we believe it is a mistake for Iran's actions in Syria, Iraq, Yemen and elsewhere to be overlooked, minimized, excused or even welcomed. We also believe it will better serve our country's interests to pay closer attention to the human rights and aspirations of the Iranian people.

Today we call for an end to the misguided position of those in Washington who seek to isolate, exclude or otherwise ignore Iran's largest, most established and best organized political opposition, the National Council of Resistance of Iran, led by Mrs. Maryam Rajavi. In recent years we have come to know Mrs. Rajavi and the NCRI, and we know the resistance far better than many in Washington who believe that the NCRI should be kept at arm's length for one reason or another.

We call as well for immediate pressure by our government on the government of Iraq, which depends on United States military and financial aid, to end the systematic torment of the MEK members still in Iraq that has thus far resulted in 142 deaths (101 outright murdered, 15 victims of rocket attacks, and 26 denied access to proper medical treatment) and the ongoing denial of livable health, sanitary and nutrition conditions. This cessation of harassment should be followed immediately by their physical removal from Iraq to countries in which Iranian opposition members are already leading productive lives, including the United States.

Mrs. Rajavi's steadfast message, to political and religious leaders around the world over a period of many years, is a 10-point plan for the future of Iran that would resolve Iran's most dangerous and destabilizing challenges. The plan would restore political legitimacy through universal suffrage, guarantee rights for all citizens and particularly women and minorities, end the cruel excesses of the judiciary and establish the rule of law, end the nightmare of fundamentalist Islamic dictatorship by once again separating church and state, protect property rights, promote equal opportunity and environmental protections, and—last but certainly not least—seek a nonnuclear Iran, free of weapons of mass destruction. The idea that Washington should continue in 2015 to disregard a worldwide group of Iranians promoting such a platform is indefensible. The United States should be maintaining a vibrant and constant dialogue with the National Council of Resistance of Iran.

It is by now beyond dispute that the regime in Tehran is fomenting instability and conflict throughout the region, most notably in Syria, Lebanon, Yemen and Iraq. Its campaign to undermine stability was launched because the regime sought to enhance its influence throughout the region and because it feared the emergence of more open political systems in nearby countries that could revive the democratic forces behind the Persian Spring of 2009. Iran shares responsibility for the rise of ISIS; this phenomenon was cynically facilitated by Syrian dictator Bashar al Assad and then-Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki in Iraq to divert the focus from their own divisive sectarian actions, supported by Iran, about which we have repeatedly warned in previous years.

Iran's regime has sustained a leader in Damascus guilty of major war crimes against his own people and in defiance of a Presidential ''red line,'' a UN-brokered transition process and the united stance of Arab League governments insisting on his departure. It has supplied military-grade weapons to Hizballah, a Lebanese non-state actor with the blood of American diplomats and Marines on its hands. It has supported and led sectarian militias in Iraq assaulting Sunni villages and towns. It has provided long-range rockets to Hamas in Gaza to be aimed at population centers in Israel, destabilizing efforts at a negotiated two-state solution. And it has supplied arms, explosives, and funds to an insurgent group in Yemen that has driven out foreign Embassies, including our own, seized power and provoked a new regional military conflict.

In all of these actions, while the U.S. Administration has exercised restraint in the apparent hope of moderating Iran's behavior, Iran's leaders have shown nothing but contempt for longstanding American, European, and Arab interests throughout the Middle East. They have also clearly demonstrated that money is no object in their efforts to quell popular movements for more open and democratic governance, both domestically and in neighboring Arab countries.

Inside Iran, while many Americans have for years detected signs of moderation, the regime has become, if anything, more repressive since Hassan Rouhani became President in 2013. Imprisonment and executions have increased. Information, including access to the internet, radio, and television, as well as social media, are now substantially controlled by the Revolutionary Guards. The 2013 elections were carefully managed by the regime to avoid a repeat of the open rebellion in the streets in 2009, after which many were executed and more have been imprisoned.

The editors of The Washington Post, writing about its reporter, whom they say is ''entirely innocent of the charges'' for which he has been imprisoned in Iran since July of 2014, write that this ''blatant abuse of the human rights of an American journalist'' raises ''disturbing questions about a regime that Mr. Obama is counting on to implement a complex and multifaceted accord limiting its nuclear activities.'' The Post editors ask, ''If [Foreign Minister] Zarif and President Hassan Rouhani either countenance or cannot stop such blatantly provocative behavior by the Iranian intelligence services and judiciary, how can they be expected to overcome the entrenched resistance to limiting Iran's uranium enrichment?''

We share these concerns. We also recognize that the fundamentalist regime in Tehran, in violating so many norms of political governance and international behavior since the 1979 revolution, survives not through the ballot box but only by absolute suppression and its false claim to religious authority—a formula which has now been repeated by Sunni extremists attempting to create an Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. No one should misunderstand why the National Council of Resistance of Iran is the single entity feared most by the rulers in Tehran: it is because the MEK and NCRI directly challenge the religious claim of authority that the mullahs have used to exercise and maintain political power.

The ayatollahs' thirty-five-year war against the MEK and the NCRI; the repeated deadly assaults against the residents of Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty; their intelligence services' covert influence and propaganda campaigns against the Resistance in Western countries; their constant diplomatic requests over the past two decades for the U.S., France, and other governments to place the MEK on their lists of terrorist organizations; their confiscation of satellite dishes and jamming of Iran National TV signals reaching the population inside Iran; their arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, and execution of anyone supporting the Resistance—all these aspects of the regime's obsessive focus on the Resistance are due to one fact.

This is not about terrorism, not about culture, not about the Iran-Iraq War or the aftermath of the 1991 Gulf War. All the propaganda generated by the regime to defame and criminalize the Resistance has now been exposed, and the NCRI has challenged every terrorist listing and won. No, this obsession of the mullahs with the Resistance is about Islam, and the desire of millions of Iranians to exercise their faith while living in a modern society with higher education, and economic and political empowerment for women and men alike. The concept of Velayat e-faqih in the new regime's constitution—forcefully imposed by Ayatollah Khomeini after the fall of the Shah to place total religious and political power in the hands of one man—has been a disaster for the Iranian people, for Iran, and for the world. You will not hear any debate in Washington that ISIS must be stopped; it is high time Americans also recognized that if ISIS succeeds, what the world will get is a Sunni version of Khomeini's Iran.

We recommend the following four initiatives to our government and to presidential candidates and prospective candidates in both parties, aimed at de-escalating conflict throughout the Middle East, in part by recognizing these realities, standing for American principles and basic international norms, and opposing the destructive role of Iran in the region.

First, on the nuclear issue, we support a peaceful solution if it can be achieved through diplomacy. However, we strongly believe that such a solution cannot be achieved by making concessions to Iran but rather by making clear that Iran will be denied any potential opportunity to obtain a nuclear bomb. Iran under the ayatollahs has consistently shown that it cannot be trusted. Verification, not blind trust in

the Iranian government to fulfill conditions of the agreement, must be an unconditional reality. Furthermore, western negotiators must clarify what is meant by Possible Military Dimension (PMD) activities of Iran before a comprehensive deal can be signed.

Second, Iran's destructive role throughout the region must be curbed and deterred. Far from being part of the solution, Iran is a major part of the problem. There should be no direct or indirect cooperation with Iran under the pretext of fighting ISIS. Iran has been a major engine of the spread of Islamic extremism and fundamentalism. It is globally recognized to be the primary state sponsor of terrorism. The success of a long-term stabilization strategy in the region hinges on ending Iran's cynical and destructive meddling in Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Lebanon, and other countries.

Third, we should be more vigilant and vocal about the serious human rights abuses by the regime that continue inside Iran. Our policy on Iran's internal and external transgressions against universal international norms can no longer be held hostage to the nuclear issue. Indeed, our failure to stand for basic principles and rights only encourages the regime to violate them further with impunity. Nuclear negotiations, which many have taken as an indication of moderation within the theocratic regime, must not inadvertently provide it an undeserved veneer of legitimacy and abet its suppression of the Iranian people. During Mr. Rouhani's tenure as President, the human rights situation in Iran has measurably deteriorated, while illicit arms trafficking and support for terrorist non-state actors has continued unabated. A successful policy toward Iran and the Middle East cannot be based on denial of these realities.

Ultimately, the core of our approach is to side with 80 million Iranian people and their desire, along with people everywhere, for freedom and popular sovereignty based on democratic principles. Engaging with the democratic opposition has been the missing piece of U.S. policy for many years under both Republican and Democratic leadership. Thus, as our fourth initiative, we call on our government to break the stalemate and engage in respectful dialogue with the Iranian opposition, consistent with our country's policy of dialogue with all political groups. Whatever the outcome of nuclear negotiations and in virtually any possible scenario, the wishes of the Iranian people and their desire for change must be taken into consideration.

The fact is that Washington officials, experts, and expatriates cannot possibly know what Iranians living under a violently repressive dictatorship truly believe about their circumstances or whom they would support in an open political process. We disrespect a great people by assuming that a democratic and non-nuclear Iran is impossible. It is not impossible; to the contrary, it is the only way to a future of regional stability.

Mrs. Maryam Rajavi, as a Muslim woman advocating a tolerant and democratic interpretation of Islam enabling Muslims to be accepted and respected by all cultures and faiths, represents the very opposite of the misogynous Iranian regime's dictatorial nature and that of all Islamic fundamentalists and extremists. We need to align our policies with our principles, and begin listening to the voices of brave Iranians, many of whom have waited more than three decades, as their loved ones endured torture and death in the mullahs' prisons, still believing in the promise of America. All of us here today stand with them in solidarity with their deepest aspirations for a respectable, just, and democratic Iranian government worthy of its people.

Hon. J. Kenneth Blackwell—Former U.S. Ambassador, UN Human Rights Commission

Hon. Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Jr.—Former Special Envoy and Asst. Secretary of State

Hon. John Bolton—Former U.S. Ambassador to the UN

Col., U.S. Army (Ret.) Thomas V. Cantwell—Former U.S. Military Commander for Camp Ashraf

Hon. Marc Ginsberg—Former U.S. Ambassador to Morocco

Hon. Rudy Giuliani—Former Mayor of New York City, Presidential Candidate

Hon. Porter Goss—Former Director of CIA, Former Chairman of House Intel Committee

Hon. Newt Gingrich—Former Speaker of the House

Brig. Gen., U.S. Army (Ret.) David D. Phillips—Former U.S. Military Commander for Camp Ashraf

Hon. Mitchell B. Reiss—Former Ambassador, Former Special Envoy to the Northern Ireland Peace Process

Hon. Bill Richardson—Former NM Governor, Secretary of Energy, UN Ambassador, Presidential Candidate

Hon. Glenn Carle—Former Deputy National Intelligence Officer for Transnational Threats, National Intelligence Council

Gen., U.S. Army George Casey—Former Chief of Staff and Commander of Multi-National Forces—Iraq

Hon. Linda Chavez—Former Assistant to the President for Public Liaison, Chairman of the Center for Equal Opportunity

Gen., U.S. Marine Corps (Ret.) James Conway—Former Commandant

Hon. Howard Dean—Former Governor of Vermont, DNC Chairman, Presidential Candidate

Dr. Alan Dershowitz—Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

Lt. Gen., U.S. Air Force (Ret.) David Deptula—Former Deputy Chief of Staff for Intel, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance

Hon. Paula J. Dobriansky—Former Under Secretary of State for Democracy and Global Affairs

Hon. Louis J. Freeh—Former FBI Director

Gen., U.S. Marine Corps (Ret.) James L. Jones—Former Commandant, NATO Commander, National Security Advisor to the President

Hon. Robert Joseph—Former Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security

Hon. Patrick Kennedy—Former Congressman from Rhode Island

Hon. Joseph I. Lieberman—Former Senator from Connecticut

Col., U.S. Army (Ret.) Wesley M. Martin—Former U.S. Military Commander for Camp Ashraf, Senior Antiterrorism Officer—Iraq

Lt. Col., U.S. Army (Ret.) Leo McCloskey—Former U.S. Military Commander for Camp Ashraf

Hon. R. Bruce McColm—President, Institute for Democratic Strategies

Col., U.S. Army (Ret.) Gary Morsch—Former Senior Medical Officer, Camp Ashraf

Hon. Michael B. Mukasey—Former U.S. Attorney General

Hon. Tom Ridge—Former Governor of Pennsylvania, Secretary Homeland Security

Hon. John Sano—Former Deputy Director, CIA National Clandestine Service

Gen., U.S. Army (Ret.) Hugh Shelton—Former Chairman of U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff

Hon. Eugene R. Sullivan—Retired Federal Judge, Lt. Col., U.S. Army (Ret.)

Hon. Raymond Tanter—Former Personal Representative of Secretary of Defense to Arms Control Negotiations

Hon. Robert Torricelli—Former Senator from New Jersey

Hon. Frances Townsend—Former Homeland Security Advisor to the President

Gen., U.S. Air Force (Ret.) Charles (Chuck) Wald—Former Deputy Commander U.S. European Command

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 615, the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act. I want to commend Mr. PAYNE on this momentous day for the hard work he has spent crafting and shaping this bill.

A year ago, when I was Chairman of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, Mr. PAYNE approached me with concern after learning that DHS has not achieved Department-wide interoperability. He told me that although nationwide over $13 billion has been invested in achieving interoperable communications at the State and local level, the DHS Office of Inspector General, found that "personnel do not have reliable interoperable communications for daily operations, planned events, and emergencies."

As a former U.S. Attorney, who helped set up Indiana's Anti-Terrorism Advisory Council and Fusion Center, I was astounded by this persistent information gap and pledged to work with the gentleman on producing and moving a bill that puts DHS on the path to achieving interoperability.

The bill before us does this by requiring the Department's Under Secretary for Management to develop a strategy for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications between the DHS components. Moreover, it requires DHS to report to Congress on the progress it is making toward achieving these milestones.

Seamless communication between first responders in the aftermath of a disaster is absolutely vital to coordinating an effective response. As we learned on 9/11, inoperability of first responders' communication systems led to confusion, duplication, and discord that cost some brave men and women their lives. The federal government must take the lead in this effort and develop a system that will allow DHS's own components to effectively communicate both day to day and, most importantly, during emergencies.

After nearly a year and three votes on the House floor, I'm proud of the tenacity and

dedication of the gentleman in sheparding this bill through both chambers. I'm proud to support this bill that will head directly to the President's desk for signature and thus improve the safety of all our communities.

TRIBUTE TO MS. CARRIE MAE PACE-WILLIAMS THOMPSON

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Ms. Carrie Mae Pace-Williams Thompson was born on December 10, 1920 in Taliaferro County, Georgia and this year she is celebrating a remarkable milestone reaching 95 years of age; and

Whereas, Ms. Pace-Williams Thompson has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; she is a strong woman of God and a sister in the Hall Order of Eastern Stars; and

Whereas, Ms. Pace-Williams Thompson is celebrating her 95th Birthday with family members at this year's Pace-Williams Family Reunion in Virginia Beach, Virginia; and

Whereas, she celebrates a life of blessings as a Mother, Grandmother, Great Grandmother, Great-Great Grandmother, friend, community servant and leader; and

Whereas, the Lord has been her Shepherd throughout her 95 years and she prays daily and leads by example serving as an advocate, faithful matriarch and a community leader; and

Whereas, we are honored that she is celebrating her birthday today with family and friends giving generations of loved ones the opportunity to give thanks and display their love for the blessings that God has bestowed upon the Pace-Williams family; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Pace-Williams Thompson for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim June 26th and December 10th, 2015 as Ms. Carrie Mae Pace-Williams Thompson Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 26th day of June, 2015.

IN RECOGNITION OF KLA LABORATORIES' 85TH ANNIVERSARY AND GRAND OPENING OF THEIR NEW TECHNICAL CENTER IN DEARBORN

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize KLA Laboratories on their 85th anniversary as well as for the opening of their new facility in Dearborn, Michigan. As a Member of Congress it is both my privilege and honor to recognize KLA for their dedication and service in the IT and communications field.

In today's technological climate, a skilled and dependable communication provider is an invaluable asset. Over the course of 85 years, KLA Laboratories has been a critical resource for private and public entities ranging from cellular providers to educators and healthcare organizations. KLA established itself on the principles of customer satisfaction, a commitment to quality, and safety. As a testament to these principles, KLA Laboratories now counts several major Detroit-area businesses among those they serve, including Ford Motor Company, General Motors, and all of Detroit's professional sport teams. This diverse client base exemplifies KLA's leadership in the communications field and has warranted them the coveted ''Best Audio/Visual Provider in Michigan Award'' on numerous occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring KLA Laboratories for combining best business practices and a committed partnership with our community. I thank them for their great work in our region and hope it will continue for many years to come.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF RAYMOND SHELTON

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks to commemorate the life of Buffalo Soldier Raymond Shelton of Halifax County, Virginia, who passed away June 12, 2015 at age 100.

Raymond Shelton served as a medic in the 92nd Infantry Buffalo Division, the last segregated Army division and the only African-American division to fight in Europe during World War II. This division suffered 3,200 devastating casualties between August 1944 and May 1945, as it fought to liberate Italy from Nazi occupation. Mr. Shelton served as a chaplain assistant for an Army medical corps, where he played music at services in the field, fought in combat, guarded a German POW camp, and had the somber task of collecting personal belongings of deceased soldiers to return to their families.

Mr. Shelton was awarded four medals for his dedicated service: a good conduct medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Service Medal, American Service Medal, and World War II Victory Medal. In 1946, Shelton was honorably discharged as a tech corporal and later settled in Hampton, where he worked his way up from bag boy to store manager at the Bi-Lo Market.

He retired to South Boston with his wife, Mabel, but his service to others did not end with his military career. In his retirement, he often visited nursing homes, sharing his love of music by playing the piano and entertaining residents with his stories. He was a pillar in the community and will forever be remembered as a hero to South Boston and our great nation for his compassion, dedication, and patriotism.

On the occasion of the passing of Raymond Shelton, I ask that the members of this House of Representatives join with me and the community of South Boston, Virginia in honoring the memory of a great American hero.

RECOGNIZING LEVITTOWN-FAIRLESS HILLS ROTARY CLUB

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the Levittown-Fairless Hills Rotary Club on its 60th anniversary. Yours is a global service organization, founded in 1905 in Chicago and since then has grown to more than 34,000 clubs and 1.2 million members, worldwide. Rotary International has contributed to many service projects on the local and global scale and consistently worked toward the elimination of polio, which is a major Rotary project. In forming your clubs, you gather together business and professional leaders, who will strive to advance high ethical standards and dedicate themselves to humanitarian service. Rotarians contribute to their communities through individual local chapters, such as the Levittown-Fairless Hills Club that each year awards scholarships to local, high school graduates and takes part in the international efforts. In so doing, you are upholding the Rotary International motto: Service Above Self. Again, congratulations to the Levittown-Fairless Hills Rotary Club for 60 years of community service and best wishes for continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF JANUSZ BORZUCHOWSKI

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Janusz Borzuchowski of Bialystok, Poland, who helped keep the flame of liberty alive in one of this country's most important allies since the birth of the American Revolution.

As the 2016 election cycle roars into our television sets and permeates our consciousness, I am pleased to be able to report from time to time on the sometimes secret heroes whose lives we can all celebrate in the most bipartisan fashion.

Many of their stories we find in our civil and human rights movements, on our factory floors, in our military and police, in our hospitals, and myriad other places—all bearing the stamp: MADE IN THE USA.

However, it is also important to remember those around the world who, while not sharing our sacred citizenship, do share our values—often at the greatest risk and greatest potential cost to themselves.

Janusz Borzuchowski was not quite six years old when his father, Lieutenant Tadeusz Borzuchowski, was taken from their home by a Soviet Union then allied with Hitler's Germany. He, along with thousands of others of Poland's intelligencia, was murdered on Stalin's orders in Katyn Forest.

As a young man, Janusz Borzuchowski became a civil engineer and well-known outdoorsman, teaching at the local university and marrying a woman with whom he deeply fell in love, Halina Dworakowska, who herself returned to Poland very young after being born in Kazakhstan, where her parents had been sent into exile by the Soviet regime.

As the Polish motto, ''For Our Freedom—and Yours,'' slowly resurrected itself from behind the Iron Curtain, Janusz went on to be a key clandestine figure in the Solidarity movement in Eastern Poland. Working out of Bialystok, he was in charge of collecting money to support the cause—distributing in the process beautiful clandestine postage stamps for secret sale among liberty's partisans—and secretly running the region's printing press from one of his apartments.

At the same time, his sister Agnieszka, who passed away three years ago, was a fabled physician in the Medical University of Bialystok who hid Solidarity movement fugitives from Communist authorities—disguising them as patients in her hospital ward for infectious diseases. She was also the premier and pioneering figure in the largest city in northeastern Poland in the fight against HIV/AIDS. Just last year, Bialystok named a local park after Agnieszka in recognition of her vast following of well-wishers and her many medical, social, and political contributions to Poland.

Agnieszka's passing was followed last year by that of Janusz's oldest daughter, Dorota, an architect in Warsaw who was very well known for her designing of the interiors of some of the most famous gambling casinos in Poland's capital. His other daughter, Polish American Congress Washington Director Dr. Barbara Borzuchowski Andersen, is one of the Polish American community advocates best known for her work with both Congress and the White House.

Unfortunately Janusz—a devoted husband, father, brother and advocate for liberty—is himself now facing major health problems. I cannot think of a better tribute to him now than to salute him: ''W imię Boga za Naszą i Waszą Wolność''—thanking God, for our freedom, yours, and that of people around the world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to a delayed flight and was not present for two roll call votes on Tuesday, June 23, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner:

Rollcall Vote # 376—Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015—''no.''

Rollcall Vote # 377—Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act of 2015—''yes.''

Rollcall Vote # 378—TSCA Modernization Act—''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN C. CARNEY, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my position on the vote cast for H. Con. Res. 55 (Roll no. 371).

On June 17, 2015 I voted against Representative MCGOVERN's Resolution which would have directed the President to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2015. I appreciate the Congressman's sustained work on this issue. I continue to believe Congress should vote on a new Authorization for Use of Military Force and have previously voted in favor of revoking the existing AUMF. However, I am not comfortable requiring that the President remove troops in the short time frame provided in this legislation, especially given the difficult job those troops face in combating ISIL and training our allies in Iraq and the region.

TRIBUTE TO THE MCCORMICK FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, the arrival of John Dominy and his two sons Tom Ball and Abraham McCormick to America in 1830 began the McCormick family lineage which has blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, the McCormick Family has produced many well respected citizens, and the patriarchs and matriarchs of the McCormick family are pillars of strength that have touched the lives of many; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have members of the McCormick family for they are some of our most honorable citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world and we take pride in knowing that families such as the McCormick family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other through their family reunion in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the McCormick family; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim August 1, 2015 as McCormick Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 1st day of August, 2015.

IN RECOGNITION OF GEORGIE GOODE

HON. RUBEN GALLEGO

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Georgie Goode, a longtime Phoenix educator, and community activist, who passed away recently at the age of 87.

Born to Horace H.S. and Georgia Stroud in 1928, Mrs. Goode led a remarkable life that can serve as an example to young people in our communities. She was a Phoenix treasure—an educator, school board leader, activist, mother and grandmother who inspired our community in countless, immeasurable ways.

Raised near Atlanta in segregated schools, she would go on to graduate from Spelman College, a historically black liberal arts college for women and later received a master's degree from Atlanta University.

Mrs. Goode arrived in Phoenix in the 1950s, where she would marry Mr. Calvin C. Goode. In her time in Phoenix, she was a tremendous leader, serving as a City of Phoenix Councilwoman for 22 years. She was passionately committed to strengthening education and did so through her work on the board of the Phoenix Elementary School District and Phoenix Union High School District, as well as a teacher in the Roosevelt School District.

Mrs. Goode was also a very active member of several community boards, where she was instrumental in providing basic amenities for several neighborhoods, such as paved roads, streetlights, and a library.

Mr. Speaker, Georgia Goode was a pillar of the Phoenix community. Her lifelong commitment to education, building strong neighborhoods, and mentoring those around her will live on. I am deeply honored to recognize Georgie Goode's storied life. She will be missed by many, but her impact on our communities will endure for generations to come.

HONORING THE GRAND OPENING OF THE PALM BEACH RENEWABLE ENERGY FACILITY 2

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Solid Waste Authority of Palm Beach County as they open the Palm Beach Renewable Energy Facility 2. Today, the facility will celebrate its public grand opening as the most environmentally friendly waste-to-energy power plant in North America. It is also the first waste-to-energy power plant built in the United States in more than 15 years. As a member of Congress representing Palm Beach County, I am proud to recognize the County's commitment to alternative forms of energy and reducing the accumulation of waste.

The Palm Beach Renewable Energy Facility 2 will reduce our reliance on the County's landfill by up to 90 percent while providing enough energy to power an estimated 44,000 homes and businesses. Each year, this facility will process over one million tons of post-recycled waste as well as recycle an estimated 27,000 tons of metal. Not only will the Palm Beach Renewable Energy Facility 2 repurpose our waste, but it will do so in an efficient way using advanced air pollution controls and water conservation measures.

I especially look forward to visiting the facility's Education Center. This Center will provide countless opportunities to educate our students and the greater public on the benefits of preserving our environment and investing in innovative energy solutions.

I congratulate the Solid Waste Authority of Palm Beach County, its partners, and its employees on this momentous occasion and honor them.

PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the wellbeing of seniors in my district. The House passed H.R. 1190, which would repeal provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, more commonly known as ObamaCare, to create an unelected Independent Patient Advisory Board (IPAB) to determine Medicare benefits.

Currently, ObamaCare grants the IPAB the authority to unilaterally cut Medicare spending, risking the solvency and stability of the program, without an Act of Congress. Simply put, the unelected and unaccountable Washington bureaucrats, not patients and doctors, control the level of benefits at the most important health care system for seniors.

Like millions of seniors, my late mother depended on Medicare for quality health care to meet her needs during her golden years. Because this issue is so personal to me, I am proud to join Representative ROE (R–TN) and 233 other bipartisan cosponsors in the House to vote in favor of this critical legislation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to protect Medicare for today's seniors, while providing a fiscally sound program to assist future generations. Our seniors deserve the best health care, and the right to make their own choices and not rely on unaccountable executive appointments to make decisions for them.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support the bipartisan Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015 and the repeal of the IPAB.

CONGRATULATING PIONEER NATURAL RESOURCES ON EARNING PLACEMENT ON THE FORTUNE 500 LIST

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pioneer Natural Resources of Irving, Texas, on having a successful fiscal year and joining an elite group of businesses on the Fortune 500 list.

Pioneer is a strong and driven company set on providing oil and natural gas to the world. They work to meet the needs and demands of the oil and natural gas market that drives much of the energy industry. Pioneer has provided many years of stable economic growth, producing jobs and opportunities worldwide. It is an incredibly active and enriching company, and I am honored to have such a business within the 24th district of Texas.

This company was not built overnight. Pioneer came to be by hardworking individuals and tactical strategic intelligent business maneuvers. With large oil and natural gas operations, its economic impact is felt far and wide. But its positive impact on local communities is just as meaningful. Pioneer's employees give back by volunteering for Habitat for Humanity, Dallas Court Appointed Special Advocates, the United Way, and the North Texas Food Bank, to name a few.

By focusing on economic growth and helping the communities in which they are involved, Pioneer has built a strong reputation. This company will continue expanding and practicing smart business tactics that will bring about more jobs and enrich the lives of Texans and many others. Pioneer has brought pride to the 24th district of Texas and continues to be a positive influence in the state and our country.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize Pioneer Natural Resources as a member of the Forbes 500 list. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating such an accomplishment.

TRIBUTE TO STANLEY HANKIN

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the career of a distinguished public servant, Stanley Hankin, after a remarkable 53 years of service to our country. On July 3, 2015, Mr. Hankin will be retiring from the U.S. Department of Labor, leaving a legacy of extraordinary dedication to the Department and to the American worker.

Mr. Hankin arrived at the U.S. Department of Labor in 1962 as a graduate student at the University of Maryland. He began in the Division of State and Federal Relations within the Bureau of Employment Security, where he developed national training programs for workers in the State Employment Security system. At that time, videotape technology was just being introduced, although its uses were largely unknown within the government. Using his initiative and foresight, Mr. Hankin transformed video into an integral part of the Department's strategy to convey its messages to the American public.

As an innovator and forward-thinker, Mr. Hankin's talents as an Audiovisual Producer were well-known. He ran nationwide training workshops on how to videotape and produce programs, and he began videotaping significant meetings and sending the recordings to employees in the field. Mr. Hankin also persuaded the Job Corps and the Bureau of Apprenticeship to utilize video PSAs as tools for promoting their good work. After Jobs Corps began to collaborate with the National Football League, Mr. Hankin produced the first in-house Department of Labor PSA, which featured Rosey Grier and Ron Jaworski of the Philadelphia Eagles and Franco Harris of the Pittsburgh Steelers.

Mr. Hankin continued his work with video into the 1970s, a period when the technology was gaining popularity. During this time, he began efforts to use video as a means of communicating with workers, and also started a program to coach Department of Labor executives for on-camera appearances and interviews. In the 1980s, when the Department of Labor was given a fully operational Ampex Television studio, Mr. Hankin seized the opportunity. Before long, he was producing award-winning programs for both employees and employers. Mr. Hankin's accomplishments were so widespread that he was invited to Amsterdam to teach its Labor Department employees how to produce video programming. He was then asked to document the 1983 Conference of Liberators, which brought together men and women from across the world who had played a role in liberating Nazi concentration camps. The resulting work, To Bear Witness, brought the Department critical acclaim, winning an Emmy in 1983.

From the 1990s until today, Mr. Hankin continued to approach the Department's use of various forms of media with great innovation. Among many other projects, he produced emergency PSAs for victims of Hurricane Katrina, and Up From Zero, a program documenting the heroic workers in New York City who reclaimed and recovered the World Trade Center site. Considered by Mr. Hankin to be one of the Department's crowning achievements, Up From Zero won numerous awards, including the coveted CINE Golden Eagle Award. His most recent plans include making video-streaming a regular component of the Department's events and maintaining the standard of excellence expected of the Department's television facility.

Whether he was training Department employees on how to better communicate the goals of their new programs and initiatives or producing PSAs to help the unemployed, at-risk youth, or veterans suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, Mr. Hankin always has supported the mission of the Department to assist and protect the rights of American workers. Over the course of his career, he produced or directed more than 1000 video programs and projects.

Through his leadership, infectious energy, and enthusiasm, Mr. Hankin has inspired a standard of excellence in the creative disciplines throughout the Department of Labor. A truly remarkable and accomplished public servant, he has received well-deserved recognition and the love and respect of employees throughout the decades.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest gratitude and appreciation to Stanley Hankin for his 53 years of outstanding service to our country.

A TRIBUTE TO PAMELA THIEVON—DECADES OF SERVICE

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House come from all backgrounds, walks of life, and political philosophies. We are truly a diverse group. However, each and every one of us has at least one thing in common—the desire to provide quality service to the hundreds of thousands of constituents who call us ''Representative.''

My predecessor, the late Representative Dean A. Gallo, established a well-earned reputation for prompt and accurate constituent service, helping thousands of New Jersey residents over his two decades of service in Congress. I would like to think that I have been successful in emulating Dean's stellar record.

There is no mystery about this continuity and I would like to identify and pay tribute to

a "common link" between the staff of Congressman Gallo and my New Jersey District Office staff: Mrs. Pamela Thievon of Long Hill, New Jersey.

For over two decades, Pam has provided tireless service to the people of New Jersey's 11th Congressional District. As my current District Director, Pam leads a team of caseworkers and field personnel. In this important capacity, she has helped thousands of families, taxpayers, veterans, citizen organizations and service groups in their daily struggle to work through the federal bureaucracy. I take casework—resolving your problems with the federal government—very seriously and work enormously hard to get you the answers you deserve. Pam helps me to ensure that constituents are heard and are given an adequate response in a timely manner.

In addition, over the past two decades Pam has mentored dozens of caseworkers and field staff, making an indelible impression on their careers and, indeed, their lives. Just as important, she has provided responsible and sound advice to me as I work to serve the diverse communities of the 11th Congressional District.

Of course, retirement itself is a great gift. After decades of selfless effort, Pamela Thievon will retire at month's end. She certainly earned this new chapter in her life. We will miss her, but hope she will enjoy her "golden years" surrounded by family and friends.

I am confident that my friend, Dean Gallo, would join me in uttering a heartfelt, "thank you" to Mrs. Pamela Thievon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained from voting when my D.C. bound flight was diverted to Richmond, VA due to the severe weather in this region. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall #376: "no."
Rollcall #377: "no."
Rollcall #378: "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Rollcall #376 on H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act. I was not present for this vote due to travel in Texas at the ICE detention facilities and subsequent flight delay. I intended to vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Rollcall #377 on H.R. 805, Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters (DOTCOM) Act of 2015. I was not present for this vote due to travel in Texas at the ICE detention facilities and subsequent flight delay. I intended to vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on Rollcall #378 on H.R. 2576, TSCA Modernization Act of 2015. I was not present for this vote due to a travel in Texas at the ICE detention facilities and subsequent flight delay. I intended to vote "yes."

STOP OVERDOSE STAT (SOS) ACT

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I reintroduced the Stop Overdose Stat (S.O.S.) Act, legislation that will curb the nation's growing opioid overdose rates.

Joined by Sen. JACK REED of Rhode Island, our legislation will establish a grant program that funds efforts to educate and train the public, first responders, and caregivers of those at-risk of overdose on how to administer naloxone, a drug that reverses the effects of heroin and opioid overdoses until proper medical care can be provided.

We remain encouraged that this important legislation can be funded during the Fiscal Year 2016 appropriations cycle, a reflection of the Obama Administration's priority to expand naloxone access across our nation.

Since I first introduced this bill in 2009, nearly 140,000 Americans have died from opioid related deaths, including more than 4,000 from my home state of Maryland.

I thank Sen. REED for leading this effort on the Senate side, committing to the idea that Washington lawmakers have a responsibility to fund proven programs that make a real difference in treating and preventing overdose, and ultimately saving lives.

And while I understand that there is much work to be done in order to address substance abuse before it gets to the point of overdose, each year hundreds of Maryland families and tens of thousands of American families need immediate assistance.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to cosponsor this important and much needed piece of legislation.

HONORING THE OLDENBURG INDIANA VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT'S 150 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Oldenburg Indiana Volunteer Fire Department's 150 years of service to the community.

Being a volunteer firefighter is a special calling. These brave men and women who serve obviously don't do it for the money. They volunteer for this job because they love their community and want to give back.

Firefighters put their lives on the line every day to protect their neighbors. And, for that, their community owes them a tremendous debt of gratitude.

It is my privilege to recognize Oldenburg's courageous firefighters for their dedication and to recognize the Oldenburg Indiana Volunteer Fire Department for 150 years of service to the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 2015, I was unable to be present for all votes due to multiple flight delays.

If present, I would have voted accordingly on the following votes:

H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act—Aye.

H.R. 805, Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters (DOTCOM) Act—Aye.

H.R. 2576, TSCA Modernization Act—Aye.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, I was unable to vote due to travel delays. Had I been present on the House floor, I would have voted "nay" on roll call No. 376, final passage of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015. I would have voted "aye" on roll call No. 377, H.R. 805, the Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act of 2015, and "aye" on roll call No. 378, H.R. 2576, TSCA Modernization Act of 2015.

TRIBUTE TO MS. PHYLLIS DANIEL

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Thirty five years ago a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve as a teacher, administrator and principal; and

Whereas, Ms. Phyllis E. Daniel has enhanced the academic curriculum of Public Schools in DeKalb County, Georgia and has increased the good will of the schools in my district. Her work resonates throughout the community and she has created a legacy for students through scholarships and servitude; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents as a friend, a fearless leader and a servant to ensure that all students receive the best education and skills to become outstanding leaders of our communities and nation; and

Whereas, Ms. Phyllis E. Daniel is a cornerstone in our community who has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of my District and our Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Phyllis E. Daniel on her retirement and to wish her well

in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim May 26, 2015 as Ms. Phyllis E. Daniel Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 26th day of May, 2015.

15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HERO CAMPAIGN

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to recognize the 15th Anniversary of the John R. Elliot HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers.

The HERO Campaign was created by Bill and Muriel Elliot in honor of their son John, a Naval Academy graduate, that seeks to end drunken driving tragedies nationwide by promoting the use of safe and sober designated drivers. This campaign, which began as a result of the death of John at the hands of a drunk driver who was arrested and released while still intoxicated, resulted in the enactment of John's Law which allows police to hold a driver's vehicle for up to 12 hours if they are arrested for driving while under the influence.

Since the organization's founding in 2000, the HERO Campaign has organized more than 100,000 designated drivers to end drunk driving and has extended its reach to over seven states, from Massachusetts to Kentucky, through its partnerships with the NFL and NASCAR. In 2005, I was a co-sponsor of H.R. 3—the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy For Users (SAFETEA-LU) that included this needed provision and ensured John's legacy would live on through the protection of drivers across the nation

Finally, I would like to extend my appreciation to Bill and Muriel for their many years of hard work on this very important issue. The strength they have shown in turning tragedy into a worthwhile cause is a testament to their son's memory and the noble and needed cause to end drunk driving.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, my family and I said goodbye to a remarkable woman, my mother-in-law, Loretto Wagner. While she will be greatly missed, we are comforted in knowing that she lived a full and blessed life as a voice for the voiceless, and is now in Jesus' embrace as his good and faithful servant.

Due to the extraordinary nature of this event, I was unable to be in Washington, D.C. and vote on legislative business during this time. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On Passage of H.R. 1190—Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015 (Roll Call Vote #376), had I been present I would have voted yes.

On Passage of H.R. 805—Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act of 2015 (Roll Call Vote #377), had I been present I would have voted yes.

On Passage of H.R. 2576—TSCA Modernization Act of 2015 (Roll Call Vote #378), had I been present I would have voted yes.

CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF ADDISON, TEXAS ON THIRTY YEARS OF ADDISON KABOOM TOWN!

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the city of Addison, Texas, located in my Congressional district, for this year's Addison Kaboom Town! fireworks show. July 3rd marks the 30th consecutive fireworks show for the town, which is expected to draw over 500,000 spectators, a remarkable accomplishment as Addison is home to 19,000 residents and is only 4.4 sq miles.

Addison Kaboom Town! began in 1985 and has quickly grown into the nationally renowned event it is today. Addison Kaboom Town! has received accolades from the American Pyrotechnics Associations, USA Today, the Wall Street Journal, and AOL, each naming it one of the top fireworks shows in the country. The fireworks show has been simulcast over Dallas-Fort Worth radio, which broadcasts a music program that accompanies the fireworks.

In addition to the fireworks show, this year will also feature the Addison Airport Air Show in addition to live performances by the 36th Infantry Division Band, Rhythm and Boots, and the Dallas Wind Symphony. Addison Kaboom Town! is truly a remarkable fixture of the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, and the display of patriotism from Addison and the plethora of visitors it attracts is second to none. I look forward to this year's celebration as well as its continued success into the future.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring the 30th anniversary of Addison Kaboom Town!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, I was absent during roll call vote #376. Had I been present, I would have voted "NO" on passage of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015.

COMMENDING THE NORTH ATTLEBORO POLICE DEPARTMENT AND CHIEF JOHN REILLY

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY III

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the North Attleboro Police Department and Chief John Reilly on achieving accreditation and demonstrating the department goes above and beyond state and national standards.

Under the strong leadership of Chief Reilly, the department has revamped their policies and practices to come in compliance with the requirements of the Massachusetts Police Accreditation Commission.

For two years, the entire department worked together to ensure that they met the highest possible standards in their service to the town of North Attleboro. This is no small feat, nor is it an easy task for a department facing budget cuts.

Earning this recognition is about more than the preparation and readiness of the North Attleboro Police Department, it's about guaranteeing their officers are committed to the safety and protection of their community.

With each traffic stop and every distress call, our police officers face a challenging, oftentimes evolving situation with courage and bravery.

They never ask who is calling for their help or whether their service is necessary. Instead, they race to the scene and risk their safety for that of the community.

Thank you Chief Reilly and your entire force for your work day and night to ensure that our citizens can walk around North Attleboro knowing you will always answer their call.

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF GRACE LEE BOGGS

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Grace Lee Boggs who will celebrate her 100th birthday on June 27, 2015. As a Member of Congress it is both my privilege and honor to recognize Mrs. Boggs for her service and contributions to the cause of civil rights throughout the 20th and 21st centuries.

Born to Chinese immigrants in Providence, Rhode Island, Mrs. Boggs graduated from Barnard College in 1935 before going on to receive her Ph.D. in philosophy from Bryn Mawr College in 1940. Mrs. Boggs moved to Detroit in 1953 and immediately identified with issues facing the city's African American population.

In an era known for the greatest civil rights advancements in our nation's history, Grace Lee Boggs became an indispensible ally. Her unique approach to the power struggle affecting minorities and women in the middle of the 20th century stood out as innovative even amongst the leading civil rights thinkers of the time. At the core of Mrs. Boggs understanding of social relations is the idea that small groups

of people working together are the key to bringing about social change, as opposed to the idea that total revolution is the only option. Mrs. Boggs' belief in starting with localized change is one which all Americans can support, as our nation was founded on the idea of change coming from the bottom, rather than the top.

Mrs. Boggs' legacy in Detroit has been enshrined in The James & Grace Lee Boggs School, the Boggs Center, and programs like the Detroit Summer, which brings members of all ages and backgrounds together to think creatively about the problems their communities face and fulfilling the dream of making positive change one small group at a time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Mrs. Boggs for her service to our community and her leadership in advancing the rights of all Americans. She has made an indelible mark on our nation for which we owe a tremendous debt of gratitude.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CENTER WEST MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Center West Missionary Baptist Church in Delta, Alabama, located in Randolph County.

The church was founded on July 11, 1915 under Rev. B.W. Matthews.

The original church building was built in 1915 and burned in 1946. It was rebuilt that same year in the same location. In 1973, a new more modern building was constructed across the road where services are still held today.

On July 11th, the congregation will gather to commemorate their 100th anniversary. Former pastors, leaders and members will join the present Center West family to reminisce about the past and prepare for the future in this rural community focused on God's word.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing this milestone for Center West Missionary Baptist Church and congratulate them all on their 100th anniversary.

THE NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE P5+1 AND IRAN

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the ongoing negotiations between the P5+1 and Iran concerning Iran's nuclear weapons program. In today's polarized environment there are few areas where we can all reach agreement, but certainly Democrats and Republicans alike can agree that Iran must not be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon. I believe that every single pathway available to Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon must be completely blocked.

I commend the efforts of President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry, as well as our partners in the P5+1, as they have worked diligently to reach a framework agreement that will halt Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon. We must ensure that any agreement reached has as its aim a framework that allows for unobstructed verification and enforceability. Such an agreement is not only in our best interest, but also in the best interest of the region at-large. We need such a framework because it is no secret that the Iranians have engaged, over the years, in deceitful actions that are cause for much concern. This reality of course does not mean that we should not engage fully in negotiations, but simply, that we must weave this reality into our final agreement. Buyers beware, Mr. Speaker.

It is my belief that as we move closer to a final agreement, we must ensure that Iran allows United Nations' inspectors the necessary and sufficient access to nuclear sites. This must include military sites. Along similar lines, we must be allowed a full accounting of Iran's previous efforts at weaponization. In knowing their past progress, we will be better able to discern their compliance with the agreement. These factors are essential if we are to determine whether Iran is meeting its obligations.

Although these elements are needed, we must also have a strong mechanism that allows sanctions to be re-imposed should Iran violate the agreement. The political calculus of reimposing sanctions could be quite difficult and, therefore, it is not enough that sanctions be able to be "snapped back," but we must also ensure that any sanctions in place now are lifted gently and deliberately. We cannot lose sight of the fact that Iran continues to fund terrorist organizations the world over. Any sanctions relief will undoubtedly increase their ability to fund such organizations. The final deal must spell out the immediate consequences for Iran should it violate the agreement, and sanctions must only be reduced when Iran provides unequivocal proof of compliance with the negotiated agreement.

Furthermore, this ought to be clear as day to all involved—any agreement must block Iran's path to a nuclear weapon not for a year, not for five years, but for decades to come. It concerns me that Iran's breakout time will be just a matter of days after twelve or thirteen years. It is important to remember that should we need to re-impose sanctions that we will certainly need more than a few days to do so. Any deal worth signing, therefore, must mandate that Iran demonstrate that it has entirely abandoned its desire for nuclear weapons capabilities.

Similarly, a final deal must insist that Iran dismantle its nuclear infrastructure. Allowing such infrastructure to remain simply courts trouble further down the road. Should Iran's nuclear infrastructure remain in place, it will be far too easy for Iran to not only skirt its responsibilities under the agreement, but to reinvest in its nuclear weapons ambitions quickly and meaningfully.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Obama and Secretary Kerry for working diligently to find a diplomatic solution that stops Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. The United States must certainly continue to negotiate from a position of strength. Such a position is clearly strengthened when Congress continues to weigh in on what a final agreement must entail. At the end of the day, however, I do believe that no deal is better than a bad deal. Let us work together to ensure that we choose neither "no deal" nor "a bad deal," but a strong deal that denies the Iranians all paths to a nuclear weapon.

KILLEN'S KNOWS BRISKET

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Killen's Barbeque in Pearland for being named one of the top barbeque destinations in the country. The Food Network finally recognized what Pearland residents have known since Chef Ronnie Killen opened his doors.

A new Food Network series, "Top 5 Restaurants," named Killen's Barbeque the second best barbeque restaurant in the nation for its delicious smoked brisket. After millions of fan recommendations, our hometown barbeque hero's brisket came second only to a pork rib joint in Memphis. Killen's brisket is truly the best of the best. I can't wait to get back to Texas and order up some delicious brisket!

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to the entire team at Killen's Barbeque on being recognized as a top barbeque destination in America.

STATEMENT ON INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION CALLING FOR SUBSTANTIVE DIALOGUE, WITHOUT PRECONDITIONS, IN ORDER TO ADDRESS TIBETAN GRIEVANCES AND SECURE A NEGOTIATED AGREEMENT FOR THE TIBETAN PEOPLE

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this resolution along with my friends and colleagues Representatives MATT SALMON, NANCY PELOSI, JOSEPH R. PITTS, JAMES P. MCGOVERN, YVETTE D. CLARKE, STEVE CHABOT, ALAN GRAYSON, GERALD CONNOLLY, ALBIO SIRES, ALCEE L. HASTINGS, MICHAEL E. CAPUANO, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, JOHN LEWIS, DONALD S. BEYER, Jr., BETTY MCCOLLUM, SCOTT DESJARLAIS, DAVID N. CICILLINE, ALAN S. LOWENTHAL, JARED POLIS, BRAD SHERMAN, MICHAEL M. HONDA, REID J. RIBBLE, CHARLES B. RANGEL, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, DANA ROHRABACHER, KATHERINE M. CLARK, TRENT FRANKS, and AMI BERA.

This resolution calls for meaningful dialogue and a negotiated settlement for the people of Tibet and acknowledges the contributions of His Holiness, the 14th Dalai Lama in advance of his 80th birthday. The 14th Dalai Lama has tirelessly promoted, through peaceful means, genuine autonomy for the people of Tibet.

Throughout his life, His Holiness, the 14th Dalai Lama, has championed greater understanding, harmony and respect among all religious faiths. As the spiritual and temporal leader of the Tibetan people, he has been a

model for all of us on the importance of preserving the cultural, religious, historical, and linguistic heritage—not just for the Tibetan people but for all people.

His Holiness has done outstanding work to safeguard the environment in the Tibetan plateau, to promote democracy among the Tibetan people, and to champion non-violent conflict resolution. With this resolution, we reaffirm the unwavering friendship between the Tibetan people and the United States and call on the government of the United States to uphold its commitment to preserving the human rights, political and religious freedom of the people of Tibet. Additionally, it calls on the People's Republic of China to enter into meaningful dialogue with the Dalai Lama and his representatives, without any preconditions, in order to produce negotiated settlement for the Tibetan people.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

RECOGNIZING JIM TUDOR

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank Jim Tudor with the Georgia Association of Convenience Stores who is retiring this week after 29 years of outstanding service to the people of Georgia.

Jim and his wife Sandra Tudor have 4 children, James, Kelly, Bobby & Bill, and 5 grandchildren.

In addition to working for 29 years on behalf of Georgia consumers at the Georgia Association of Convenience Stores, Jim worked for 7-Eleven for nine years and served his country as a member of the U.S. Army for two years.

An active member of my community, Jim donated his time through the Covington Rotary and previously the South Dekalb Rotary.

Over the years Jim has received a number of awards, including the Liberty Award from Brown & Williamson in 2000 and various Pigeon Awards from The Pigeon Committee—a group of fellow lobbyists for the State of Georgia.

Jim was recognized by James Magazine as one of the Top Ten Lobbyists or Trade Organizations for 3 straight years: 2012–2013–2014.

He gives back to his community and has been extremely active with Georgia Youth Assembly, the YMCA, and various other youth groups as a mentor and leader.

Upon retirement, Jim and Sandra plan to roam the countryside in their retro-style 2015 Mellow Yellow Winnebago.

I wish Jim, Sandra, and the entire Tudor family lots of happiness as they embark on this new adventure.

HONORING JAMES ''JIM'' E. TUDOR

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I honor today a dedicated Georgia citizen and leader, James ''Jim'' E. Tudor. After a 29-year-long career, Jim Tudor has recently announced his retirement from the Georgia Association of Convenience Stores, where he has contributed his time and loyalty since January 1987.

Before dedicating his career to Georgia's convenience store industry, Mr. Jim Tudor worked for nine years at 7-Eleven, followed by two years of committed service in the United States Army. He is also a 1972 graduate from the University of Cincinnati.

In 2000, Jim Tudor was honored with the Liberty Award from Brown & Williamson, a now-retired American tobacco company responsible for producing many of the United States' popular cigarette brands. Jim has also received various Pigeon Awards presented by The Pigeon Committee, a group of fellow Georgia lobbyists. Namely, in 2012, Jim received the annual Pigeon Award for his work towards the legalization of Sunday alcohol sales in Georgia. Mr. Tudor was again recognized by James Magazine as one of the Top 10 Lobbyists and Associations in Georgia for three consecutive years, 2012, 2013 and 2014.

Aside from his notable career and presence in the Georgia Association of Convenience Stores, Jim maintains a strong presence in the Covington Rotary, and, previously, the South Dekalb Rotary. Within his community he acts as an active mentor and leader, dedicating his time to the Georgia Youth Assembly and The YMCA, amongst various other youth groups. Jim is also a devout Christian and has served in various leadership roles in his church.

Jim and his wife, Sandra Tudor, have four children—James, Kelly, Bobby and Bill—and five grandchildren to whom Jim, known better (more affectionately?) as ''Poppy'' to his grandkids, refers to as ''the reward you get for not killing your children''. Upon retirement, Georgia natives Jim and Sandra Tudor plan to roam the countryside in their beloved retro-style 2015 Mellow Yellow Winnebago.

Over the past three decades, James E. Tudor has been a crucial and unforgettable part of the Georgia Association of Convenience Stores. His service in and out of the workplace has left a lasting impact, and I am pleased to have had the opportunity to meet such a devoted Georgia citizen. A leader, mentor, veteran and friend—Jim, on behalf of the Georgia community, I offer the sincerest thank you and best wishes on your retirement.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,152,658,501,837.30. We've added $7,525,781,452,924.22 to our debt in 6 years. This is over $7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CONGRATULATING JUDGE DAN CONKLIN ON HIS RETIREMENT AND 29 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Judge Dan Conklin's 29 years of service with Missouri's 31st Circuit Court in Greene County.

Judge Conklin was elected Circuit 31, Division 3 judge in 2004 after serving as an associate circuit judge since 1987. The great work and contributions to the judicial system and community have not gone unrecognized, demonstrated with his 2010 re-election and getting 78 percent of the vote. Prior to his time with the 31st Circuit, Judge Conklin was the Republic, Mo., city attorney and worked as a partner in a private practice, Conklin, Holden and Wagner.

Judge Conklin is known for his passion for the court, and he is respected far and wide for it. Colleagues and attorneys have all mentioned the humor he brings to the bench. He has been dedicated to improving the quality and speed of the legal system, putting in 45 weeks per year for jury trials. Judge Conklin has no plans of slowing down as he approaches his 70th birthday, and plans to continue his record of service with a transition back to private practice.

I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Judge Dan Conklin for his decades of service to Greene County and the State of Missouri. I wish him all the very best in his future endeavors.

INTRODUCTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRUST AND INTEGRITY ACT OF 2015

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Ms. JACKSON LEE, I am pleased to introduce the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2015, along with additional cosponsors. This legislation has a history of support by both police and civil rights organizations around the country and is focused on building trust between law enforcement agencies, officials and the people they serve.

Over the past two decades, tensions between police and communities of color have grown as allegations of bias-based policing by law enforcement agents, sometimes supported by data collection efforts and video evidence, have increased in number and frequency. Since the tragic police-involved shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, there has been public outcry for Congressional action to address police accountability and public safety issues through the adoption of substantive law enforcement policy reforms.

Despite the fact that the majority of law enforcement officers perform their duties professionally and without bias, the relationship between the police and some of minority communities has deteriorated to such a degree that federal action is required to begin addressing the issue. With recent Washington

Post reports of almost 400 police-involved shooting fatalities in the first five months of 2015, all should agree that the time for bipartisan action is long overdue.

The Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act is designed to provide incentives for local police organizations to voluntarily adopt standards to ensure that incidents of deadly force or misconduct will be minimized through appropriate management and training protocols and properly investigated, should they occur. The bill authorizes the Department of Justice to work cooperatively with independent accreditation, law enforcement and community-based organizations to further develop and refine accreditation standards, and further authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to law enforcement agencies for the purpose of obtaining accreditation from certified law enforcement accreditation organizations.

Beyond the human toll created by law enforcement accountability issues, there remains the fiscal impact created by the high cost of litigation settlements for police abuse claims. Currently, there are no federally recognized minimum standards for operating a law enforcement agency. The ad hoc nature of police management has accordingly left many officers and agencies in the dark about how to cope with changes in their communities. While most cities fail to systematically track the cost of litigation, the cost reports for major cities have proven staggering. In New York City alone, during Mayor Michael Bloomberg's three term tenure, NYPD payouts were in excess of $1 billion for policing claims. For small departments, the cost of a single high profile incident could prove crippling in its impact on public safety.

While the Department of Justice has a range of criminal and civil authority to address policing issues, the Civil Rights Division will never have the resources necessary to investigate more than a small fraction of those departments engaged in unconstitutional conduct, even with the enhanced funding and task force authority granted by this legislation. Through the support of a robust accreditation regime, like that existing in healthcare, Congress can ensure that all communities have the best trained and managed police departments. Only by establishing acceptable police operations standards can we begin to preemptively address issues like use of force and heal the rifts within our communities.

Media reports from Baltimore and other cities depicting confrontations between protestors and their police departments illustrate the current divide between law enforcement and the communities they police. In the past years, cities from New York to Cincinnati and Miami to Los Angeles have experienced unrest following controversial use of force incidents by their police. Absent a climate of trust and accountability, community needs are not served and the jobs of the police officers become more difficult and dangerous.

The energies of Congress should be focused on the adoption of legislative priorities that address the substance of law enforcement management and strengthen the current battery of tools available to sanction misconduct. As a Congress we have been enthusiastic about supporting programs designed to get officers on the street. We must be just as willing to support programs designed to train and manage them after they get there. The current national climate requires decisive action to implement solutions. Out of respect for all who have lost their lives over the last nine months—both law enforcement and civilian—I hope you will join Ms. JACKSON LEE and myself in supporting legislation that initiates the reforms necessary to restore public trust and accountability to law enforcement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID W. JOLLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 375.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

HOUSE MAJORITY TURNING ITS BACK ON COMPETITIVENESS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I and many business leaders are having trouble fathoming this foolhardy decision by House Republicans to allow the Export-Import Bank to expire.

I thought my Republican colleagues wanted to support small businesses and create jobs.

Well, last year, the Bank helped 121 Virginia businesses, and thousands more nationwide, reach new global markets with their American-made products and services. Nearly 90% of its loans benefit small businesses, and those loans supported 164,000 jobs, most of which had higher-than-average wages.

I also thought my Republican colleagues wanted to help reduce the deficit.

The Bank returned $675 million to the Treasury last year and more than $1 billion in each of the previous two years.

By allowing the Bank to expire, House Republicans are casting aside a program that has consistently created jobs, strengthened small businesses, and helped reduce the deficit.

Every other industrialized nation has an export-import bank, and this unilateral disarmament cedes American competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, there is a bipartisan majority that supports the Ex-Im Bank. I urge you to bring up a clean extension and let the House work its will.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. SUSAN MARTIN'S SERVICE AS PRESIDENT OF EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Susan Martin for her seven years of service as President of Eastern Michigan University and her long career as a public servant to the State of Michigan. Dr. Martin's commitment to EMU and higher education has resulted in tremendous improvement for the university's campus and greatly enriched the collegiate experience of thousands of students. Dr. Martin's long career in public service reveals her dedication to the betterment of the State of Michigan and her capacity to inspire others to achieve academic excellence.

Dr. Martin's passion for higher education began when she worked as an administrator at Grand Valley State University. For 18 years, she worked in several faculty and administrative positions, including Assistant and Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, Special Assistant to the Provost, and Executive Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs. She later served as the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at The University of Michigan-Dearborn.

Dr. Martin's seven years as the first female president of Eastern Michigan University are marked by many accomplishments. Under her leadership, the university has experienced enrollment growth, the expansion of the Honors College, increased financial aid assistance, student-focused academic advising, collaboration with public safety agencies in the surrounding community, the creation of living and learning spaces, and massive construction projects.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Dr. Susan Martin for her seven years as president of Eastern Michigan University and her dedication to quality, affordable, public education. I thank her for her leadership, and wish her many years of success.

TRIBUTE TO MS. GLADYS OPELOUSAS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, reaching the age of 90 years is a remarkable milestone; and

Whereas, Ms. Gladys Opelousas was born on August 30, 1925 in Marks, Mississippi and today she is celebrating reaching that milestone of reaching 90 years of age; and

Whereas, Ms. Opelousas has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; she is a devoted aunt and sister that blesses the lives of others with her kindness and charm; and

Whereas, Ms. Opelousas is celebrating her 90th Birthday with family members and friends in Chicago, Illinois; and

Whereas, she celebrates a life of blessings and through her goodwill, communities across the nation have been enhanced; and

Whereas, the Lord has been her Shepherd throughout 90 years and she is leading by example a blessed life by serving as a faithful matriarch to her family and a precious jewel to our nation; and

Whereas, we are honored that she is celebrating the milestone of her birthday today with family that hail from the 4th District of Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Gladys Opelousas for an exemplary life which is an

inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. ''HANK'' JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim August 30, 2015 as Ms. Gladys Opelousas Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 15th day of August, 2015.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for votes on June 23, 2015 due to responsibilities back in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted:

''No'' on roll call no. 376, passage of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors Access to Medicare Act of 2015;

''Yes'' on roll call no. 377, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as amended, H.R. 805, the Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act of 2015 (DOTCOM Act of 2015); and,

''Yes'' on roll call no. 378, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as amended, H.R. 2576, the TSCA Modernization Act of 2015.

HONORING LOUIS WILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a tremendous public servant who has dedicated his life to serving the needs of his community. Louis Williams, of Edwards, Mississippi, is retiring from the police force after 39 years of service, 38 of which he spent as chief of police. As an officer, Williams has served as a vital link between law enforcement and the youth of his community as a figure both highly respected and admired.

Before joining the police force, Williams coached Edwards' youth baseball and basketball and has continued doing so over the years. His mentorship gave him the relatability necessary to effectively police his city and maintain a healthy relationship with its citizens. The number of adolescents he has coached now spans three generations for many families whom Williams has gotten to know over his decades of service.

As police chief, his dedication is unquestioned, as he has made the concerted effort to maintain round-the-clock availability. While Williams views that as a condition of the job, he is greatly appreciated for it by all who have ever given him a call. His career has exemplified how policemen and women can govern efficiently by truly committing their time and effort to their citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Chief Williams for his dedication to serving others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 23rd, 2015, I was absent during roll call vote #377. Had I been present, I would have voted ''YEA'' On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 805, Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters Act of 2015 (DOTCOM Act of 2015).

IN SUPPORT OF THE INTRODUCTION OF H. RES. 329 ''LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH''

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate LGBTQ Pride Month and the remarkable progress that has been made in making our country more diverse and tolerant and embracing differences in the 17 years since the cruel murder of Matthew Shepherd, a college student from Laramie, Wyoming, and 12 years since the historic case of Lawrence v. Texas that laid the groundwork for the Supreme Court decision in United States v. Windsor, which held that the Defense of Marriage Act was unconstitutional.

As a country, America has made and continues to make great progress in the area of social equality, as evidenced most dramatically by the seismic shift in public support for marriage equality over the past decade.

Today, supporters of marriage equality dramatically outnumber opponents by 61%–35%; a near total reversal from 2004, when opponents outnumbered supporters 58–39 percent. Currently, we await a critical ruling from the Supreme Court which could legalize same-sex marriage nationwide later this month.

Our country made progress in bringing our LGBTQ brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers, out of the shadows with the repeal of ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell,'' which I was proud to support.

Our nation is now stronger and our people are safer thanks to the sacrifices made by these brave Americans, who no longer need to choose between service and silence.

There have been other changes for the better.

In April 2015, President Obama issued a landmark Executive Order prohibiting discrimination against LGBTQ persons in the workplace.

This civil rights victory ensures the tax dollars used to pay government contractors support contractors that are committed to equal employment opportunity for all persons regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

This legislation marks a major shift from a time when the U.S. Civil Service Commission prohibited the hiring of LGBTQ persons to a time when the Secretary of Defense has selected an openly gay man as his chief of staff.

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 46th anniversary of the LGBTQ Civil Rights Movement, where activists such as Frank Kameny led the struggle for the voices of the LGBTQ community to be heard.

Frank Kameny's courageous demonstrations inspired others to resist mistreatment, and we witnessed in 1969 what happens when a community says enough is enough.

Our country has made progress since the Stonewall uprising of 1969, and with the support of equal rights for all communities by leaders such as President Barack Obama, more and more voices are being heard.

Mr. Speaker, although more remains to be done to realize the full promise of America that all are equally treated and protected by the law, it is undeniable that America is closer to realizing that promise than it was during the dark days of Stonewall.

So there is much reason for joy and optimism as my home city of Houston celebrates Houston Pride Week right now.

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the 16th largest LGBTQ community in the nation is located in the Houston metropolitan area, which I am privileged to represent.

The Houston LGBTQ community is culturally diverse, economically dynamic, and artistically vibrant.

Houston Pride Week has been an annual event for the last 36 years, since 1979, and promotes the individuality of Houston's ever-growing LGBTQ community.

The Pride Festival and Parade are at the center of the Celebration and are annually attended by more than 400,000 people from Houston and around the world. I am a proud participant and previous grand marshal of the event.

Mr. Speaker, progress is made through the efforts of courageous leaders who actively engage their communities and face adversity to ensure that the rights of all are clearly recognized and protected.

People like the legendary Bayard Rustin, who organized the 1947 Journey of Reconciliation which inspired the Freedom Rides of the 1960s and helped Dr. King organize the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and who was the driving force behind the historic 1963 March on Washington.

Texas natives such as Sheryl Swoopes, a 3-time WNBA Most Valuable Player and champion for the Houston Comets, as well as Houston Mayor Annise Parker, whose election made Houston the largest city in the U.S. to have an openly gay mayor.

These leaders have set an example of what can happen when we lift the limits of inequality and support our fellow Americans in pursuit of their inalienable rights.

Other members of the LGBTQ community whose contributions have enriched American culture and made our country better include the great poet Langston Hughes; Mandy Carter, 2008 national co-chair of Obama Pride and lifelong activist; Billy Strayhorn, the musician and gifted composer whose 30-year collaboration with Duke Ellington gave the world some of the greatest jazz music ever; Tom Waddell, army medical doctor and Olympic athlete; and James Baldwin, one of the towering figures in the history of American literature.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to acknowledge the achievements of just a few of the countless number of Americans who overcame prejudice and discrimination to make America a more welcoming place for succeeding generations of LGBTQ community members.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we need to think in a comprehensive way about water in California. The controversial California Water Fix, formerly known as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), is an outdated and destructive plumbing system. It does not create any new water nor does it provide the water and the ecological protection that the Golden State must have. California and the federal government must set aside this big, expensive, destructive plumbing plan and immediately move forward with a comprehensive approach that includes:

1) Conservation,
2) Recycling,
3) The creation of new storage systems,
4) Fix the Delta—right sized conveyance, levee improvements, and habitat restoration,
5) Science driven process,
6) Protection of existing water rights.

This combination of projects constitutes a comprehensive water plan for the state.

Through a comprehensive plan that brings all stakeholders to the table, California can solve its water needs, and it can avoid the continuous water wars that have long divided our state. Unfortunately, California is once again embroiled in a bitter water war brought about by the California Water Fix (BDCP), the most recent attempt to fix California's water supply. After more than five years of study and over $200,000,000 spent on consultants, the process has become bogged down and turned into another battle pitting north vs. south, water exporters vs. environmentalists, and senior water right holders vs. new comers. A classic California water brawl is in full bloom.

The governor's water plan for California is to take water out of the Sacramento River just south of Sacramento and put it into two tunnels each 40 miles long, 40 feet in diameter and with a potential capacity of moving 15,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). While the current proposal is set up to move 9000 cfs, the twin tunnels have a much larger capacity therefore setting the system up for future expansion. Pumping would also continue directly from the southern Delta at the Tracy pumps. The system will be able to deliver up to 5.3 million acre feet of water to the pumps in Tracy and then on to the San Joaquin Valley farmers and Los Angeles.

So what is wrong with the Water Fix (BDCP)? It is not a water plan for California. It does not create one gallon of new water. It does not solve the long term needs of the state. With a minimum estimated construction and operating cost over 50 years of $24.5 billion, it is an extraordinarily expensive plumbing system dressed up with a coating of habitat restoration. The plan simply takes water from one region and delivers it to another while tearing up acres of prime agricultural farm land in the process. All of this while stoking the fire of divisiveness over water that has plagued our state for years.

A quick look at the water flow in the Sacramento River over the last two decades shows that approximately six months out of the year there is somewhere between 15 and 20 thousand cubic feet per second (cfs) of water flowing in the Sacramento River. This proposal has the potential to suck the river dry and destroy the largest delta estuary on the west coast of the Western Hemisphere. Critical habitat for dozens of fish species like salmon, striped bass, and sturgeon would be threatened. These fish and the water they live in are crucial for jobs, agriculture and fishing businesses, and the region's economy.

We should never build a water system that has such destructive potential. It is never safe to assume that ecological concerns will trump greed and thirst. We should keep in mind that in 2012 the U.S. House of Representatives voted on H.R. 1837, the euphemistically titled Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Reliability Act. The bill passed by a vote of 246 to 175 and swept away all environmental protections for the Delta while stealing 800,000 acre feet of water from the aquatic environment. Luckily, the legislation was derailed in the U.S. Senate, but H.R. 1837 in one form or another is likely to return in future legislative battles.

California must move beyond a patched plumbing system. We need to think about what California really needs, and what it needs is a comprehensive water plan. Big changes are coming that threaten our water supply and our economy. A short list of these challenges include: climate change and related weather events, population growth, world food supplies, and earthquakes.

Climate change is real and its effect on California will be significant. The Colorado River Basin is in a prolonged drought, and likely to be much drier in the future. Based on today's water flows, the water in the Colorado River is oversubscribed by a third and projections indicate less water in the future. This is a big, big problem for the seven states that rely on the river, and especially for Southern California.

The Sierra Nevada Mountains, the Central Valley, and the coastal ranges will also be drastically impacted by climate change. We know that the timing of the precipitation is going to change and the snow is already melting earlier. As a result, the snowpack is moving up the mountains and while it may be deeper at the higher altitudes, the amount of land it covers is greatly reduced. It's the lower snowpack that has the greatest volumes of water and if that continues to recede, we will have less and less water. The 2009 ''California Water Plan,'' published by the California Department of Water Resources, estimates that the snowpack will decrease 25–40 percent by 2050. We must also anticipate more severe storms and flooding. All of this means the natural and man-made storage systems will hold less water. Putting the denial of scientific facts aside, California has to deal with the reality of climate change and its water policy implications.

We know California's population will continue to grow and therefore, the demand for water will increase. We know the world will be very hungry in the future, and we know that the role of agriculture in California is going to be exceedingly important. California agriculture not only fills our own desire for diverse and nutritious foods, but it will also continue to meet basic food needs for people around the world and will continue to serve as an essential component of our nation's economy.

We know the Delta is in serious trouble. The fish species are threatened with extinction and a total collapse of the estuary ecosystem is possible if the current water pumping program continues. Rising sea levels and deferred maintenance threaten the Delta levees which protect nearly 500,000 people, thousands of acres of valuable farm land, and miles of critical highways, gas and water transmission lines, and water delivery channels. Major upgrades are needed.

For these reasons, California must take off its blinders and expand its scope when thinking about ways to manage its water supply. It must be a holistic approach that is applied to every project that will impact the water needs of all Californians.

To achieve this comprehensive approach, here are six specific actions to provide a foundation for California's water future. If California does all of these, we will create new water supplies and better use the resources we already have:

1) Conservation,
2) Recycling,
3) The creation of new storage systems,
4) Fix the Delta—right sized conveyance, levee improvements, and habitat restoration,
5) Science driven process,
6) Protection of existing water rights

The quickest and cheapest source of new water is to stretch our current supplies by conserving what we have. Californians have been at this for years in our cities, in our industries, on the farm, and in our homes. We have engaged in serious water conservation, yet more can and should be done everywhere.

There are many conservation strategies. One conservation strategy is to use devices that measure the moisture in the soil to provide real time monitoring of the exact amount of water needed for ideal growing conditions. These devices are connected to a computer that automatically turns on just the right amount of water. These systems are in use and conserve at least ten percent with a financial payback in less than one year. If they were deployed widely perhaps at least 1 percent of the 30 million acre feet of water consumed by agriculture could be saved each year (300,000 acre feet).

All of us are going to do a lot more water conservation, not just the agriculture community. The water conservation mandate set by the state is a 20 percent reduction per capita by 2020 which equals 1,600,000 acre feet. In a very real way conservation can create new water that was not previously available for use. To be on the conservative side, let us assume that just one quarter of the State's goal could be obtained in the next decade, thereby adding 400,000 acre feet of new water to our supplies each year.

Can you name the fifth biggest river on the west coast of the Western Hemisphere? It's the water that flows out of the sanitation plants in Southern California and is dumped into the Pacific Ocean.

Why would any sane government take water from the Sacramento River, pump it 500 miles south, lift it 5,000 feet in the air, clean it, use it once, clean it to a higher standard than the day it arrives in Southern California, then dump it in the ocean? California does just this as it discharges over 3.5 million acre feet of water to the ocean each year, much of which could be reused.

We need to think seriously about recycling, not just in Southern California, but everywhere. The State of California currently recycles approximately 650,000 acre feet of water

each year and has set a water recycling goal of 1.5 million acre feet of new water in California by 2020, and 2.5 million acre feet by 2030. While achievable, WateReuse California estimates this goal cannot be achieved without State regulatory changes to expand the types of recycling available that rely on existing technologies.

Another option is desalination of the ocean. This is feasible and used extensively throughout the world, however it is not a viable option for all communities. It costs about 40 percent more to desalinate sea water than to recycle water using current technology. However, technological advances are being pursued for both recycling and desalination that could lower the costs of both.

In the next ten years, conservation and recycling in California can create approximately 2.2 million acre feet of new water to use each year, and that can increase to 3.2 million acre feet in twenty years. This is new water that is not available today because it is wasted or pumped out to sea. It can be developed at a reasonable cost when compared to all other alternatives that might be out there. Conservation and recycling are steps one and two in a comprehensive water program for California.

Water storage south of the Delta is possible and necessary. The capacity of the great Delta pumps near Tracy is 15,000 cubic feet per second. They are designed to meet maximum demand south of the Delta. They do not operate year round, only when there is sufficient water in the Delta, when threatened fish are not near the pumps, and when there is agricultural and urban demand south of the Tracy pumps. There is very limited water storage capacity south of the Delta. We must build more. San Luis and Los Vaqueros reservoirs could be expanded. New dams could be built at Los Banos Grandes, Temperance Flats, and numerous smaller off stream sites throughout the San Joaquin Valley. There are extensive and numerous aquifers throughout the San Joaquin Valley that may prove suitable to store additional water that would be used in a conjunctive water management system. With these water storage facilities in place and a smaller cross Delta facility operating year round, the need for havoc causing, excessive pumping in the Delta could be avoided.

When coupled with recycling, the underground aquifers in Southern California are another key to our water future. The underground aquifers of the Santa Ana River in Orange County, the San Fernando Basin, Chino Basin, San Bernardino, San Gabriel Basin, and others have a combined capacity larger than Shasta Reservoir, the largest man made reservoir in the state. Today, some recycled water is put into the underground water basins to be stored for those inevitably dry years. When needed, it is pumped out, used, cleaned and returned to storage. On a larger scale this recycling system could create as much as 2.5 million acre feet of new water, and thereby reduce the need for shifting Colorado River supplies and imports from the Sacramento River.

Surface and underground storage should be used in a conjunctive water management program. Use the rivers when there is lots of water and use the reservoirs when there is little. Another way to describe this strategy is ''big gulp'' and ''little sips.'' When there are low flows in the Delta the system would take a little sip. When there is excessive water in the Delta, the system would take a big gulp, but there must be some place to put that water when the big gulp is taken. Therefore, the surface and sub-surface reservoirs south of the Delta become an essential element in a California water plan.

Water storage north of the Delta is also important, and three proposals are on the books today. An off stream reservoir at Sites, located west of Williams, has great promise for storage and for creating greater flexibility in managing the Sacramento River for salmon runs, water demand, and Delta outflow. This reservoir can deliver 500,000 acre feet of annual yield and the additional flexibility that it offers can under some scenarios save another 500,000 acre feet of water that would otherwise be released into the river systems. Raising Shasta Dam is also possible, as is better conjunctive management of the many aquifers in the Sacramento Valley. State and federal agencies have already commenced studies for these projects. A quick completion of these studies is essential.

The current plan for the California Water Fix (BDCP) is a dual use facility with the main focus on the twin tunnels with a capacity of 15,000 cubic feet per second, and the continued use of the Delta channels for moving water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers to the Tracy pumps. This dual use system adds another layer of risk to the eco-system and agricultural economy of the Delta with the potential for the massive tunnels to suck the Delta dry from the north and from the south with the thirsty pumps. In scale, the cost and destructive potential of this project will rival the Three Gorges Dam on the Yangtze River in China. The twin tunnel proposal is a large scale, destructive project that does not create one gallon of new water for a thirsty California.

The location of the intakes for the twin tunnels is in the heart of the rich farm lands of the northern Delta, near the small community of Courtland. Thousands of acres of valuable farmland essential to California agriculture production will be destroyed during construction of the project, and, following completion, a vast industrial zone of pumping stations, fish screens, reservoirs, and electrical stations will impede on one of California's great agricultural regions. Along the forty mile route of the twin tunnels the construction process will produce a total of 22 million cubic yards of tunnel muck. This combination of soil and conditioning agents will have to be stored and managed and the latest draft of the plan calls for storage areas along the tunnel ranging in size from 100 to 570 acres. The amount of muck extracted would be enough to cover 100 football fields to a height of roughly 100 feet, and in the end will destroy close to 1600 acres of farm land while disrupting domestic and agricultural water wells.

Go forward carefully; start small; use science to evaluate each step; then proceed to the next step. Remember the Delta is a unique and precious environmental asset. We must take care of it. A narrowly focused plumbing system like the California Water Fix/BDCP will not achieve progress in creating a water supply sufficient for California's future. We must pursue a holistic, comprehensive approach that will achieve a bigger bang for our buck.

First, reduce demand on the Delta with steps one, two and three: water conservation, recycling, and strategic use of storage facilities. Use the ''Big Gulp, Little Sip'' pumping strategy. Move forward with the flood plain and fresh and saltwater marsh habitat improvements. Repair and improve the key Delta levees. Evaluate the effect on the Delta as these projects come on line.

Then, and only if necessary, proceed with a conveyance system that is much smaller and with a reduced capacity to destroy.

A much smaller facility with a capacity of no more than 3,000 cubic feet per second could be built to deliver water from the Sacramento River to the Tracy pumps. With the normal minimum flows in the Sacramento River above 15,000 cfs, a small 3,000 cfs facility could operate at least 300 days in most years, delivering approximately two million acre feet of water south to the pumps at Tracy where it would be pumped south to the new and expanded storage facilities.

There are several alternative ways to build this smaller system. One alternative is found with a careful look at the Delta map which reveals that two thirds of this Delta friendly system is already built. Two miles from the State Capital is the Port of Sacramento and the shipping channel that ends 25 miles south near Rio Vista. From there it is thirteen miles to existing channels and the Tracy pumps. The Federal Government already owns the land along the river where an intake and fish screen could be built, allowing 3000 cfs of Sacramento River water to enter the channel and flow south to a shipping lock at the southern end of the channel. Then, pumps could deliver the water into a short 12-mile pipe beneath the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and into the existing Delta channels that lead to the Tracy Pumps. The threatened Delta fish could be protected by sealing the channel from the Delta. Such a smaller facility is less costly than two 40-foot diameter, 40-mile long tunnels that devastate large swaths of the Delta and put the entire Delta at risk.

It is correct that this smaller facility like the twin tunnels is insufficient to quench the thirst of the Southern water contractors. This is where the southern reservoirs and the ''Little Sip, Big Gulp'' strategy comes into play. In normal water years there is sufficient water in the Delta to allow the pumps to take a big gulp of two million acre feet of water. This amount together with the two million acre feet delivered through the 3,000 cfs facility and the new water developed from conservation and recycling efforts could add up to six million acre feet. This plan would create far more new water than will ever be available with the current California Water Fix (BDCP) plan, which in its current state creates nothing new, except new destruction.

This small 3,000 cfs proposal and the current twin tunnel proposal envision the continued use of the existing Delta levee system as water conveyance channels for the delivery of water to the big pumps at Tracy. However, the California Water Fix (BDCP) has neither a plan nor funding for the maintenance of the levees that are crucial for their proposed water conveyance system. The Delta levees must be upgraded and maintained if water is to be transported through the Delta and if the Delta agriculture, infrastructure, ecology and people are to be protected.

No sane homeowner would go fifty years without maintaining their plumbing system. For more than fifty years, the Bureau of Reclamation and the California Department of Water

Resources have used the Delta levees as a plumbing system to deliver water from the Sacramento River to the Tracy pumps. Yet, they have spent virtually no money maintaining these critical levees, the failure of which could shut down water deliveries for an extended period of time. The Federal and State agencies have relied upon the local reclamation agencies to do the repairs, literally giving the exporters a free ride. When a levee does give way and an island is flooded, it is the local agency and Federal and State governments that foot the bill to repair the levees, often at a much greater cost than would have been necessary with basic maintenance.

Legislation is necessary to require that the Federal and State water contractors, who have for years and will continue for even more years depended upon the Delta levees for the delivery of water to their fields and cities, pay a part of the levee maintenance cost.

The California Water Fix (BDCP) envisions restoring flood plains and the salt and freshwater marsh habitat of the Delta in an effort to restore the fisheries. However, a series of questions are raised: where to do it, how much to do, what type, at what cost and who is to pay for the restoration? Those who have created the ecological problem should pay for the restoration of the problem. All this will require careful attention to science, and a careful balance between competing goals. Current science indicates that no amount of habitat restoration can compensate for the damage done to fish from excessive water exports.

The California Water Fix (BDCP) and any other proposal must be based and driven by quality science that measures and informs decisions. California and federal law require that the Delta aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems be protected. We must do so, not just because the laws demand it, but because our status as human beings on this planet demands that we pay attention and protect precious and rare ecosystems. Also, healthy ecosystems provide a valuable asset to our communities because healthy ecosystems help to ensure we have healthy water. If we let the ecosystems fall by the wayside, our water will get dirtier making it increasingly difficult and costly to clean it up enough to use. For all of these reasons, we must let science govern.

The California Water Fix (BDCP) anticipates 50-year permits from state and federal agencies to allow incidental takes of endangered fish species. Once granted, the water exporters will have assurances that the project can take covered species and pump Delta water despite changes in the environment. To date, the California Water Fix (BDCP) has not built in flexibility to address the inevitable changes that will occur and the damage that could be done if the plan does not account for climate change.

We must also use science to understand our river basins in the age of climate change. Dams on California Rivers serve multiple purposes of water storage, flood protection, electric power generation, recreation, and environmental river flows. Current dam operations on California Rivers place flood protection as the first priority followed by water storage. The decisions to release water to create greater flood storage are based on the average river flows compiled from the last 60 years. Climate change and resulting river flow change is certain and one can only imagine how rare it will be for the historic average to actually occur.

We have the technology today to better understand what is happening, in real time, in every river basin in this state. Satellites and unmanned aircraft using infrared and ground sensing radar, together with terrestrial stations collecting soil conditions, snow temperature and moisture content coupled with telemetry will soon be deployed in the American River basin. Collecting this data and using it in real time to predict river flows allows for better operation of the dams so that additional flood storage capacity could be available by lowering the reservoir ahead of the storm or keeping water in the reservoir if a major storm is heading for a different river basin or if it is a cold snow storm. Using the best science can simultaneously deliver increased flood protection and greater water storage.

Soon after gold was discovered in California, the miners discovered that water could be used to separate gold from gravel and soon after, the right to the water flowing in the rivers became as valuable as the gold. Today, water is California's gold. The classic water war in California is usually about one group attempting to take another group's water. It is reasonable to view the current twin tunnels conflict in this way: southern exporters taking water belonging to northern water right holders and water necessary for the aquatic river environment. Any water plan that ignores the prior and existing water rights is destined to be embroiled in a vicious and contracted water war. If a project is to be built, then existing rights must be honored.

California must develop a comprehensive water program. The current California Water Fix (BDCP) is an outdated and destructive plumbing system. It does not create any new water. It does not provide the water and the ecological protection the Golden State must have. California and the federal government must set aside the big, expensive, destructive plumbing plan and immediately move forward with a comprehensive program that includes:

1) Conservation,

2) Recycling,

3) The creation of new storage systems,

4) Fix the Delta—right sized conveyance, levee improvements, and habitat restoration,

5) Science driven process,

6) Protection of existing water rights

California is once again embroiled in a water war. The California Water Fix/BDCP is not a comprehensive plan; it is a plumbing system that seeks to extract water from one part of the state and deliver it to another part. If history is any indication, water wars are expensive and fruitless. Only by embracing a comprehensive plan that creates new water for the entire state can we avoid gridlock and a water war. This paper presents a plan that emphasizes using the best available science and a portfolio of water projects to create a positive solution to the water challenge facing California. It's time to move forward and ensure a reliable water supply for the entire state.

[From sacbee.com]

WATER SOLUTION FOR CALIFORNIA: 'LITTLE SIP, BIG GULP'

(By John Garamendi)

Don't be fooled. The dreaded twin tunnels through the heart of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta did not die. The governor's new ''California Water Fix'' plan is the same destructive twin tunnel $17 billion boondoggle, just without the fig leaf cover of habitat restoration. Not one gallon of new water supply is created for our thirsty state.

California water needs can be met with a comprehensive program that over the next 10 years can create more than 5 million acre-feet of new water at a cost no greater than the twin tunnels. Here are the keys to our water future:

1. Conservation

2. Recycling/desalinization

3. Creation of new surface and aquifer storage

4. Science-driven process

5. Fixing the Delta—right-sized conveyance, levee improvements and habitat restoration

Go forward carefully; start small; use science to evaluate each step; then proceed to the next step. The Delta is a unique and precious environmental asset.

First, reduce demand on the Delta with water conservation, recycling and desalinization, and strategic use of surface and aquifer storage. Move forward with habitat improvements for the floodplain and fresh and saltwater marshes. Repair and improve the key Delta levees. Evaluate the effect on the Delta as these projects come online. Then, and only if necessary, proceed with a conveyance system that is much smaller and with a reduced capacity to destroy.

A much smaller facility with a capacity of no more than 3,000 cubic feet per second could be built to deliver water from the Sacramento River to the Tracy pumps. With the normal minimum flows in the Sacramento River above 15,000 cubic feet per second, a 3,000–cfs facility could operate at least 300 days in most years, delivering about 2 million acre feet of water to the pumps at Tracy and on south to new and expanded storage facilities.

Half of this Delta-friendly system is already built. Two miles from the state Capitol is the Port of Sacramento. A fish screen could be built at the existing opening on the Sacramento River, allowing 3,000 cubic feet per second of Sacramento River water to enter the deep water channel and flow 25 miles south to a shipping lock at the southern end of the channel. Then, pumps could deliver the water into a 12-mile pipe beneath the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and into a new aqueduct alongside the Old River channel that leads to the Tracy pumps.

An alternative route could take the water out at the southern end of the shipping channel, delivering it into an aqueduct around the town of Rio Vista, across the Sacramento River at Sherman Island and through Contra Costa County to the Tracy pumps. This route would intersect six vital San Francisco Bay aqueducts, thus creating a safety system for 8 million Bay residents.

The ''Little Sip, Big Gulp'' strategy completes the program to meet California's future water needs.

In normal water years, there is sufficient water in the Delta to allow the pumps to take a ''big gulp'' of 2 million acre-feet of water. This amount together with the 2 million acre-feet delivered through the 3,000-cfs facility would meet the annual water demand south of the Delta.

The new water developed from surface and underground storage, conservation, and recycling and desalinization efforts could add up to 5 million acre-feet, and together with an eco-friendly Delta solution would be enough to serve the future needs of a thriving California.

CONGRATULATING ARAPAHOE/DOUGLAS WORKS! (ADW)

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Arapahoe/Douglas Works! (ADW). ADW was selected as the NAWB 2015 WIB Excellence Award Winner and was recognized during the 2015 NAWB Forum in Washington, D.C.

The WIB Excellence Award honors workforce investment boards that have demonstrated an ongoing ability to develop comprehensive workforce solutions and innovations for its community by creating proactive program initiatives, engaging businesses, diversifying funding, and ensuring accountability. Not only did ADW fulfill and exceed its Workforce Investment Act responsibilities, but it has continuously demonstrated its dedication and leadership in promoting workforce development strategies.

By developing partnerships and initiatives that serve the entire community, ADW has proven to be a critical resource to southeastern Colorado. I am proud to hold my annual Relevant Job Skills Seminar in conjunction with ADW to better prepare those looking for jobs.

Mr. Speaker, Arapahoe/Douglas Works! is a testament to how public service can help build a community and I am honored to represent them in Congress.

MARY LOIS NEVINS

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and work of my close friend, Mary Lois Nevins, who passed away on May 25, 2015.

A resident of Pasadena for over seventy years, Mary Lois embodied civic engagement as she was an active supporter of the Altadena-Pasadena Young Democrats, the California Democratic Council, the League of Women Voters, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Club, and the National Women's Political Caucus of Greater Pasadena. She walked the precincts, knocked on doors to engage voters, and volunteered her time to monitor polling stations on Election Day. In fact, she was gearing up for the 2016 elections during her last weeks.

I met Mary Lois when I won a seat on the California Board of Equalization, which was previously held by her husband, Richard Nevins. From that time, she was my most enthusiastic supporter in Pasadena, and I owe so much of my connection to the Pasadena community to her. After I came to the House of Representatives and redistricting placed Pasadena in my district, Mary was the first one to express her excitement and support.

But my longstanding friendship with Mary Lois is just an example of the passion and positive change she brought to Pasadena. After raising three sons with Richard, she went back to school to earn her teaching credentials, and spent the next twenty years teaching at-risk youth at the center now known as Hillsides. But she didn't stop there. She founded the Tutor-Friend Volunteer program, which brings together the young residents of Hillsides with high school and college students in Pasadena. This unique program allows students to build close-knit communities as they help each other reach their highest potential. That was Mary Lois' strength since she saw the best in everyone she met. The students at Hillsides, many in the foster care system, were no exception. She was determined that they receive every opportunity regardless of their background, and her legacy with the Hillsides program will never be forgotten.

After she retired from Hillsides in 1986, Mary Lois remained active in Pasadena. She was devoted to the Mother's Club Family Learning Center, and served as the President of the Board from 1988 to 1992. She promoted the revolutionary concept of two-generation learning, which focuses on educating both the child and his or her caregiver. She believed that educating a child during the first years of life is critical to a healthy future, but it is just as important to educate the child's caregiver. Thanks to her dedication, the Mother's Club is now a nationally recognized model for two-generation family learning.

Mary Lois is truly a shining example of activism. She firmly believed that everyone should be engaged in their government, educated about the issues affecting them and their community, and that ordinary citizens putting their minds together could make a difference. We are thankful for her many years of service, and will continue to honor her legacy and commitment to her community.

HONORING MR. FRANK KOGUT

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Frank Kogut, a 100-year-old veteran of World War II, who served in the Army from 1941 to 1946.

As the Representative of a district home to veterans of every major conflict since World War II, I know very well the sacrifices that our veterans, military men and women, and their families have made for our country. I speak for our district and the Nation when I sincerely thank Mr. Kogut for his service to our country. Mr. Kogut, who held the rank of First Lieutenant, captured a German Admiral and fought in the 746th Tank Battalion on D-Day.

Mr. Kogut's courage and resolve reflect the dedication of a generation of men and women who served during one of history's darkest periods. His patriotism is truly admirable and exhibits a level of dedication and self-sacrifice worthy of recognition. It is with great pleasure and gratitude that I honor Frank Kogut.

RECOGNIZING SANDI ADAMS-SLESCH

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Sandi Adams-Slesch's 30 years of committed service to the people of Tullytown Borough.

Tullytown lays on the southern edge of Lower Bucks County along the Delaware River, between Falls and Bristol Townships, and includes part of historic Levittown—the embodiment of the American dream for families who returned home after World War II. Levittown—and Tullytown—has an important place in our local history, and one that is only strengthened by the individuals that live and work there.

For three decades, Sandi has attended to the needs of her neighbors and community through her service as Police Secretary of Tullytown Borough. Her thoughtful and dedicated work has earned the praise of her peers and added to the success of her hometown.

The continued efforts of involved individuals, like Sandi, make my District of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, a special one to represent.

I thank Sandi for dutifully executing her role as Police Secretary for the last 30 years and wish her all the best in her next 30.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. PATRICK J. CARANO

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of Patrick J. Carano, who passed away peacefully on June 5, 2015. Mr. Carano was highly regarded for his commitment to social justice, his educational determination, his devotion to his work, and most of all his unconditional love for family and friends. As a member of the Summit County community, Mr. Carano attended St. Martha's Catholic Grade School and North High School prior to graduating from Akron University. As a devoted public servant, Mr. Carano worked vigilantly for Summit County and the Summit County Port Authority until ultimately retiring in 2011 as the head of economic development for the City of Tallmadge, Ohio.

Mr. Carano was an esteemed member of our community. In his early years, he created the St. Martha's Social Committee. He later served on the board of the Akron Catholic Commission and dedicated his time to working with the non-profit Genneserat, Inc. He was a man who championed his fellow workers and fought for better wages and fairer contracts for union members. Mr. Carano understood the importance of being politically involved and proved himself to be a leader within his party. He participated in numerous campaigns for Democratic candidates, organized the Summit County Progressive Democrats, and reinvigorated the Tallmadge Democratic Club.

Patrick Carano aimed to make his community a better place to call home, and he undoubtedly succeeded. Patrick is survived by

his loving wife, Lisa Zeno Carano; his sons, Justin and Matthew Carano; step-daughters, Kelsey and Samantha Kulesza; twin brother, Michael Carano; his nieces, Sarah and Lisa; his sister, Joan Feaster; and brothers, David and Thomas Carano. I am deeply saddened by the passing of Patrick Carano and I would like to extend my deepest condolences to his entire family. He was a great man whose legacy and memory will live on.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 25, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 7

3 p.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine highly pathogenic avian influenza, focusing on the impact on the United States poultry sector and protecting poultry flocks.

SR–328A

JULY 8

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine a path forward, focusing on trust modernization and reform for Indian lands.

SD–628

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine cyber crime, focusing on modernizing our legal framework for the information age.

SD–226

JULY 9

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine mitigation requirements, interagency coordination, and pilot projects related to economic development on Federal lands.

SD–366

AUGUST 4

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the back-end of the nuclear fuel cycle and related legislation, including S. 854, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.

SD–366

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 2146, Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act.

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1295, Trade Preferences Extension Act, with an amendment.

Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 19, Adjournment Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4557–S4617

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1655–1676, S. Res. 211–213, and S. Con. Res. 19. **Pages S4601–02**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016". (S. Rept. No. 114–72)

S. 282, to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–71)

H.R. 728, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 891, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building".

H.R. 1326, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office".

H.R. 1350, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building". **Page S4601**

Measures Passed:

Condemning the Attack in South Carolina: Senate agreed to S. Res. 212, condemning the attack on Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, and expressing encouragement and prayers for all affected by this evil assault. **Pages S4582–3**

Revoking the Charter of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 533, to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and the bill was then passed. **Page S4608**

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 19, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives. **Page S4608**

House Messages:

Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act House Message: By 60 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. 219) Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, after taking action on the following motion and amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S4559–82**

Withdrawn:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Amendment No. 2060 (to the House

Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date. **Page S4582**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

McConnell Amendment No. 2061 (to Amendment No. 2060), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Amendment No. 2060 (listed above) was withdrawn. **Page S4582**

Trade Preferences Extension Act: Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, with McConnell/Hatch Amendment No. 2065 (to the House Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), in the nature of a substitute, after taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4583–84**

Withdrawn:

McConnell Amendment No. 2066 (to Amendment No. 2065), to change the enactment date. **Page S4584**

McConnell motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 2067, to change the enactment date. **Page S4584**

McConnell Amendment No. 2068 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2067), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4584**

McConnell Amendment No. 2069 (to Amendment No. 2068), of a perfecting nature. **Page S4584**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 76 yeas to 22 nays (Vote No. 220), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell/Hatch Amendment No. 2065 (to the House Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill) (listed above). **Page S4583**

Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act: Senate continued consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 644, to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair was authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Hatch, Cornyn, Thune, Isakson, Wyden, Schumer, and Stabenow. **Pages S4584, S4608**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the cloture motion relative to McConnell motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees, be withdrawn. **Page S4583**

Every Child Achieves Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following Leader remarks on Tuesday, July 7, 2015, Senate begin consideration of S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves. **Page S4608**

Stoll Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 5:30 p.m., on Tuesday, July 7, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Kara Farnandez Stoll, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit; that Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order to the nomination. **Page S4608**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Nancy Bikoff Pettit, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia. **Pages S4584–95, S4617**

Charles C. Adams, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland. **Pages S4584–95, S4617**

Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan. **Pages S4584–95, S4617**

Anne Elizabeth Wall, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury. **Pages S4584–95, S4617**

Gregory T. Delawie, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kosovo. **Pages S4584–95, S4617**

Ian C. Kelly, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Georgia. **Pages S4584–95, S4617**

Julieta Valls Noyes, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Croatia. **Pages S4584–95, S4617**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Janet Garvin McCabe, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Coast Guard nomination in the rank of admiral.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S4612–17**

Messages from the House: Page S4597

Measures Referred: Pages S4597–98

Executive Communications: Pages S4598–S4601

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S4601

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S4602–04

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S4604–07

Additional Statements: Pages S4504–97

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S4607–08

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—220) Pages S4582, S4583

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:53 p.m., until 9:50 a.m. on Thursday, June 25, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4610.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

THE FAIRNESS FOR CRIME VICTIMS ACT OF 2015

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 1495, to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 1647, to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs, with amendments.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 607, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program;

S. 1349, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals;

S. 1461, to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015;

S. 313, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare;

S. 1253, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of certain disposable medical technologies under the Medicare program;

S. 1347, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use;

S. 704, to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries;

S. 1362, to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs);

S. 861, to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs;

S. 349, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts;

S. 466, to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives; and

S. 599, to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

WMD NEGOTIATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine lessons learned from past WMD negotiations, after receiving testimony from William Tobey, and Graham T. Allison, both of Harvard University Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1629, to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia;

S. 1576, to amend title 5, United States Code, to prevent fraud by representative payees;

S. 742, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1550, to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1616, to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic souring opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards;

S. 1580, to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates;

S. 1090, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance;

S. 1603, to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1115, to close out expired, empty grant accounts, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 310, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government;

S. 991, to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1620, to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security;

S. 1638, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress information on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region;

H.R. 728, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7050 Highway BB in Cedar Hill, Missouri, as the "Sergeant First Class William B. Woods, Jr. Post Office";

H.R. 891, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the "Floresville Veterans Post Office Building";

H.R. 1326, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office";

H.R. 1350, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building"; and

The nominations of Carol Fortine Ochoa, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, General Services Administration, and Steven M. Wellner, and William Ward Nooter, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

NATIVE YOUTH SUICIDE

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine demanding results to end Native youth suicides, after receiving testimony from Robert G. McSwain, Acting Director, Indian Health Services, Department of Health and Human Services; Collins Clifford, Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, South Dakota; Darrell G. Seki, Sr., Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Red Lake, Minnesota; and Teresa D. LaFromboise, Stanford University Graduate School of Education, Stanford, California.

HEALTH CARE AND BENEFITS LEGISLATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 469, to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, S. 901, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, S. 1082, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, S. 1085, to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, S. 1117, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to remove senior executives of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct to include removal of certain other employees of the Department, H.R. 91, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans, an original bill entitled, "Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act", and an original bill entitled, "Biological Implant Tracking and Veterans Safety Act", after receiving testimony from Rajiv Jain, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary Veterans Affairs for Health for Patient Care Services, Veterans Health Administration; Ian de Planque, The American Legion, Peter B. Hegseth, Concerned Veterans for America, Adrian M. Atizado, Disabled American Veterans, Carl Blake, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Max Stier, Partnership for Public Service, all of Washington, D.C.; and John Rowan, Vietnam Veterans of America, Queens, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016".

CAREER REINVENTIONS AND THE NEW RETIREMENT WORKSCAPE

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine work in retirement, focusing on career reinventions and the new retirement workscape, after receiving testimony from Sara E. Rix, Work and Aging, and Kerry Hannon, *Forbes*, both of Washington, D.C.; Susan E. Nordman, Erda, Dexter, Maine; and James C. Godwin, Jr., Bon Secours Virginia Health System, Richmond.

CANNABIDIOL

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: Caucus concluded a hearing to examine cannabidiol, focusing on barriers to research and potential medical benefits, after receiving testimony from Joseph T. Rannazzisi, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice; Douglas C. Throckmorton, Deputy Director for Regulatory Programs, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, and Nora D. Volkow, Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, both of the Department of Health and Human Services; John Bradford Ingram, University of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson; Kevin A. Sabet, SAM, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Thomas Minahan, Arrowhead Regional Medical Center, Colton, California.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 2867–2885; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 58; and H. Res. 336–337, 339, were introduced. **Pages H4650–51**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4651–52**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

S. 984, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices (H. Rept. 114–178, Part 1); and

H. Res. 338, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1295) to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–179). **Pages H4649–50**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Duncan (TN) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4595**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:04 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4602**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Chandra Bhanu Satpathy, Shri Sai Cultural & Community Center, Seattle, Washington. **Pages H4602–03**

Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015: The House passed 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, by a recorded vote of 247 ayes to 180 noes, Roll No. 384. **Pages H4617–33**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–20 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H4624**

Agreed to:

Huizenga (MI) amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 114–177) that offers a sense of Congress that the EPA should specifically address how the megawatt hours discharged from pumped hydroelectric storage will be incorporated in State and Federal implementation plans created by final rules made under section (2)(b) of this bill; and **Pages H4627–28**

Newhouse amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 114–177) that directs the EPA to recognize hydropower as a renewable energy source when issuing,

implementing, and enforcing any final rule to address carbon dioxide emissions from existing sources under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act.

Pages H4629–30

Rejected:

Pallone amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 114–177) that sought to require a governor wishing to opt out of the Clean Power Plan, to include a certification that electric generating units are sources of carbon pollution that contribute to human-induced climate change; and the state or federal plan to reduce carbon emissions from electric generating units would promote national security, economic growth and public health by addressing human induced climate change through the increased use of clean energy, energy efficiency and reductions in carbon pollution (by a recorded vote of 181 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 381); **Pages H4725–26, H4630**

Rush amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 114–177) that sought to require a governor's determination and shall also include certification that the inapplicability of a state or federal plan will not have a significant adverse effect on costs associated with a State's plan to respond to extreme weather events associated with human-caused climate change, including flooding, intense storms, frequent wildfires, and increased drought (by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 382); and

Pages H4626–27, H4630–31

McNerney amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 114–177) that sought to require a state public utility commission/public service commission and the Electric Reliability Organization to conduct an analysis of any state or federal plan (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 383).

Pages H4628–29, H4631–32

H. Res. 333, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2822) and (H.R. 2042) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 178 noes, Roll No. 380, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 243 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 379. **Pages H4608–17**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, June 25. **Page H4633**

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Thompson (MS) announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Pages H4633–34**

Recess: The House recessed at 7:51 p.m. and reconvened at 8:32 p.m. **Page H4648**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H4633 and H4347–48.

Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 19 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4615, H4616, H4630, H4630–31, H4631–32, and H4632–33. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Committee Meetings

REVIEW OF U.S. INTERNATIONAL FOOD AID PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing on review of U.S. international food aid programs. Testimony was heard from Phil Karsting, Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture; and Thomas H. Staal, Acting Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill for FY 2016. The Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill for FY 2016 was ordered reported, as amended.

THE COUNTERTERRORISM STRATEGY AGAINST THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT (ISIL): ARE WE ON THE RIGHT PATH?

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled "The Counterterrorism Strategy Against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL): Are We on the Right Path?". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHILD NUTRITION ASSISTANCE: LOOKING AT THE COST OF COMPLIANCE FOR STATES AND SCHOOLS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled "Child Nutrition Assistance: Looking at the Cost of Compliance for States and Schools". Testimony was heard from Melody Schopp, Secretary of Education, South Dakota Department of Education; John Payne, President, Blackford County School Board of Trustees, Indiana; Donna Martin, Director, School Nutrition Program, Burke County Public Schools, Georgia; and Lynn Harvey, Chief, School Nutrition Services, Safe and Healthy Schools Support Division, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

EXAMINING THE ADMINISTRATION'S APPROVAL OF MEDICAID DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Administration's Approval of Medicaid Demonstration Projects''. Testimony was heard from Katherine Iritani, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

EVALUATING THE SECURITY OF THE U.S. FINANCIAL SECTOR

Committee on Financial Services: Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing held a hearing entitled ''Evaluating the Security of the U.S. Financial Sector''. Testimony was heard from Cyrus Vance, Jr., District Attorney, New York County District Attorney's Office; and public witnesses.

COLOMBIA: PEACE WITH THE FARC?

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled ''Colombia: Peace with the FARC?''. Testimony was heard from Bernard Aronson, Special Envoy to the Colombian Peace Process, Department of State; and Alex Lee, Deputy Assistant Secretary for South America and Cuba, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State.

ADMITTING SYRIAN REFUGEES: THE INTELLIGENCE VOID AND THE EMERGING HOMELAND SECURITY THREAT

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''Admitting Syrian Refugees: The Intelligence Void and the Emerging Homeland Security Threat''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DHS' EFFORTS TO SECURE .GOV

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a hearing entitled ''DHS' Efforts to Secure .Gov''. Testimony was heard from Andy Ozment, Assistant Security, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protections and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Gregory C. Wilshusen, Director, Information Security Issues, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1927, the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015''. H.R. 1927 was ordered reported, as amended.

GAO REPORT DOCUMENTS BLM'S CHRONIC MISMANAGEMENT OF WIND AND SOLAR RECLAMATION BONDS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''GAO Report Documents BLM's Chronic Mismanagement of Wind and Solar Reclamation Bonds''. Testimony was heard from Anne-Marie Fennell, Director, Natural Resources and Environment Team, Government Accountability Office; and Steven A. Ellis, Deputy Director for Operations, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

EXAMINING PROCEDURES REGARDING PUERTO RICO'S POLITICAL STATUS AND ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Examining Procedures Regarding Puerto Rico's Political Status and Economic Outlook''. Testimony was heard from Resident Commissioner Pierluisi; César A. Miranda Rodríguez, Attorney General of Puerto Rico, testifying on behalf of Governor Alejandro García Padilla; Carmen Yulín Cruz Soto, Mayor of San Juan, Puerto Rico; and public witnesses.

OPM DATA BREACH: PART II

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''OPM Data Breach: Part II''. Testimony was heard from Katherine Archuleta, Director, Office of Personnel Management; Patrick E. McFarland, Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management; Donna K. Seymour, Chief Information Officer, Office of Personnel Management; Ann Barron-DiCamillo, Director, U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO THE TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on Senate Amendment to H.R. 1295, the ''Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015'' (meeting II). The committee granted, by voice vote, a rule that provides for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

U.S. ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION REPORT: ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF THE EPA'S CLEAN POWER PLAN

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment; and Subcommittee on Energy, held a joint hearing entitled "U.S. Energy Information Administration Report: Analysis of the Impacts of the EPA's Clean Power Plan". Testimony was heard from Howard Gruenspecht, Deputy Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration; and public witnesses.

THE STATE OF POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled "The State of Positive Train Control Implementation in the United States". Testimony was heard from Sarah Feinberg, Acting Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration; Charles Mathias, Associate Bureau Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; and public witnesses.

MEETING THE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF RURAL AMERICA

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Highways and Transit held a hearing entitled "Meeting the Transportation Needs of Rural America". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 2214, the "Disabled Veterans' Access to Medical Exams Improvement Act"; H.R. 1380, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for a medallion furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to signify the veteran status of a deceased individual; H.R. 2706, the "Veterans National Remembrance Act"; H.R. 2691, the "Veterans' Survivors Claims Processing Automation Act of 2015"; H.R. 303, the "Retired Pay Restoration Act"; H.R. 1338, the "Dignified Interment of Our Veterans Act of 2015"; H.R. 1302, the "VA Appeals Backlog Relief Act"; H.R. 2605, the "Veterans Fiduciary Reform Act of 2015"; and H.R. 1384, the "Honor America's Guard-Reserve Retirees Act". Testimony was heard from Representative Johnson of Ohio; David R. McLenachen, Acting Deputy Under Secretary for Disability Assistance, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

RISING HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS UNDER OBAMACARE

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing on rising health insurance premiums under Obamacare. Testimony was heard from Julie McPeak, Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Commerce and Insurance; Al Redmer, Jr., Commissioner of the Maryland Insurance Administration; Mike Kreidler, Washington State Insurance Commissioner; and a public witness.

REPATRIATION OF FOREIGN EARNINGS AS A SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures held a hearing on repatriation of foreign earnings as a source of funding for the Highway Trust Fund. Testimony was heard from Tom Barthold, Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Taxation; Jane Gravelle, Senior Specialist in Economic Policy, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine country of origin labeling and trade retaliation, focusing on what's at stake for America's farmers, ranchers, businesses, and consumers, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to markup an original bill entitled, "Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016", and an original bill entitled, "Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016", 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance, to hold hearings to examine economic crisis, focusing on the global impact of a Greek default, 1:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider S. 1626, to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, improve safety, streamline rail project delivery, S. 1611, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, S. 1573, to establish regional weather forecast offices, S. 1298, to provide nationally consistent measures of performance of the Nation's ports, S. 1403, to amend

the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to promote sustainable conservation and management for the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic fisheries and the communities that rely on them, S. 1551, to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition, S. 1182, to exempt application of JSA attribution rule in case of existing agreements, S. 1250, to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and the nominations of Andrew J. Read, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission, and routine lists in the Coast Guard, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the private sector, focusing on state innovations in financing transportation infrastructure, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. Res. 204, recognizing June 20, 2015 as ''World Refugee Day'', S. Res. 207, recognizing threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority in efforts of the United States Government to promote democracy and good governance, S. 1643, to require a report on actions to secure the safety and security of dissidents housed at Camp Liberty, Iraq, S. 1632, to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram, S. Res. 211, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding Srebrenica, and the nominations of Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, Brian James Egan, of Maryland, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State, Gayle Smith, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and Jennifer Zimdahl Galt, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to Mongolia; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine evaluating key components of a joint comprehensive plan of action with Iran, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine federal cybersecurity and the Office of Personnel Management data breach, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1482, to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the antitrust laws to the award of need-based educational aid, S. 1300, to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations, and the nominations of Luis Felipe Restrepo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Travis Randall McDonough, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, and Waverly D. Crenshaw, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, 9:45 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine economic opportunity for our veterans and their families through entrepreneurship, 9:30 a.m., SR–428A.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research, hearing to review food labeling legislation, 1:30 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Nuclear Deterrence in the 21st Century'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Update on Findings and Recommendations of the 2014 Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise Review'', 1 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Examining Public Health Legislation: H.R. 2820, H.R. 1344, and H.R. 1462'', 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade, hearing entitled ''Vehicle to Vehicle Communications and Connected Roadways of the Future'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Examining Continuing Allegations of Discrimination and Retaliation at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2037, the ''United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2015''; and H.R. 2494, the ''Global Anti-Poaching Act'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Is Academic Freedom Threatened by China's Influence on U.S. Universities?'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 158, the ''Visa Waiver Program Improvement Act of 2015''; H.R. 455, the ''Northern Border Security Review Act''; H.R. 998, the ''Preclearance Authorization Act of 2015''; H.R. 1073, the ''Critical Infrastructure Protection Act''; H.R. 1634, the ''Border Security Technology Accountability Act of 2015''; H.R. 2127, the ''Securing Expedited Screening Act''; H.R. 2750, the ''Improved Security Vetting for Aviation Workers Act of 2015''; H.R. 2770, the ''Keeping our Travelers Safe and Secure Act''; H.R. 2786, the ''Cross-Border Rail Security Act of 2015''; and H.R. 2843, the ''TSA PreCheck Expansion Act'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans, hearing on H.R. 1107, the ''Bureau of Reclamation Transparency Act''; H.R. 1406, the ''New Mexico Navajo Water Settlement Technical Corrections Act''; H.R. 2273, to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir; H.R. 2749, the ''Dam Authorization, Maintenance, and Safety (DAMS) Act of 2015'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 1937, the ''National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015'', 10:30 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''IRS: TIGTA Update Part II'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled ''A Review of Veterans Affairs Major Lease Procurement'', 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Oversight; and Subcommittee on Research and Technology, joint hearing entitled ''Is NSF Properly Managing Its Rotating Staff?'', 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce, hearing entitled ''GSA's Proposed Transactional Data Rule and its Effect on Small Businesses'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, business meeting—Committee Photo for the 114th Congress; hearing entitled ''The State of VA's Fiscal Year 2015 Budget'', 10:15 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, markup on pending legislation, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources; and Subcommittee on Nutrition of the House Committee on Agriculture, joint hearing entitled ''Past, Present, and Future of SNAP: How Our Welfare System Can Discourage Work'', 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:50 a.m., Thursday, June 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, June 25

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1295)—Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule). Begin consideration of H.R. 2822—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E957
Blum, Rod, Iowa, E963
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E960
Carney, John C., Jr., E962
Carter, John R., Tex., E964
Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E964
Chu, Judy, Calif, E964, E973
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E967, E973
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E968
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E967
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E969
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E962, E973
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E961, E965, E968
Edwards, Donna F., Md., E964
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E966
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E961, E973
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E963
Gallego, Ruben, Ariz., E962
Garamendi, John, Calif., E970
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E966
Hurt, Robert, Va., E961
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E969
Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'', Jr., Ga., E961, E962, E964, E967, E968
Jolly, David W., Fla., E968
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E961
Kato, John, N.Y., E957
Kennedy, Joseph P., III, Mass., E965
LoBiondo, Frank A., N.J., E965
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E964
Long, Billy, Mo., E967
MacArthur, Thomas, N.J., E957
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E963, E965
McClintock, Tom, Calif., E958
Messer, Luke, Ind., E964
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E965, E969
Olson, Pete, Tex., E966
Poliquin, Bruce, Me., E957
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E966
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E962
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E973
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E969
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E963
Wagner, Ann, Mo., E965
Westmoreland, Lynn A., Ga., E967
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E958

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.