United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2015 No. 146

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 6, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ADRIAN SMITH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, on the campus of Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, Oregon, nine innocent men and women lost their lives. They were killed, as so many have been this year in communities across our country, because a person with evil in their heart was able to get his hands on a gun.

This horrific event was the 294th mass shooting that we have seen in 2015, more than any other country in the world. So far this year, we have mourned nine parishioners who were killed during Bible study at their church in Charleston, South Carolina; two women who were killed and nine others who were injured at a movie theater in Lafayette, Louisiana; and a local television reporter and her cameraman who died covering a story outside Lynchburg, Virginia.

But there were thousands of other victims of gun violence. Their deaths have garnered less media attention, but they too deserve to have their stories told.

In the United States this year, more than 10,000 people have died and more than 20,000 have been injured during an incident that involved a gun. Each day an average of 92 Americans are killed in an incident involving a gun.

Yesterday the victims included the supervisor of a food market in Houston who was killed by a disgruntled employee; a 21-year-old father of two in Louisville; and a 23-year-old man and an 18-year-old woman who were killed outside New Orleans during a drive-by shooting. Altogether, nearly 1.5 million Americans have lost their lives to gun violence since the year 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that every one of my colleagues in this Chamber has spent much of the last few days thinking about and praying for the victims in Oregon and their families. I know I have.

But to put it bluntly, our thoughts and prayers aren't good enough, not for those who have already been killed and not for the 92 Americans who are going to lose their lives today, tomorrow, and every day until we do something.

Thoughts and prayers won't bring back the innocent men, women, and children who have been killed or heal the families that have been torn apart. Thoughts and prayers are no excuse for inaction and cowardice in the face of powerful special interests.

It is on all of us to do better than thoughts and prayers. It is long past time to take actions to reduce the threat of gun violence and to do all we can to protect our constituents from the ravages of this epidemic.

Earlier this year I introduced a package of three bills to get to the core of our country's problem with gun violence by focusing on keeping guns from children, criminals, and those who are severely mentally ill such that possession of a firearm would pose a threat to themselves or others.

The End Purchase of Firearms by Dangerous Individuals Act, H.R. 2917, requires that States provide information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System on individuals who are committed to a mental institution or make a threat of violence to a mental health professional that demonstrates that this individual would present a danger to himself or others if armed with a gun.

The Fire Sale Loophole Closing Act, H.R. 2916, ends the practice by which Federally licensed gun dealers who lose their licenses for misconduct can convert their entire inventory to a ''personal collection'' in order to liquidate it without conducting background checks on their customers. Under the law, such dealers could transfer their inventory only to other properly licensed Federal gun dealers.

I also introduced a resolution, H. Con. Res. 59, to support the goals of National ASK Day, which falls on June 21 each year. National ASK Day encourages parents to ask other parents whether their children are playing in a house with an unlocked gun.

In the United States, 1.7 million children are in homes with loaded, unlocked guns. This initiative is supported by Head Start, the American Public Health Association, and the American Academy of Pediatrics.

In addition to these measures that I have introduced, I have also co-sponsored the Large Capacity Ammunition

Printed on recycled paper.

Feeding Device Act to ban the sale of large-capacity magazines and Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act to prohibit individuals suspected of ties to terrorist organizations from purchasing a gun, and H.R. 2380 and H.R. 3411, which fix our broken background check system.

Any of these bills would immediately improve public safety in this country, a country that sees its citizens die at the hands of a loaded gun 297 times more than in Japan, 49 times more than in France, and 33 times more than in Israel.

Any one of these rational, commonsense proposals would immediately make life safer for men, women, and children in cities and towns across America; yet, we are going to sit on our hands because Republican leaders would rather genuflect before the National Rifle Association than do anything that could help save the lives of thousands of Americans.

The last time this institution passed a major bill to prevent gun violence was November 10, 1993, when the House approved the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act and President Clinton signed it into law.

Mr. Speaker, I will end by saying I do not know what it will take for us to finally take action. But I do know what I will do. I will continue speaking out every week on the floor of this Chamber until we get something done that makes our communities safer and honors the lives of all the victims who have lost their lives in this country to gun violence.

AMERICA MUST STAND FIRM

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I just wrote on the board that it has been 1,510 days since the President said that Syria's Bashar Assad must go. He is still in office.

It is 767 days since the President drew the red line in the sand that said, if Bashar Assad used chemical weapons on his own people, he must go. He is still in office.

What we are seeing in Syria—the refugees' humanitarian crisis, a bloody civil war, the rise of ISIS—is a direct response to this administration's ineptness to handle these problems.

Now we have Russia's Putin on the floor of the U.N.—on U.S. soil—saying America is weak. But we didn't need Putin to tell us that by his words. He has done it by his actions. He invaded Crimea in Ukraine because he knew that this administration would draw another red line, but do nothing about it.

America is losing her standing in the world because we would rather appease our enemies than show strength. This administration still has no strategy handling ISIS, no tangible plan to handle the Syrian problem or defeating Assad, and certainly no plan to deal with Russia's new very powerful aggression in many areas of the world.

Assad must go. ISIS must be defeated. America must stand firm and show the world that we are a force to be reckoned with, not to be trampled on.

CELEBRATING THE LIVES OF BEN KUROKI AND SUSUMU ''SUS'' ITO

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

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the lives of two trailblazers for the Asian American community, Ben Kuroki and Susumu ''Sus'' Ito.

After the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Kuroki and his brother were one of the first Japanese Americans to enlist in the United States Air Force during World War II at a time when over 100,000 other Japanese Americans were forced into incarceration camps without due process under the law.

The need for aerial gunners was high; so, Kuroki applied for the job, was approved, and was sent to a 2-week course in Britain. Kuroki received on-the-job training. His maiden flight was on December 13, 1942.

During this time of heavy discrimination against Japanese Americans, Kuroki's flight crew was instrumental in protecting him from the sneers and abuse by his fellow soldiers.

Kuroki received three Distinguished Flying Cross medals for volunteering to fly 25 combat missions against Germany and 28 missions in the Pacific. He was the only Japanese American to serve as an aerial gunner in the Asia-Pacific theater during World War II.

The son of Japanese immigrant farmers, Kuroki was born on May 16, 1917, in Gaithersburg, Nebraska.

After his many missions in Europe, Kuroki visited other Japanese Americans behind barbed wire to promote the military and asked other Japanese Americans to join what would soon become the 442nd Regimental Combat Team of the 100th Infantry Battalion.

Ben Kuroki exemplified the embodiment of patriotism and service above self. He often said, ''I had to fight for the right to fight for my own country, and now I feel vindication.''

Today I rise to share Ben Kuroki's tremendous accomplishments and dedicated public service with the House of Representatives. Ben Kuroki was the definition of an American hero.

I would also like to take this time to recognize another extraordinary trailblazer for the Japanese American community, Susumu ''Sus'' Ito.

Ito, the oldest and only son of Japanese immigrants, was drafted into the military in 1940. After Pearl Harbor, his parents and his sister were sent to the incarceration camp in Rohwer, Arkansas. During this time, he volunteered to become a forward observer for the 442nd Infantry Battalion, one of the most dangerous positions in the battalion.

Known as mischievous, he brought with him to Europe an Agfa Memo, a contraband 35-millimeter camera that fit right in the palm of his hand. Ito spent his deployment in Europe, starting in 1944 until the war ended, taking pictures of his surroundings.

From playing chess during downtime to posing with the Colosseum during their trek into Rome, he spent the war revealing the daily lives of this little known mostly Japanese American unit.

However, many of Ito's pictures also accurately depicted the brazenness of war. The 442nd was one of the first battalions to reach the Dachau Concentration Camp, and Ito took pictures of dazed prisoners leaving the camp for the very first time. He also captured the despair of his fellow soldiers as they rescued the Lost Battalion.

After World War II and through the GI Bill, he started an extraordinary career as a cellular biologist and became a researcher and professor at Harvard Medical School, where he worked for over 50 years.

Ito donated his vast collection, thousands of images, to the Japanese American Museum in Los Angeles, as part of their Before They Were Heroes: Sus Ito's World War II Images collection.

In August, I had the opportunity to tour this exhibit. The images he captured constantly reminded me of the courage of our Japanese American GIs who fought valiantly for our country while their families remained behind barbed wire.

Today I rise to share Sus Ito's tremendous accomplishments and dedicated public service with the House of Representatives.

□ 1215

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Nation saw a very important program expire, the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I rise today to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me and call for a vote on a full and continued permanent reauthorization of the LWCF.

For 50 years, this critical fund has added value to my district and to so many across the Nation. Last week, inaction by Congress led to the expiration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and I believe it is critical that we renew our commitment to the fund.

The fund helps our communities protect critical lands by providing State and local governments with necessary funding and flexibility to develop and improve the very land on display for

everyone to enjoy. Nowhere is it more critical than in my home State of Pennsylvania.

Over the past 50 years, Pennsylvania has received approximately $300 million in land and water conservation funding for protection in many areas of national significance, such as Gettysburg National Military Park, the Paoli Battlefield, the Brandywine Battlefield, Valley Forge National Historical Park, and John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge.

Not only have we seen the LWCF at work on the State level, we have also seen its benefits at the local level, including the Birdsboro Waters Forest Legacy Project, protecting critical woodlands at the East Coventry Wineberry Estates, expanding Shaw's Bridge Park in East Bradford Township, and enhancing the Pottstown Borough Memorial Park with a new dog park, pavilions, restrooms, ballfields, and walking trails.

The outdoor recreation industry, Governors, mayors, sportsmen, small-business owners, conservation leaders, landowners, ranchers, farmers, and millions of Americans are united in a push for permanent reauthorization and full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund because it provides an economic benefit to our region and across the country. The LWCF gives a boost to the $646 billion recreation economy and serves to protect our national parks and other public lands from being destroyed.

Indeed, in one such study, the Outdoor Industry Association has found that outdoor active recreation generates $21.5 billion annually in consumer spending in Pennsylvania alone. Outdoor recreation supports over 219,000 jobs across the State and generates $7.2 billion in wages and salaries. It also produces $1.6 billion annually in State and local tax revenue.

Outdoor recreation benefits the Pennsylvania economy. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that each year over 5.4 million people participated in hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching in Pennsylvania, contributing $5.4 billion to the State economy.

Additionally, the Land and Water Conservation Fund State Assistance Program provides matching grants to help States and local communities protect parks and recreation resources. Nationwide, the LWCF has benefited countless counties in America, supporting over 41,000 projects.

The State assistance 50–50 matching program acts as the primary investment tool to ensure that all can enjoy hiking, biking, running trails, community parks, and playgrounds. Approximately $4 billion in LWCF grants have been awarded to States, including $4.27 million for 34 total projects in Berks County, $4.78 million for 30 total projects in Chester County, $2.8 million for 49 total projects in Montgomery County, and over $800,000 for 11 projects in Lebanon County. These are all counties in my congressional district.

Our public lands and outdoor recreation areas are an integral part of our heritage, civic identity, and local community. I believe the Land and Water Conservation Fund is one of our most important conservation programs and an excellent example of a bipartisan commitment to the safeguard of our natural resources and cultural heritage, and we must reauthorize it.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 1814 to permanently reauthorize the LWCF, I look forward to working with my colleagues to preserve our public lands so that current and future generations may continue to enjoy and appreciate them year-round.

I respectfully call upon my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to work for a bipartisan solution to reauthorize this very important program.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Hispanic Heritage Month, I would like to recognize the great achievement of Latinos within their communities.

America has been home to countless numbers of outstanding Latinos over time who reflect the best of our community: activists like Cesar Chavez and Joan Baez; artists like Selena and Carlos Santana; the brave women and men who have served in our armed services; and, of course, today's ambitious young DREAMers.

Latinos, like all Americans, are committed to building a better and stronger future for our country and within our communities. We strive to instill a culture of hard work, of healthy living, and of academic success.

Latino families recognize the importance of attaining an education in today's society. In the past decade, Latinos have worked to cut their dropout rate in half, while tripling enrollment in 2- and 4-year colleges.

The top degrees that we earn speak to our involvement in community: our liberal arts degrees, to help the less fortunate; to heal the sick with our healthcare degrees; to create employment with our business diplomas.

In regards to health care, with the landmark Affordable Care Act, a record 2.6 million new Latinos are signed up for health care, and they are on track to leading healthier lives.

But, Mr. Speaker, even with these great advances in our communities, there is still so much work to be done. Although our dropout rate is lower, we still have the highest dropout rate among all ethnic groups. Latinos have increased their scores in math and science, but we are still below the national average. And while our communities have made massive strides in putting our children in college, still only 15 percent of college degrees are in the hands of Latinos, again, the smallest percentage of any ethnic group.

And even while 2½ million new Latinos signed up for health care, 25 percent of Latinos have no healthcare plan, and we battle high obesity and diabetes.

So I have seen these issues firsthand in my district and in California and, as a whole, have seen and have worked to improve our condition.

This Congress, I introduced the All-Year ACCESS Act, which would restore Pell grants for both full-time and part-time students, giving access to postsecondary education all year-round. Back in my home district, I relaunched Enroll OC, adding an additional 2,000 people this year, Latinos in my district, to health care.

So while we make these incredible strides in wellness and education, the Latino community still has so many issues to address. I will tell you this: the problems are not just Latino problems; they are problems for the United States because, you see, America is a family. It is a familia, and we have to address these issues together because, for the first time in my beautiful home State of California, the largest majority ethic group is now Latino.

And you know what? This should not frighten people, Mr. Speaker. I think it is actually pretty exciting because the Latino community is so embedded in the success of the American Dream, and the American Dream is so embedded in us. We are not aliens, Mr. Speaker. We are doctors, lawyers, community leaders, social workers, laborers, and DREAMers. But more importantly, we are sons, daughters, parents, siblings, and we are neighbors.

It is time for the United States as a whole to embrace the power and the potential of the Latino community and to realize that we share the common goal of furthering the greatness of this Nation. I believe as soon as we realize Latinos yearn to share the same American values and aspirations as so many descendants of other immigrant groups—of Italian Americans and Irish Americans and German Americans and Asian Americans and all Americans—certainly America will thrive.

Latinos are finding their voice, and America needs to listen.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Holy and compassionate God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As they return from their constituent visits, bless the Members of the people's House. Amid so many political pushes and pulls, give them perseverance and wisdom to address those most pressing needs for the benefit of our Nation.

In the aftermath of severe storms, bless those recovering from floods and storms this past week, and bless those emergency workers who have placed themselves in danger's path in service to their brothers and sisters in need.

May we all be inspired by their heroic example and moved to step forward in those times when we might be called upon as well.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

ADMINISTRATION'S ROLE IN RUSSIAN RISE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today, I note with great concern the divisive involvement of Russian forces in Syria. Due to the failure of this administration to articulate a strategy, Russia has now stepped in to conduct its own strategy, including airstrikes.

United States adversaries have picked up on the administration's lack of a well-articulated strategy in Syria. Sources say that Russian forces are launching deliberate airstrikes on Syrian groups backed by the CIA. While conducting these contentious attacks, Russia has violated Turkish airspace.

NATO has warned President Putin to halt the airstrikes, but where is President Obama with his warnings? If sources are accurate, the administration has abandoned CIA-backed fighters. President Obama is fearful of taking the necessary steps. But given his failings in the region, is anyone surprised by Russia's actions?

This unrest contributes to the growing refugee crisis, putting a strain on our own country and others to manage the influx of refugees fleeing the turmoil that this administration has helped to create.

As warned in Proverbs 28:19, ''Where there is no vision, the people perish.''

REPUBLICANS' CALENDAR OF CHAOS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, last week 151 Republicans, a majority of the Republicans in Congress, voted to shut down the Federal Government. This week, another entry into this calendar of chaos and dysfunction. We are coming up on several crucial deadlines, and so far the Republican leadership in Congress has presented no clear plan, no path forward.

As we approach another debt limit, there are questions as to whether the United States Government will default on its obligations. There is another highway funding expiration, another government funding deadline of December 11, and lack of the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, which is costing the United States jobs—thousands of jobs.

The American people are frustrated, and rightfully so.

We may not agree on this floor, we may not agree with the majority, but there is no excuse for not getting your job done. That is what I hear from the people back home, from the American people, a simple question: Why can't Congress just do its work, just do its job?

We stand ready to work with Republicans. We need a willing partner. There is a lot of work to do for the American people. Let's get down to business.

SYRIAN REFUGEES AND THE OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently Secretary Kerry pledged that the United States would accept 185,000 refugees from the war-torn Syrian area. This would be over 2 years.

America has been a generous, welcoming country; but I have to tell you, while we have compassion for these refugees, Secretary Kerry's pledge leaves us with some grave concerns.

The first is security. How can we verify these refugees do not present a threat to our national security? Syria has proven to be a fertile recruiting ground for Islamic extremists and terrorists.

Second, the Office of Refugee Resettlement has not been transparent and accountable enough to handle the transfers. Over the past year, I have been investigating ORR and found that they have not been filing annual reports on their activities as required by law. In addition, there is evidence of widespread abuse of refugees, including children, who are improperly handled by the ORR. In many instances, a failure to refer the abuse to the FBI has allowed child abusers to walk free.

The curtain must be pulled back completely on the ORR's operations before we can trust it with a responsibility as serious as settling Syrian refugees in the U.S. We must find the delicate balance and protect our safety and security.

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT AMENDING THE AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–64)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95–216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Supplementary Agreement Amending the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Czech Republic (the ''Supplementary Agreement''). The Supplementary Agreement, signed at Prague on September 23, 2013, is intended to modify a certain provision of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Czech Republic, with Administrative Arrangement, signed at Prague on September 7, 2007, and entered into force January 1, 2009 (the ''U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement'').

The U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement as amended by the Supplementary Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements already in force with most European Union countries, Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, and the Republic of Korea. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the lost benefit

protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Supplementary Agreement amends the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement to account for a new Czech domestic health insurance law, which was enacted subsequent to the signing of the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement in 2007. By including the health insurance law within the scope of the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement, this amendment will exempt U.S. citizen workers and multinational companies from contributing to the Czech health insurance system, when such workers otherwise meet all of the ordinary criteria for such an exemption.

The U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement, as amended, will continue to contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4) of the Social Security Act.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Supplementary Agreement and its estimated cost effect. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Supplementary Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the Supplementary Agreement to the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement and related documents.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 6, 2015.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 6, 2015 at 2:59 p.m.:

Appointment:

Social Security Advisory Board.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CHILD SUPPORT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2091) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify the ability to request consumer reports in certain cases to establish and enforce child support payments and awards.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2091

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 ''Child Support Assistance Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REQUESTS FOR CONSUMER REPORTS BY STATE OR LOCAL CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

Paragraph (4) of section 604(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or determining the appropriate level of such payments'' and inserting '', determining the appropriate level of such payments, or enforcing a child support order, award, agreement, or judgment'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''paternity'' and inserting ''parentage''; and

(B) by adding ''and'' at the end;

(3) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(4) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2091. My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), has worked hard to build significant bipartisan support for this commonsense legislation. It passed out of the Committee on Financial Services with a vote of 56–2.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that most child support payments are collected from noncustodial parents through income withholding. In order to verify income, assets, and debt for purposes of establishing or enforcing child support obligations, State and local child support agencies and courts often request consumer reports from the consumer reporting agencies.

State and local child support agencies argue that the 10-day notice provision provides obligors with an opportunity to hide savings and other assets, run up credit card debt, and take other financial or employment actions to avoid or reduce child support payments.

This bill authorizes a consumer reporting agency to furnish a consumer report in response to a request by the head of a State or local child support enforcement agency if the requestor certifies that the report is needed for enforcing a child support order, award, agreement, or judgment. The bill also repeals the requirement of 10 days' prior notice to a consumer whose report is requested.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense piece of legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I support H.R. 2091, the Child Support Assistance Act, because it will help child support enforcement agencies do their job and will make child support payments more efficient.

When a State child support enforcement agency wants to locate a parent who is delinquent on his or her child support payment, the agency requests the parent's consumer report from one of the consumer reporting agencies. This allows the agency to verify the parent's employment and income, which are key factors for child support payments.

Current law, however, requires the agency to provide the delinquent parent 10 days' notice before it can even request the consumer report from the credit bureaus. This 10-day head start serves no legitimate policy purpose. In fact, the only thing it does is give delinquent parents time to manipulate their financial position to evade paying their child support obligations.

The consequences of this 10-day notice requirement is that some delinquent parents who should be paying child support are not paying all they owe and the money they do pay isn't

getting to the families as quickly as it should.

This bill would eliminate this loophole by doing away with the 10-day notice requirement. Providing 10 days' notice before pulling someone's consumer report might make sense in some circumstances, but in this situation, it only slows down the wheels of justice and gives delinquent parents an opportunity to further avoid paying their child support obligations.

I support this bill that was reported out almost unanimously, with only two people voting against it. I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) as well as Mr. ELLISON on the Democratic side for their hard work on this commonsense bill.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN). He has worked tirelessly on this piece of legislation. I appreciate his efforts.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am thrilled to stand before the House today as the author of the Child Support Assistance Act, H.R. 2091.

Across America today we have 17 million kids coast to coast who benefit from the child support program. In our great State of Maine alone, there are some 57,000 kids who need our help. As a single parent myself, I believe that the most important job in the world is taking care of our kids. Unfortunately, not every parent believes that.

After a court determines that a noncustodial parent owes financial support for his or her children, there currently is, as Mrs. MALONEY stated, a 10-day waiting period between the time when the court determines that money is owed for the kids and when the State agencies can start collecting that money. As a result, here across America there is about $100 billion in unpaid child support. In the State of Maine alone, there is over $500 million that is owed our kids.

This bill, H.R. 2091, the Child Support Assistance Act, fixes a technical part of this law that is a commonsense fix. As Mrs. MALONEY stated, it removes this 10-day waiting period.

Now, what that simply means is that a parent who is supposed to be responsible for his or her children will have less of an opportunity, less time to shift those assets or hide those assets, put them in the name of someone else or maybe even quit his or her job and be paid under the table.

That is not right, and that is certainly not fair. We need in this Chamber Republicans and Democrats to stand up and be compassionate and to help those 17 million kids across our country that need this support.

As a single parent myself, I know what it is like to work a demanding full-time job and to care for a child. In my case, it was one child, my son. I know what it is like to pick up my son after school and then to rush off to the grocery store to do our shopping and get home quickly so I can start dinner and he can start working on his homework. When that is done, we have to clean up and I expect Sammy to do his reading or I read to him and then it is a bath and to bed.

Then while you are working on peanut butter and jelly sandwiches for the next day and thinking about what you have to do with your own job, you get a few hours' sleep after that before you have to do it all over again.

I cannot imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it must be like for a single mom or dad to do this with two, three, or four kids. The last thing our single parents need is to worry about child support payments that they are rightly owed, that the court says they are due, to help their kids have food on the table or buy a new pair of winter boots or to make sure there is lunch money the next day.

In this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, we speak about a lot of things—debt and spending and national security issues—but this bill is so close to the ground that it directly and immediately will help our kids and our single parents who are trying to raise our kids under very difficult circumstances for a lot of them.

I am thrilled to offer this bill, Mr. Speaker. I am greatly appreciative of the tremendous bipartisan support. I do thank Mr. ELLISON for all of his hard work on this bill. I encourage everybody to please support the Child Support Assistance Act.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I just urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill that Mr. POLIQUIN pointed out can make a real difference in the lives of single parents and their children. Again, I thank him for his leadership on it and his very eloquent statement today on the floor.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, too many children grow up in today's society without basic essentials: food, clothing, proper shelter. Many times this is the result of a lack of child support payments from an estranged parent.

I have a young boy, and I can tell you he takes a lot of energy out of my wife and me. We do everything we can to support him to our fullest with love and all the basic essentials, but not all children are that lucky. Some are due child support payments that they don't receive.

I know our local district attorneys do a lot in furtherance and sheriff's departments do a lot in furtherance of collecting those child support payments, but Congressman POLIQUIN's commonsense measure here, the Child Support Assistance Act, is going to help State and local enforcement agencies aid families in collecting child support payments in a timely manner.

How is that going to happen? It is going to allow enforcement agencies to obtain consumer reports on negligent parents in a more expeditious manner. Consequently, that is going to streamline the process and better enforce the collection of child support payments.

I believe Representative POLIQUIN stated it very eloquently just a moment ago. This is something that we can all get behind. It is for the good of this country. It is for the good of children across America. Let's be proud as we ensure that our children have the resources to succeed, with this legislation being a positive step in the right direction.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2091.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BANK EXAM CYCLE REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1553) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1553

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 ''Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. SMALLER INSTITUTIONS QUALIFYING FOR 18-MONTH EXAMINATION CYCLE.

Section 10(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1820(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$500,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000,000''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''; and

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''$500,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000,000''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1615

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative TIPTON for his hard work in advocating for community bank regulatory relief. This is a commonsense regulatory relief measure that has earned significant bipartisan support. It was reported out of the Financial Services Committee by a vote of 58–0.

This legislation is designed to allow additional well-managed financial institutions to qualify for an 18-month exam cycle. The longer exam cycle permits community banks to focus their time and resources on the surrounding community rather than on the exam process. This bill also allows bank examiners to spend their resources working with banks that need additional attention instead of with banks that are already considered well managed.

To qualify, an institution must have total assets of less than $1 billion, and at its most recent examination, it must have earned an ''outstanding'' or ''good'' rating under the Uniform Financial Institutions Rating System, or CAMELS. So only smaller, well-financed, well-rated financial institutions who pose very little risk would qualify for extended exam cycles.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1553, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act. This bill allows more small banks to qualify for a longer, 18-month exam cycle. This means that these banks would only have a full, onsite examination every 18 months, rather than every 12 months.

The logic behind this bill is simple: small community banks that are both well capitalized and well managed do not need as much regulatory scrutiny as larger, more complex banks. In addition, regulators need the ability to focus their limited resources on the banks that present bigger risks. That is why we have long allowed well-run small banks to have less frequent examinations than larger, more complex banks.

This bill simply increases the threshold for banks that qualify for the 18-month cycle from $500 million to $1 billion. Onsite examinations are time-consuming endeavors both for the regulator and the bank, and if the regulator is conducting exams of these well-run banks more frequently than he really needs to, then he is wasting precious government resources. In addition, he is also wasting the bank's resources, because the frequent exams require the time and attention of the bank's executives and staff, and it is costly. Therefore, banks with assets between $500 million and $1 billion that are well capitalized and well managed will receive real, meaningful regulatory relief as a result of this bill.

Not only is this bill supported by small banks, it is also supported by the regulators. The OCC has in fact advocated for this change for some time now.

I am very glad that we are moving this bill through the House today, and I hope that the Senate will act quickly on the bill as well so that we can get regulatory relief to some very deserving community banks. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I congratulate my colleague, LACY CLAY, for also being the lead Democrat and working very hard on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, community banks are a crucial source of credit for many across the Nation, but these banks are currently facing an ever-increasing regulatory burden that they can no longer shoulder. These misguided regulations are resulting in a devastating impact on small banks, forcing consolidation or failure and stifling creation of new banks in communities that need access to credit.

In rural areas, such as my district in western Colorado, oftentimes the only access to credit for small businesses is a community bank. Unfortunately, rising compliance costs and complicated regulatory requirements have dried up bank credit for those in need of it most.

For these reasons, I introduced, along with Representative LACY CLAY and Representative BARR, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act, a targeted relief effort designed to allow additional well-managed financial institutions to qualify for an 18-month exam cycle.

Full-scope, onsite examinations of insured depository institutions are a rigorous event for banks of all sizes, especially small banks that may not have dedicated compliance staff. These examinations require significant preparation leading up to the examination, as well as attention to the onsite examiner during the exam itself.

Whereas larger banks can absorb the work hours and compliance costs associated with these onsite examinations, community banks, much smaller institutions, do not have the economy of scale to deflect the burden. However, a longer exam cycle permits well-run community banks to focus their time and resources on the surrounding community rather than on the exam process, opening up opportunities for sustainable economic growth in towns across the United States.

The Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act amends the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the qualifying asset threshold from $500 million to $1 billion for small banks. This relief measure is only for well-managed community banks that did not cause the financial crisis but are now living with regulatory blowback.

As part of the examination process, financial regulators rate financial institutions on several criteria, including safety and soundness and their compliance with legal and regulatory requirements. To qualify for the 18-month exam cycle, an institution must have earned an outstanding or good rating on their most recent examination. Only smaller, well-rated banks, those which pose little risk, can qualify for extended exam cycles.

The banking regulators also support an increase in the qualifying asset threshold. In February, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency sent draft legislative ideas for regulatory relief to the House Financial Services Committee, including a proposal that is the framework for H.R. 1553. The Comptroller of the Currency, Thomas Curry, publicly stated such a change would reduce burdens on well-managed community institutions. It also was applauded by the FDIC and the OCC during committee hearings earlier this spring.

Not only will this legislation provide relief for community banks, it will also allow examiners to focus their resources, working with banks that need the additional attention or present supervisory concerns.

This bipartisan legislation enjoys the support of the American Bankers Association, the Independent Community Bankers Association, the Conference of State Bank Supervisors, the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, as well as 19 bipartisan cosponsors. The legislation was voted out of the Financial Services Committee with a unanimous 58–0 vote.

Congress last raised the threshold for outstanding-rated institutions in 2006 and granted agencies discretion to increase the threshold for good-rated institutions in 2007. It is time again to raise the threshold in statute so these small banks can continue to serve their important purpose in our communities: providing capital for small business growth and banking products for their local communities.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), who is also the ranking member on the Financial Institutions Subcommittee and the lead Democrat on this bill.

Mr. CLAY. Let me thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

I, too, rise today to support H.R. 1553, the Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) as well as Mr. BARR for their leadership on this important issue.

The overwhelming majority of banks in this country are community banks with less than $1 billion in assets. As

the regulatory landscape has evolved for the Nation's financial institutions since the financial crisis, I have worked with my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to ensure that our community banks are not unduly burdened. H.R. 1553 is a part of that effort, as it will extend much-needed relief to Main Street banks by allowing well-managed, well-capitalized community banks an opportunity to take advantage of an extended 18-month examination cycle.

While bank examinations are vital to the safety and soundness of the American banking system, the time and resources that banks put into preparing for and responding to examinations can be extremely time consuming, particularly for smaller banks with limited staff and resources that cannot afford to divert key personnel away from their core business in order to prepare for examinations.

H.R. 1553 also allows banking regulators to better allocate their resources to financial institutions that warrant additional attention and away from community banks that have otherwise demonstrated that they are soundly managed and well capitalized.

I have heard from community bankers in Missouri and from across the country that straightforward, bipartisan, commonsense regulatory relief proposals like H.R. 1553 can contribute significantly to community banks' ability to lend to Main Street businesses and reinvest in our communities.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. CLAY. I look forward to working with Mr. TIPTON and my other colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to find additional opportunities to enact targeted relief for our community banks, and I would urge my colleagues to adopt H.R. 1553.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense piece of legislation. You talk about bipartisan; when it passes out of your committee with no opposition, that is bipartisan support. I think that says a lot about how important community banks are to America and how important this Congress thinks community banks are.

The fact is these organizations that are well managed and have good ratings will only have to get an examination every 18 months. So I encourage support for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1553.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1525) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10–K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1525

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 ''Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. SUMMARY PAGE FOR FORM 10–K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue regulations to permit issuers to submit a summary page on form 10–K (17 C.F.R. 249.310), but only if each item on such summary page includes a cross-reference (by electronic link or otherwise) to the material contained in form 10–K to which such item relates.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENT OF REGULATION S–K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall take all such actions to revise regulation S–K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.)—

(1) to further scale or eliminate requirements of regulation S–K, in order to reduce the burden on emerging growth companies, accelerated filers, smaller reporting companies, and other smaller issuers, while still providing all material information to investors;

(2) to eliminate provisions of regulation S–K, required for all issuers, that are duplicative, overlapping, outdated, or unnecessary; and

(3) for which the Commission determines that no further study under section 4 is necessary to determine the efficacy of such revisions to regulation S–K.

SEC. 4. STUDY ON MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF REGULATION S–K.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the requirements contained in regulation S–K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) determine how best to modernize and simplify such requirements in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on issuers while still providing all material information;

(2) emphasize a company by company approach that allows relevant and material information to be disseminated to investors without boilerplate language or static requirements while preserving completeness and comparability of information across registrants; and

(3) evaluate methods of information delivery and presentation and explore methods for discouraging repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Investor Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) specific and detailed recommendations on modernizing and simplifying the requirements in regulation S–K in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on companies while still providing all material information; and

(3) specific and detailed recommendations on ways to improve the readability and navigability of disclosure documents and to discourage repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date that the report is issued to the Congress under subsection (c), the Commission shall issue a proposed rule to implement the recommendations of the report issued under subsection (c).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revisions made to regulation S–K by the Commission under section 3 shall not be construed as satisfying the rulemaking requirements under this section.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee—that would be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING)—for his leadership in helping to bring a number of bills, as we have just seen, to the floor today.

I would also like to thank all of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee from both sides of the aisle—obviously, both sides—because they have voted unanimously, voted the Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act out of committee not just once, but twice, when you include passage last year as well.

I would also like to add this legislation passed the House of Representatives by voice vote in December of 2014.

So you ask what is the purpose of this bill, and why is it necessary.

Well, Mr. Speaker, look, if you step back about eight decades ago, Congress made the monumental decision in this country that disclosure, opening up, and transparency would be the centerpiece of our Nation's securities law.

See, instead of carving out or creating a merit review system where the Federal Government determined which companies we were allowed to put our money into, Congress wisely went down the other road and decided that those decisions would be best made where?

Left in the hands of the people, in the hands of the investors themselves, so long as they were provided with a sufficient level of disclosure from publicly traded companies.

Unfortunately, over the last eight decades since the securities laws were first put in place, the quarterly and annual reports filed by the public companies have grown, and they have grown in size tremendously, larger and more complex than ever, to the point where now the most sophisticated of investors have trouble understanding even the most basic operations and risks of these companies. This has come to be known as the phenomenon of information overload.

So to put this in perspective, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal noted that the average annual report from public companies is now 42,000 words, a 40 percent increase just from the year 2000 alone and even longer than the entire Sarbanes-Oxley bill that passed Congress in 2002.

Another recent report out of Stanford University found that only 38 percent of institutional investors view disclosures about executive compensation as ''easy to understand.''

So, if you think about it, if the majority of institutional investors can't understand the disclosure, what chance does the little guy, the mom-and-pop investor, have to understand all this?

They, of course, have very little chance and can even be harmed by the disclosures that too voluminous and complex reports show.

As then-SEC Commissioner Troy Paredes put it way back in 2013, ''If investors are overloaded, more disclosure actually can result in less transparency and worse decisions, in which case capital is allocated less efficiently and market discipline is compromised.''

So what would our bill do today? It would rectify the situation.

How? One, it would require that the SEC eliminate any outdated or duplicative disclosure requirements that are not material to investors and, furthermore, to scale disclosures for emerging growth companies and small issuers.

Two, it will allow issuers to file a summary page of their annual report that will include simply cross-references to the material already included.

Three, it would require the SEC to produce a broad study on how best to, amongst all the other things, utilize technology in order to improve delivery and presentation systems for disclosure and, also, a requirement that the SEC commence a rulemaking in order to implement some of these ideas that come out of the study.

You see, these provisions will help our disclosure regime of the 21st century while at the very same time address the issue of information overload that I mentioned before.

If you go back, as part of the JOBS Act, Congress directed the SEC to review its existing disclosure requirements, and it was told to identify ways to make our current disclosure regime less burdensome for issuers and for people as investors.

While the SEC produced a report a few years ago—2013—that identified a number of obsolete things and duplicative requirements that could be addressed, unfortunately, the agency has yet to act upon them, this despite an ongoing disclosure effectiveness review that has so far only produced a concept release.

So, at the end, it is important that this Congress come here today and act on behalf of all the American investors, all the people in this country, in order to keep the original intent of our securities laws relevant today and ensure that the effective disclosure remains this very centerpiece of the capital markets.

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

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

I rise today in support of this bill. I thank Mr. GARRETT for his hard work. We worked together on this in the last Congress, and I added an amendment to improve the bill in the markup last year.

Markets are constantly evolving, and so too must our regulatory regime. This is especially true when it comes to reporting requirements for small public companies.

The process of scaling and streamlining the reporting requirements for these small companies is something that, in order to keep pace with the ever-evolving marketplace, has historically been revisited roughly once every 10 years. It requires vigilance by the SEC and, also, by Congress.

The Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act directs the SEC to simplify the reporting requirements for small companies in regulation S–K.

First, the SEC would be required to revise regulation S–K to take care of any low-hanging fruit, that is, make any improvements to regulation S–K that they have already identified as helpful for small companies.

Next, the SEC would conduct a study of the best way to simplify and modernize the disclosure requirements in regulation S–K while still providing all the necessary information to investors and to also make specific detailed recommendations to Congress for how to achieve this.

Finally, the bill allows companies to submit a summary page on their form 10–K annual reports in order to make these annual reports easier to understand by investors.

In testimony before the Financial Services Committee last year, Colombia Professor John Coffee called the idea ''simple and unobjectionable'' and said that he ''didn't see how anyone could be opposed to it.''

I agree that this is a commonsense idea that could make lengthy annual reports, which are often hundreds of pages long and difficult to navigate, significantly more investor-friendly.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I thank my colleague, Mr. GARRETT, for his leadership. He has worked on this for several Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentlewoman from New York for working with us today and also working with us over the last several years as well, trying to move this along. As you have said and I have said, this is one of those proverbial commonsense pieces of legislation.

If anyone got confused by all the technical terms that you and I used here, at the end of the day, it means, whether you are a sophisticated institutional investor or whether you are a mom-and-pop-type investor or if you are something in between, you just want to have clarity, you just want to understand what all these voluminous, hundreds-of-pages annual reports and quarterly reports are.

That is what our bill does. It just makes it a little bit simpler and then directs the SEC to go even the step further to develop other ways to do so as well.

So I look forward to passing this out of this House now for the third time, I believe, send it over to the Senate and, hopefully, get some action in the Senate and put it on the President's desk.

I encourage Members from both sides of the aisle, once again, out of the House and to the Senate.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1525.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REFORMING ACCESS FOR INVESTMENTS IN STARTUP ENTERPRISES ACT OF 2015

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1839

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 ''Reforming Access for Investments in Startup Enterprises Act of 2015'' or the ''RAISE Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. EXEMPTED TRANSACTIONS.

(a) EXEMPTED TRANSACTIONS.—Section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) transactions meeting the requirements of subsection (d).'';

(2) by redesignating the second subsection (b) (relating to securities offered and sold in compliance with Rule 506 of Regulation D) as subsection (c); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) CERTAIN ACCREDITED INVESTOR TRANSACTIONS.—The transactions referred to in subsection (a)(7) are transactions meeting the following requirements:

''(1) ACCREDITED INVESTOR REQUIREMENT.—Each purchaser is an accredited investor, as that term is defined in section 230.501(a) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

''(2) PROHIBITION ON GENERAL SOLICITATION OR ADVERTISING.—Neither the seller, nor any person acting on the seller's behalf, offers or sells securities by any form of general solicitation or general advertising.

''(3) INFORMATION REQUIREMENT.—In the case of a transaction involving the securities of an issuer that is neither subject to section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m; 78o(d)), nor exempt from reporting pursuant to section 240.12g3-2(b) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, nor a foreign government (as defined in section 230.405 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) eligible to register securities under Schedule B, the seller and a prospective purchaser designated by the seller obtain from the issuer, upon request of the seller, and the seller in all cases makes available to a prospective purchaser, the following information (which shall be reasonably current in relation to the date of resale under this section):

''(A) The exact name of the issuer and the issuer's predecessor (if any).

''(B) The address of the issuer's principal executive offices.

''(C) The exact title and class of the security.

''(D) The par or stated value of the security.

''(E) The number of shares or total amount of the securities outstanding as of the end of the issuer's most recent fiscal year.

''(F) The name and address of the transfer agent, corporate secretary, or other person responsible for transferring shares and stock certificates.

''(G) A statement of the nature of the business of the issuer and the products and services it offers, which shall be presumed reasonably current if the statement is as of 12 months before the transaction date.

''(H) The names of the officers and directors of the issuer.

''(I) The names of any persons registered as a broker, dealer, or agent that shall be paid or given, directly or indirectly, any commission or remuneration for such person's participation in the offer or sale of the securities.

''(J) The issuer's most recent balance sheet and profit and loss statement and similar financial statements, which shall—

''(i) be for such part of the two preceding fiscal years as the issuer has been in operation;

''(ii) be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles or, in the case of a foreign private issuer, be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles or the International Financial Reporting Standards issued by the International Accounting Standards Board;

''(iii) be presumed reasonably current if—

''(I) with respect to the balance sheet, the balance sheet is as of a date less than 16 months before the transaction date; and

''(II) with respect to the profit and loss statement, such statement is for the 12 months preceding the date of the issuer's balance sheet; and

''(iv) if the balance sheet is not as of a date less than 6 months before the transaction date, be accompanied by additional statements of profit and loss for the period from the date of such balance sheet to a date less than 6 months before the transaction date.

''(K) To the extent that the seller is a control person with respect to the issuer, a brief statement regarding the nature of the affiliation, and a statement certified by such seller that they have no reasonable grounds to believe that the issuer is in violation of the securities laws or regulations.

''(4) ISSUERS DISQUALIFIED.—The transaction is not for the sale of a security where the seller is an issuer or a subsidiary, either directly or indirectly, of the issuer.

''(5) BAD ACTOR PROHIBITION.—Neither the seller, nor any person that has been or will be paid (directly or indirectly) remuneration or a commission for their participation in the offer or sale of the securities, including solicitation of purchasers for the seller is subject to an event that would disqualify an issuer or other covered person under Rule 506(d)(1) of Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 230.506(d)(1)) or is subject to a statutory disqualification described under section 3(a)(39) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

''(6) BUSINESS REQUIREMENT.—The issuer is engaged in business, is not in the organizational stage or in bankruptcy or receivership, and is not a blank check, blind pool, or shell company that has no specific business plan or purpose or has indicated that the issuer's primary business plan is to engage in a merger or combination of the business with, or an acquisition of, an unidentified person.

''(7) UNDERWRITER PROHIBITION.—The transaction is not with respect to a security that constitutes the whole or part of an unsold allotment to, or a subscription or participation by, a broker or dealer as an underwriter of the security or a redistribution.

''(8) OUTSTANDING CLASS REQUIREMENT.—The transaction is with respect to a security of a class that has been authorized and outstanding for at least 90 days prior to the date of the transaction.

''(e) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an exempted transaction described under subsection (a)(7):

''(A) Securities acquired in such transaction shall be deemed to have been acquired in a transaction not involving any public offering.

''(B) Such transaction shall be deemed not to be a distribution for purposes of section 2(a)(11).

''(C) Securities involved in such transaction shall be deemed to be restricted securities within the meaning of Rule 144 (17 C.F.R. 230.144).

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The exemption provided by subsection (a)(7) shall not be the exclusive means for establishing an exemption from the registration requirements of section 5.''.

(b) EXEMPTION IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN EXEMPT OFFERINGS.—Section 18(b)(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subparagraph (D) and subparagraph (E) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively;

(2) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (F), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

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

''(G) section 4(a)(7).''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to again commend the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), who just joined us, for all of his work on this bill and the earlier bills as well and for his continued work on capital formation issues.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the JOBS Act of 2012 has been a tremendous success, a huge success, for the American public and the public marketplace.

The number of companies that have gone public has risen dramatically ever since the barriers to capital formation that existed for several years have been lifted, if you will, helping to make our capital markets more attractive to companies and investors in the United States and all around the world as well.

But the JOBS Act also did something else, somewhat ironically. It included a number of provisions that helped companies to stay private for a longer period of time.

You see, these provisions have allowed pre-IPO companies to expand their investor base, if you will, and have allowed them to open up the doors to capital that were previously shut out to them.

But, you see, as these companies raise more capital and as these companies issue more shares to investors, it can become even more difficult and even more costly for shareholders to find a willing buyer or to exit their position in that company.

That is what this bill is all about. That is where H.R. 1839, the RAISE Act, would come in. The RAISE Act would build upon the success of the JOBS Act of 2012 by creating an environment, if you will, where restricted securities of pre-IPO companies can be traded in a more liquid secondary market, which then could ultimately have the effect of lowering the cost of capital for businesses.

So the RAISE Act does this how? By codifying the longstanding exemption developed by the courts, the SEC, and the securities laws that would provide a means for the resale, if you will, of these private restricted securities.

Now, for those just listening here, this sounds a little bit technical. Maybe it sounds a lot technical to be effective. But, really, it is a simple fix

that could ultimately have the effect of helping literally thousands of businesses all across this country to do what? To raise more capital and put it to use, put it to use to innovating or to hiring more employees.

That is at the end of the day exactly the type of bipartisan solution our constituents are calling on Congress to implement. I urge all of my colleagues, again, on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1839, which is an excellent example of bipartisan compromise that I think we should do more of in this body.

I would like to thank Mr. MCHENRY and Ranking Member WATERS for all of their work on this bill on which I am pleased to be the lead Democrat.

This bill codifies a longstanding rule that has been recognized in the securities law, known informally as rule 4(1)(½), which allows investors to resell private restricted securities without registering with the SEC.

Rule 4(1)(½) has long been recognized by the SEC and has been recognized by the Federal courts on numerous occasions as well.

But no one has ever bothered to codify this rule, even though everyone is okay with it and supports it, with investors relying on this informal rule.

The reason that the SEC and the courts have long recognized this rule is that it fully complies with the spirit of the Securities Act of 1933. These sales are really just transactions between two sophisticated investors.

As a result, different law firms have different interpretations of what rule 4(1)(½) requires and the market has become very fragmented.

So I think it is a very good idea to finally codify rule 4(1)(½) so that everyone knows the rules of the road and investors can have confidence that they are complying with the law when they resell private securities to other sophisticated investors.

But this bill doesn't just codify rule 4(1)(½). It actually improves upon it by establishing minimum standards for disclosure, marketing, and a holding period that will protect investors, foster transparency, and make this market even stronger.

□ 1645

This bill addresses several concerns that we heard from investor groups and regulators:

First, it requires that the seller provide the buyer with some basic information about the company, which ensures that buyers have the standard information they need before making an investment decision.

Second, it prohibits bad actors, such as people who have been banned from the securities industry, from taking advantage of the rule.

Third, it prohibits the securities of shell companies from being sold under this new rule, 4(1)(½).

So I am pleased that we were able to work together with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) on this bill and that we were able to add these important investor protections because now we have a bill that will enjoy strong bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Again, I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of the Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee, for yielding time.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for working with me on the provisions of the bill we are talking about this afternoon.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the full committee, for working with us to craft this compromise we have on the floor here today.

I have joined together with my colleagues from across the aisle to offer a Federal exemption from registering for the resale of private company securities, which is vital for adding liquidity to the secondary markets and driving economic growth.

Today private growth companies are not only disrupting existing industries, but are creating entirely new markets. Thanks to private markets, in particular, the advancement in American technology and entrepreneurship is thriving.

Funding the growth of these private companies, however, has created a paradigm shift. This shift requires our regulatory framework to achieve a balance between encouraging innovation and growth while ensuring that shareholders and investors are protected, and those investor protections need to remain strong.

Unfortunately, as successful entrepreneurs and startup employees look to sell their private shares in the secondary markets, they encounter a regulatory framework that is inefficient. That inefficiency is costly and dries up the liquidity of these securities and is harmful to economic growth.

Most private secondary transactions rely on a broadly accepted exemption known as section 4(1)(½). While widely known and applied, section 4(1)(½) has never been formally codified into securities law. The result has been a disjointed collection of case law and no-action SEC letters that have shaped these private secondary transactions.

Our bill attempts to fix this problem. The bill would provide an exemption for these types of transactions, allowing startup employees the ability to execute trades in a way that is consistent, clear, and certain.

That is why we have Federal securities laws, for that certainty, that clarity, and that consistency. It would allow for private companies to find a much better way to raise capital by opening up the secondary markets.

Although the bill is a technical fix, we have worked hard to seek compromise and find commonsense solutions to this complicated exemption.

While we have negotiated in good faith on this bill, as has the party across the aisle, my goal is to ensure that the language and operation of this compromise will work in the real world.

Further improvements to the bill may be necessary to fully codify existing uses of that authority, and I am committed to working with my colleagues across the aisle as well as folks in the Senate to clarify the intent here.

I look forward to continuing to work with our ranking member of the full Committee on Financial Services, as necessary, to ensure that the law is a useful tool and serves as an example of how policy can meet the demands of a changing marketplace.

The bottom line is this bill is a sensible way forward. This bill will lower costs and provide transparent standards for the issues that are important in the private and secondary transactions. Additionally, the bill will give today's private growth companies a foundation on which they can confidently plan their trajectory through the capital markets, both private and public.

Ultimately, codifying this exemption will ensure the United States remains the best market in the world for the world's innovators to build their businesses here and employ Americans and grow our economy.

I am pleased that this legislation enjoys bipartisan support, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers on the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her support on this and the prior legislation, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

When the gentleman from North Carolina makes a reference to the regulations of 4(1)(½), then you know there is something wrong out there that there are just too many obscure regulations that are holding back and being impediments to our capital markets.

The gentleman from North Carolina also came up with the right summation of this. It is a technical bill to deal with all of these absurdities and technicalities just to make it easier for

people to be able to start a business, grow a business, sell a business, hire employees, grow capital formation and the number of employees in this country as well.

With that being said, I look forward to strong, bipartisan support, as we have seen in the past on this type of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1839, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2078) to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2078

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 ''United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom—

(1) was created by Congress to independently assess and to accurately and unflinchingly describe threats to religious freedom around the world; and

(2) in carrying out its prescribed duties, should use its authorized powers to ensure that efforts by the United States to advance religious freedom abroad are timely, appropriate to the circumstances, prudent, and effective.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2019''.

SEC. 4. STRATEGIC PLAN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom established under section 201 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431).

(3) COMMISSIONER.—The term ''Commissioner'' means a member of the Commission.

(4) VICE CHAIR.—The term ''Vice Chair'' means the Vice Chair of the Commission who was appointed to such position by an elected official from the political party that is different from the political party of the elected official who appointed the Chair of the Commission.

(b) STRATEGIC POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW PLANNING PROCESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than biennially thereafter, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission, in coordination with the Commissioners, the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom, Commission staff, and others jointly selected by the Chair and Vice Chair, shall carry out a strategic policy and organizational review planning process that includes—

(1) a review of the duties set forth in section 202 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432) and the powers set forth in section 203 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6432a);

(2) the preparation of a written description of prioritized actions that the Commission is required to complete to fulfill the strategic plan required under subsection (d);

(3) a review of the scope, content, and timing of the Commission's annual report and any required changes; and

(4) a review of the personnel policies set forth in section 204 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432b) and any required changes to such policies.

(c) UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the greatest extent possible, the Chair, Vice Chair, and all of the Commissioners shall ensure that this section is implemented in a manner that results in unanimous agreement among the Commissioners with regard to—

(A) the strategic policy and organizational review planning process required under subsection (b); and

(B) the strategic plan required under subsection (d).

(2) ALTERNATIVE APPROVAL PROCESS.—If unanimous agreement under paragraph (1) is not possible, items for inclusion in the strategic plan may, at the joint discretion of the Chair and Vice Chair, be approved by an affirmative vote of—

(A) a majority of Commissioners appointed by an elected official from the political party of the President; and

(B) a majority of Commissioners appointed by an elected official from the political party that is not the party of the President.

(d) SUBMISSION OF STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Act, and not less frequently than biennially thereafter, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission shall jointly submit, to the appropriate congressional committees, a written strategic plan that includes—

(1) a description of prioritized actions for the Commission for a period of time to be specified by the Commissioners;

(2) a description of any changes the Commission considers necessary with regard to the scope, content, and timing of the Commission's annual report;

(3) a description of any changes the Commission considers necessary with regard to personnel matters; and

(4) the Commission's funding requirements for the period covered by the strategic plan.

(e) PENDING ISSUES.—The strategic plan required under subsection (d) may identify any issues or proposals that have not yet been resolved by the Commission.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION OF PERSONNEL PROVISIONS AND ANNUAL REPORT.—Notwithstanding section 204(a) and 205(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432b(a) and 6533(a)), the Commission is authorized to implement provisions related to personnel and the Commission's annual report that are included in the strategic plan submitted pursuant to this section.

(g) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—Upon request, the Commission shall—

(1) make available for inspection any information and documents requested by the appropriate congressional committees; and

(2) respond to any requests to provide testimony before the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6435) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission $3,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2016 to 2019 to carry out the provisions of this Act and section 4 of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2015.

''(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until the earlier of—

''(1) the date on which they have been expended; or

''(2) the date on which the Commission is terminated under section 209.

''(c) LIMITATION.—In each fiscal year, the Commission shall only be authorized to expend amounts that have been appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) if the Commission—

''(1) complies with the requirements set forth in section 4 of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2015; and

''(2) submits the annual financial report required under section 208(e) to the appropriate congressional committees.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, tragically, religious persecution around the world continues. I thought I would give one example that we heard in our committee last week, the Foreign Affairs Committee, from ''Bozi,'' who is a young 20-year-old Yazidi woman from Iraq. She told us the story.

She very bravely recounted her brutal captivity and the abuse she faced at the hands of ISIS. As we are talking about religious freedom, she explained that, in her village, the 700 men and boys were killed, including several of

her brothers. One small brother survived because he had a bullet in his head and they thought he was dead. But, other than that, her family is all gone.

She was bought by an American who had been recruited to ISIS about 4 years prior, she said. He bought 10 of the girls, sold 9, and kept her as a concubine.

She recounted how he explained to her that, because she was a Yazidi, she was an infidel, in his mind, and she was a Pagan, in his mind; and, therefore, he had the right to enslave and rape and sell Yazidi women and children, and he does this.

After about a year, she escaped. But she reported that there were about 3,000 girls and women in ISIS captivity, Yazidis, who faced the same fate that she faced while she was in that captivity.

These crimes are just the latest outrage against people of faith which continues in so many parts of the world, whether it be against Yazidis or Christian minorities in the Middle East or the Baha'i in Iran or religious communities attempting to worship without official supervision by repressive regimes, for example, in Burma or in North Korea. Anti-Semitism also is on the rise, including in Europe.

This legislation, which was passed unanimously by the Senate last week, will continue the good work of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom. Congress created this Commission as an independent Federal entity back in 1998.

The reason it was created was because, while the fundamental freedom of religion was under siege around the world, it did not receive enough attention in U.S. foreign policy circles.

This Commission is a body of experts who speak out on behalf of persecuted believers of any faith and push for accountability, accountability beyond what the State Department or the White House may view as diplomatically feasible.

The Commission's independent voice remains critical today, as the State Department too often pushes religious freedom to the side. For example, the State Department's Ambassador at Large for religious freedom sat vacant for 2 years during the start of this administration and again for another 10 months before the appointment of the current Ambassador, Rabbi David Saperstein.

And this year, after a 3-year lapse, the Department finally made the legally required designation of ''Countries of Particular Concern'' for religious freedom, 3 years of the State Department shirking its legal responsibility.

But, as the Commission has found, another eight countries should also be placed on that list and were not placed on the list. Those countries include Vietnam, whose recent so-called amnesty of more than 18,000 prisoners included convicted murderers, convicted drug dealers, human traffickers.

But what it did not include was prisoners of religious conscience, such as the Venerable Thich Quang Do of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam. I have visited him under house arrest. They did not include Father Nguyen Van Ly, the Catholic priest who has been repeatedly beaten. These were not the people released. No. It was the human traffickers and the murderers.

So this Commission is critical in calling out these abuses.

This bill extends the authorization of the Commission for 4 more years and includes new strategic planning and transparency improvements in the act. This should ensure that the Commission's important work remains strongly bipartisan and represents the diverse American consensus on the importance of our first freedom: religious liberty.

I want to thank Senators CORKER and CARDIN and their colleagues who worked to craft this bill, which received unanimous support in the other body.

I also want to recognize the important work of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the author of the House side reauthorization bill, who has been a legislative leader on religious freedom issues throughout his career.

And, as always, I appreciate the cooperation of the ranking member, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL of New York, and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

So this bill, which has the unanimous support of the Senate and all nine current Commissioners, deserves our support also. With its passage, it goes to the President's desk. With his signature, it will ensure that freedom of religion under continuous threat from extremists and authoritarian governments remains front and center.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of S. 2078.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will reauthorize the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, what we call USCIRF, and it deserves this body's strong support.

I want to begin by thanking Senator CORKER, Senator CARDIN, and Senator DURBIN for the work that they did in pushing this bill on the Senate side. I want to thank our chairman, Chairman ROYCE, and Representative CHRIS SMITH for his strong leadership here in the House on matters dealing with religious freedom.

This bill, which has been endorsed by all nine of the current Commissioners, would reauthorize the Commission for 4 years and require that the Commission agree on a bipartisan strategic plan to be submitted to Congress within 180 days. Moreover, the Commission will also be required to reach bipartisan agreement on personnel policies, which I hope they will see as an opportunity, as an organization dedicated to promoting freedom and tolerance, to include strong nondiscrimination protections for religion, gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation, as well as the other federally protected classes.

The right to practice religion and worship freely is a bedrock principle of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, of course, of our own Constitution. This Commission on International Religious Freedom does so much to defend that liberty, whether through invaluable research, analysis, and reporting or efforts to guide lawmakers from the United States and elsewhere on the importance of this issue. Yet every day, religious communities around the world endure violence, persecution, and discrimination—and the problem, sadly, is escalating.

In Nigeria, Christian and Muslim communities live in fear of the fanatical terrorist group Boko Haram. In Iran, the regime continues to persecute members of the Baha'i faith. In Vietnam, Christians are arrested and beaten by police. Pakistan has fallen down on the job of prosecuting violence against religious minorities, while at the same time convicting religious minorities for blasphemy. And, of course, people of all faiths are being massacred by ISIL as it attempts to wipe out any beliefs that don't align with its perversion of Islam.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of intolerance has no place in the 21st century. Governments are obligated to respect the religious freedom of all citizens. It is the right thing to do, and it is also in their own interests. After all, when societies are more open, they become more prosperous. When citizens live freely without fear of persecution, they contribute more and help drive growth and stability.

So the United States wants to see religious freedom thrive around the world. That is why we established the Commission on International Religious Freedom, and that is why we should vote today to support the Commission's vital continued work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 2078.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). He worked on the original authorization of the Religious Freedom Act, and he is the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the chairman for his leadership and for his commitment to human rights, particularly religious freedom, and I want to thank Senator CORKER for helping to shepherd this legislation through the

Senate when there were some contentious issues.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom was created as part of the landmark International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, originally authored by my good friend and former colleague Frank Wolf, who provided exemplary service and leadership in this House.

The creation of USCIRF made the promotion and protection of religious freedom a priority of U.S. foreign policy; and believe me, before the passage of this law, it was not. Since its inception, USCIRF has been a valuable, independent, and bipartisan source of information and policy recommendations for the Congress, U.S. Government, and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, USCIRF gives voice to persecuted religious groups and raises prisoner cases, individual cases, at the highest levels of the U.S. Government. USCIRF's annual report—and I encourage Members to read it—often provides a fuller view of violations of religious freedom than the State Department's International Religious Freedom Report. As an independent body, USCIRF has the political freedom to report the facts and provide critical insight and recommendations on countries like Vietnam, Pakistan, India, Cuba, or China, countries where the U.S. Government may be hesitant to draw attention to religious rights violations because it is concerned about upsetting foreign governments.

It needs to be noted that in the beginning, the Clinton administration actively opposed passage of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998. I know because I chaired the hearings. We heard from people like Assistant Secretary John Shattuck, who said it would create a hierarchy of human rights, which it did not. It put religious freedom in its rightful place. Of course, years later, people from the administration pointed out that none of that happened and it was a very important addition to our work. I also want to note that a very broad coalition supported and continued to support IRFA in general and USCIRF in particular. In the end, President Clinton did sign the legislation into law.

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops endorses USCIRF's reauthorization, as do over 80 different nongovernmental organizations and religious groups, part of the International Religious Freedom Roundtable. These groups sent a letter to every Member of Congress and said, in pertinent part, ''while there is very little we agree on theologically, or politically, we all agree on the importance of religious freedom.''

Mr. Speaker, bipartisan cooperation is critically important at a time when religious freedom is under siege through the world. Anti-Semitism, pervasive in most of the Middle East, has spread like a cancer to parts of Europe. The increase in violence perpetrated against Christians, Muslims, and other religious minorities has reached staggering proportions, including disturbing reports of torture, rape, imprisonment, forced exile, and murder.

Mr. Speaker, the world faces a deepening crisis of religious freedom restrictions and abuses by governments. The Pew Foundation estimates that over 75 percent of the world's population lives in countries where severe religious freedom abuses are commonplace. Ancient Christian communities in Iraq and Syria are on the verge of extinction, and other religious minorities in the Middle East face a constant assault from ISIS. ISIS, as we all know, has committed and is committing genocide, mass atrocities, and war crimes.

China continues to suppress religious practice broadly and with impunity. It has been another punishing year for the Tibetan Buddhists, Uighur Muslims, Christians, as well as Falun Gong practitioners who face restrictions, imprisonment, and torture.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Burma is a problem; Rohingya Muslims face problems. In Pakistan, as we all know, there are problems; in Iran, not just with the Baha'i who are persecuted again and have been facing that with unrelenting pressure, but also other Christians who live there and other Muslims.

Mr. Speaker, the need for USCIRF is clear, and I hope all Members will support this important human rights legislation.

I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any more speakers, so I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, again, I want to thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, and our ranking member ELIOT ENGEL for, once again, the bipartisan way in which the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee is conducted, evidenced again today with strong bipartisan support for this bill. I also want to acknowledge the great leadership of Congressman SMITH, who has worked in this area for a very long time.

Mr. Speaker, my home State, Rhode Island, was founded by ROGER WILLIAMS, searching for a place that respects religious freedom. Rhode Island is home to the oldest synagogue in America, the Touro Synagogue, where President Washington famously wrote to the Hebrew congregation at Touro Synagogue to reassure them that this new, young Nation will be a place that respects religious freedom of all its citizens. It is this Commission that continues to promote that work around the world, to ensure that religious freedom is respected everywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, religious liberty is the first right in our Bill of Rights, and it is in the First Amendment. There are five rights in the First Amendment. Religious liberty is the first of those five rights. That is not by accident. Our ancestors believed in the right of religious liberty.

In fact, throughout the world today, religious freedom is the most important personal right for many, many people of all religious faiths—the right to practice one's religion free of persecution regardless of what that religion is.

Mr. Speaker, Saddique Azam was promoted as the headmaster of an elementary school in Pakistan a few months ago. Three Muslim teachers didn't like the fact that they had a Christian as their boss. So, yesterday, about 7:45 in the morning, they stormed his office and demanded that he resign because he was a Christian. He refused. They beat him up until he was rescued by some other staff members.

Curricula in schools throughout the world are teaching religious intolerance. The Saudi school curriculum openly vilifies other faiths, including Jews and Christians. Not too long ago, there was a 14-year-old boy by the name of Ayman Nabil Labib, a Christian in Egypt, a Coptic Christian. He went to school. The teacher of his class, a non-Christian, saw that he had a cross on his wrist. Coptic Christians I understand have a tattoo of a cross. He was told to cover up the cross. He did not. In fact, he pulled out a cross from underneath his shirt and displayed it as well. The teacher grabbed him around the neck and started choking him and asked the other students: What are you going to do about this? And they beat him to death—a 14-year-old Coptic Christian in Egypt.

Persecution happens to all faiths throughout the world.

It is the most important, in my opinion, human right, natural right, to practice one's faith, religion, and belief freely without persecution by government especially. This legislation helps protect that right worldwide. It is an important right here, but, as I said, it is a natural right, and it should be protected. I support this legislation because it protects the basic right of religious freedom.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressmen CHRIS SMITH, DAVID CICILLINE, and Judge TED POE.

Two weeks ago, we were all here on the floor of the House, and we heard

Pope Francis charged with those listening to his remarks of the important responsibility of safeguarding religious freedom. He stated at the White House that that freedom remains one of America's most precious possessions. Of course, that freedom is not only an American possession, and it is not only enjoyed by certain religions. That freedom flows from the inherent dignity of every human person and should be protected wherever it is threatened.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom remains a strong, independent, and authoritative voice on behalf of religious believers everywhere. This measure will ensure that it continues to pursue the Commission's nonpartisan mission of promoting around the world the right of religious liberty that we hold so dear as a nation. It deserves our unanimous support.

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support a commission which embodies the highest of our democratic principles: independence, bipartisanship, transparency and the defense of our fundamental freedoms.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom was created from a landmark piece of legislation, the 1998 International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA).

How that bill came about is a story in its own right, and a demonstration of how a diverse set of our nation's leaders can come together to protect a foundational freedom.

One of the best ways to expose attacks on religious freedom is meticulous chronicling of such abuses and then proclaiming them loud and clear to a watching world.

The importance of USCIRF's mission of monitoring, recording and publishing attacks on religious belief—or any belief at all—cannot be overestimated.

Their annual report is an invaluable reference for my colleagues and me and our staffs.

Like the TIP report which monitors countries' records on human trafficking, the USCIRF annual report exposes lawbreakers and violators of human rights—and recommends what actions should be taken.

And we have seen how across the world religious minorities are under attack.

Christians made up 20 percent of the Middle East population at the start of the 20th century.

Given a sustained attack in recent years on Christian belief and practice, that number is now around 5 percent and declining.

In fact, less than 1 percent of the world's more than 2 billion Christians live in the Middle East—the birthplace of the religion.

Other religions and belief systems have suffered under sustained persecution.

Yazidis in Iraq and Syria have been systematically targeted by ISIS for slavery and execution.

Just this week, news reports have revealed Yazidi women have taken their own lives out of despair after repeated rapes and assaults.

USCIRF has documented ethnic cleansing of Muslims and sectarian violence in the Central African Republic, and urged the State Department designate it as a Country of Particular Concern.

In Russia, "serious violations of freedom of religion or belief continue."

China has taken further steps to "consolidate" its "authoritarian monopoly" over the lives of its citizens.

This has led to "unprecedented violence" against Uigher Muslims, Tibetan Buddhists, Catholics, Protestants, and Falun Gong practitioners.

And the list goes on and on.

An attack on the religious belief of one is an attack on all of us.

USCIRF is a unique, independent voice calling the world to pay attention and act, especially when this freedom can take a backseat in foreign affairs.

The world forgets that the chilling of religious belief is the first step toward totalitarian control over all areas of life.

All other freedoms flow from religious liberty.

Without the freedom to believe what your conscience tells you, and live that belief out without fear of violence or other persecution, all other freedoms are meaningless.

USCIRF recognizes this reality, and acts in defense of all peoples everywhere.

I urge the House and reauthorize this important commission, and continue to defend and promote our First Amendment freedoms around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2078.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIRPORT ACCESS CONTROL SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, streamline transportation security regulations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3102

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 "Airport Access Control Security Improvement Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. AVIATION SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1602. RISK-BASED SCREENING OF EMPLOYEES AT AIRPORTS.

"(a) SCREENING MODEL.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish a risk-based, intelligence-driven model for the screening of employees at airports based on level of access and employment positions at domestic airports. Such screening model shall—

"(A) ensure that only those individuals authorized to have access to the secure areas of a domestic airport are permitted such access;

"(B) ensure that an individual is immediately denied entry to a secure area when such individual's access authorization for such secure area is withdrawn; and

"(C) provide a means to differentiate between individuals authorized to have access to an entire secure area and individuals authorized access to only a particular portion of a secure area.

"(2) FACTORS.—The Administrator shall consider the following factors when establishing the screening model described in paragraph (1):

"(A) Whether and how often employees at airports require employment-related access to Secure Identification Display Areas, Airport Operations Areas, or secure areas.

"(B) The ability of each airport operator to reduce employee entry and exit points to a mutually agreed upon minimum number of such entry and exit points necessary to maintain airport operations.

"(C) In consultation with airport operators, the ability of the Administration to create a randomization plan for screening at the defined operational minimum entry and exit points at airports which maximizes the deterrent effect of screening efforts.

"(b) DISQUALIFYING OFFENSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, labor organizations representing aviation, ground, and cabin crew workers, and the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall conduct an aviation security risk-based review of the disqualifying criminal offenses codified in sections 1542.209 and 1544.229 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, to determine the appropriateness of such offenses as a basis for denying to an employee a credential that allows unescorted access to Secure Identification Display Areas of airports. Such review shall consider the following:

"(A) The adequacy of codified disqualifying offenses to address the current aviation security threat environment, particularly the terrorism insider threat.

"(B) If such codified disqualifying offenses should be tailored to address the current aviation security threat environment, particularly the terrorism insider threat, by excluding or including other offenses.

"(C) The potential security benefits, drawbacks, and challenges associated with identifying patterns of misdemeanors or of other non-disqualifying offenses that could jeopardize aviation security.

"(D) The feasibility of integrating similar departmental eligibility requirements for access to Secure Identification Display Areas of airports.

"(E) If the ten year look-back period for disqualifying offenses is appropriate, in light of the current aviation security threat environment, particularly the terrorism insider threat.

"(2) WAIVER.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall provide an adequate redress process for an employee who is subject to an adverse employment decision, including removal or suspension of such employee, due to a disqualifying offense referred to in paragraph (1), that is consistent with the appeals and waiver process established for applicants for commercial motor vehicle hazardous materials endorsements and transportation workers at ports under section 70105(c) of title 46, United States Code.

"(3) NOTICE.—Any changes to the Secure Identification Display area badge program,

such as changes considered pursuant to subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E) of paragraph (1) shall be subject to notice of proposed rulemaking.

''(4) BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the aviation security risk-based review required under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the results of such review.

''(c) CREDENTIALING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall review the auditing procedures for all airport-issued identification media. Such review shall determine the following:

''(1) The efficacy of the auditing program requirements at domestic airports to ensure the integrity, accountability, and control of airport-issued identification media.

''(2) The feasibility of including biometrics standards for all airport-issued identification media used for identity verification and badge verification.

''(3) The feasibility of integrating other departmental programs' eligibility requirements for access to secure areas of airports.

''(d) VETTING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall—

''(A) establish a program to allow airport badging offices to utilize the employment eligibility confirmation system established under section 404 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note; commonly referred to as 'E-Verify') to determine the eligibility to work in the United States of all applicants seeking access to secure areas of airports;

''(B) establish a process to transmit applicants' biometric fingerprint data to the Office of Biometric Identity Management's (OBIM's) Automated Biometrics Identification System (IDENT) for vetting; and

''(C) conduct a data quality assessment to ensure that credential application data elements received by the Administration are complete and match the data submitted by the airport operators.

''(2) BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the responsibilities specified in paragraph (1), the Administrator shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the results of such completion.

''(e) REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish a nationwide program for the anonymous reporting of violations of airport security.

''(f) CENTRALIZED DATABASE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall—

''(1) establish a national database of employees who have had either their airport or aircraft operator-issued badge revoked for failure to comply with aviation security requirements;

''(2) determine the appropriate reporting mechanisms for airports and airlines to submit data regarding employees described in paragraph (1) and to access the database established pursuant to such paragraph; and

''(3) establish a process that allows individuals whose names were mistakenly entered into such database to have their names removed and have their credentialing restored.

''(g) UPDATED REVIEW.—Not later than April 8, 2016, the Administrator, in consultation with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall conduct an updated and thorough review of airport access controls.

''(h) EMPLOYEE SCREENING STUDY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Administrator, in consultation with the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Comptroller General of the United States a cost and feasibility study of a statistically significant number of Category I, II, and X airports, that ensures that all employee entry and exit points that lead to secure areas of such airports are comprised of the following:

''(A) A secure door utilizing card and pin entry or biometric technology.

''(B) Surveillance video recording, capable of storing video data for at least 30 days.

''(C) Advanced screening technologies, including at least one of the following:

''(i) Magnetometer (walk-through or handheld).

''(ii) Explosives detection canines.

''(iii) Explosives trace detection swabbing.

''(iv) Advanced imaging technology.

''(v) X-ray bag screening technology.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall include information related to the employee screening costs of those airports which have already implemented practices of screening one-hundred percent of employees entering secure areas of airports, including the following:

''(A) Costs associated with establishing an operational minimum number of employee entry and exit points.

''(B) A comparison of costs associated with implementing the requirements specified in paragraph (1), based on whether such implementation was carried out by the Administration or airports.

''(3) COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon completion of the study required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall review such study to assess the quality and reliability of such study.

''(B) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the receipt of the study required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the results of the review required under subparagraph (A).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1601 the following new item:

''Sec. 1602. Risk-based screening of employees at airports.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1715

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 3102 is a critically important, bipartisan piece of legislation, which serves as a culmination of months of intense oversight on the issue of airport access controls and the insider threat to aviation security.

The gaps in airport employee access control made headlines after an investigation revealed that aviation employees were trafficking weapons and ammunitions between Atlanta and New York. More than 170 guns were trafficked in such a manner.

Furthermore, a recent inspector general report found that TSA failed to identify 73 aviation workers with possible links to terrorism. Lastly, at airports such as Dallas/Fort Worth, Los Angeles International, and Oakland, many major drug-trafficking rings have been uncovered involving employees using their insider ability to access the airports.

It is the responsibility of this committee to act to prevent similar stories from continuing to emerge.

Specifically, H.R. 3102 requires TSA to consult with Federal and private sector partners to review existing employee screening protocols and work comprehensively to improve the effectiveness of controls at airports across the United States.

Moreover, the bill improves standards of vetting for the credentials granted to individuals with access to secure areas of airports and takes a robust approach to bolstering the oversight of the access given to these employees.

H.R. 3102 codifies a number of recommendations put forward by the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, which examined the issue of airport access controls earlier this year at our urging.

This legislation reflects rigorous oversight, including a number of hearings, site visits, and briefings from Homeland Security, TSA, the FBI, and aviation stakeholders.

Furthermore, I am very proud of the cooperation among our private sector stakeholders, Federal partners, and the labor community that has helped to bring this bill to the floor today.

Throughout this legislation's development, we have worked tirelessly with the same end goal in mind: to enhance the security of our Nation's airports and mitigate threats to aviation workers and the traveling public.

The insider threat to aviation is real, and it is critical that we evolve our security standards and best practices to stay abreast of changing threats to transportation.

I wish to thank Ranking Member RICE and Ranking Member THOMPSON

for their hard work and attention to this issue, as we have focused heavily on these problems in a bipartisan manner.

I also wish the thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MCCAUL, for his support on the committee's oversight efforts and for seeing this bill through the committee.

Together—together—we can fix these problems and assure the American public that their aviation system is secure and adaptive to changing threats.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3102.

Last year we learned that airport employees used their access to the secure areas of airports to bypass screening to smuggle weapons and drugs onto commercial flights.

In response, then-Acting Administrator Melvin Carraway requested that TSA's stakeholder advisory committee, the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, take on the challenge of evaluating airport access controls and come up with approaches to address security vulnerabilities.

In April, the ASAC issued a thoughtful report with 28 recommendations designated to mitigate threats and risks associated with airport access controls.

Congress approved legislation in December 2014 to codify ASAC in law in the hopes that it would result in better aviation security policymaking at TSA.

We envisioned a process in which various stakeholders throughout the aviation community were able to come together and address security issues affecting the industry. In this instance, the process worked as envisioned, and TSA is making sure and steady progress towards addressing many of the recommendations.

I believe that, by advancing this bill today, we will send a message to TSA and aviation stakeholders that we have a strong interest in raising the bar when it comes to securing our Nation's airports.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I simply reiterate that the committee remains interested in raising the level of security within our Nation's airports. As such, we will continue to track TSA's efforts at bolstering access controls and addressing the ASAC's recommendations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the issues addressed in H.R. 3102 are a pressing concern to the security of our Nation's airports. It is critical that we send this bill to the Senate today. Congress cannot stand idly by and grant tacit approval to lax security standards for employees when we have the authority and responsibility to spur action and keep the traveling public safe from harm.

I want to thank Mr. RICHMOND for his bipartisan comments. That truly is the nature of what we have done today, is act in a bipartisan manner to attack a problem.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise to speak on H.R. 3102, the "Airport Access Control Security Improvement Act of 2015," which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, and streamline transportation security regulations.

The objective of the bill is to establish a risk-based, intelligence-driven model for the screening of employees at airports based on level of access and employment positions at domestic airports.

The model is intended to ensure that only those individuals authorized to have access to secure areas of a domestic airport are permitted such access.

The model must be able to differentiate between individuals authorized to have access to an entire secure area and those who are not permitted access.

The Director of the FBI and Director of the Aviation Security Advisory Committee are directed to review the disqualifying criminal offenses in the Code of Federal Regulations to determine the adequacy for an individual to have continued access to Secure Identification Display Areas of airports.

The review based on the current language of the bill would consider whether the list of disqualifying offenses should be amended to include other offenses.

As House Judiciary Committee's Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Investigation, I am concerned that the bill contains this language.

At a time when we are discussing the rights of non-violent offenders to have an opportunity, if their conduct and records dictate to be able to fully reintegration into society, that there may be other efforts to make this process more difficult without a serious review of why such measures should be taken and for whom should they be applied?

I would offer to work with my fellow members on the House Committee on Homeland Security to consider carefully the reasons for any expansion on this list, especially if the expansion only involves the Department of Homeland Security.

There are similar concerns regarding language in the bill that may extend the period of time that may be considered between a particular situation and the life a person is currently leading.

Considering behavior of a teenager when considering the conduct of a 35 year-old adult, the weight of the consideration should be on the life of the adult and the seriousness of the offense.

Any new model that may be developed that would impact the employability of current persons who hold access credentials and future employees should be further reviewed by the full committee prior to becoming policy.

The bill's goals are important—the House should consider every aspect of airport security to improve aviation safety.

I will continue to work in my capacity on both the House Committee on Homeland Security and the House Committee on the Judiciary to improve aviation security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3102, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY ACT OF 2015

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3510) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3510

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 230. CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop a departmental strategy to carry out cybersecurity responsibilities as set forth in law.

"(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

"(1) Strategic and operational goals and priorities to successfully execute the full range of the Secretary's cybersecurity responsibilities.

"(2) Information on the programs, policies, and activities that are required to successfully execute the full range of the Secretary's cybersecurity responsibilities, including programs, policies, and activities in furtherance of the following:

"(A) Cybersecurity functions set forth in the second section 226 (relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center).

"(B) Cybersecurity investigations capabilities.

"(C) Cybersecurity research and development.

"(D) Engagement with international cybersecurity partners.

"(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

"(1) consider—

"(A) the cybersecurity strategy for the Homeland Security Enterprise published by the Secretary in November 2011;

"(B) the Department of Homeland Security Fiscal Years 2014–2018 Strategic Plan; and

"(C) the most recent Quadrennial Homeland Security Review issued pursuant to section 707; and

''(2) include information on the roles and responsibilities of components and offices of the Department, to the extent practicable, to carry out such strategy.

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the development of the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall issue an implementation plan for the strategy that includes the following:

''(1) Strategic objectives and corresponding tasks.

''(2) Projected timelines and costs for such tasks.

''(3) Metrics to evaluate performance of such tasks.

''(e) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate for assessment the following:

''(1) A copy of the strategy required under subsection (a) upon issuance.

''(2) A copy of the implementation plan required under subsection (d) upon issuance, together with detailed information on any associated legislative or budgetary proposals.

''(f) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

''(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as permitting the Department to engage in monitoring, surveillance, exfiltration, or other collection activities for the purpose of tracking an individual's personally identifiable information.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CYBERSECURITY RISK.—The term 'cybersecurity risk' has the meaning given such term in the second section 226, relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center.

''(2) HOMELAND SECURITY ENTERPRISE.—The term 'Homeland Security Enterprise' means relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities involved in homeland security, including Federal, State, local, and tribal government officials, private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

''(3) INCIDENT.—The term 'incident' has the meaning given such term in the second section 226, relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center.''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON REORGANIZATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not change the location or reporting structure of the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security, or the location or reporting structure of any office or component of the Directorate, unless the Secretary receives prior authorization from Congress permitting such change.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding at the end of the list of items for subtitle C of title II the following new item:

''Sec. 230. Cybersecurity strategy.''.

(d) AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of the second section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148; relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) the term 'incident' means an occurrence that actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of information on an information system, or actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, an information system;''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3510, the Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015, sponsored by Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND, ranking member of the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee, of which I am the chairman.

This legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to develop and to submit to Congress a cybersecurity strategy and implementation plan. Because the Department of Homeland Security is charged with securing the dot-gov domain and working with the private sector to secure the dot-com domain, a comprehensive strategic plan and implementation plan will support DHS' essential cybersecurity mission.

Mr. Speaker, too often these days cyber attacks disrupt the operations of government, of businesses, and of the lives of the American people. The increasingly sophisticated nature of the cyber threats we face on a daily basis underscore the need to manage and strengthen the cybersecurity of our Nation's critical infrastructure.

The Government Accountability Office has recommended the implementation of an overarching Federal cybersecurity strategy. H.R. 3510 is an important step toward accomplishing this task.

H.R. 3510 also precludes any reorganization effort of the Department of Homeland Security's National Protection and Programs Directorate, or NPPD, without congressional approval. This is an effort to ensure that congressional oversight is conducted.

Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, a story in the press announced that the NPPD was planning a significant reorganization. Since June, very few specifics have emerged, and even those that have have been very sparse in detail.

The details that have been made public elicit concern because they support overhauling the infrastructure protection and cybersecurity functions of the directorate without providing details on exactly what this would mean for the mission, for the structure, or for the workforce of the directorate.

The language in this bill follows a bipartisan letter sent just last month to the Department expressing congressional concern with the lack of transparency surrounding this proposed reorganization and communicating the congressional intent to provide oversight on this issue. The letter also clearly stated that any reorganization or realignment should require congressional authorization.

Over the past several years, the Committee on Homeland Security, on which I serve, has built up a collaborative working relationship with the NPPD, consulting with it to pass several strong and bipartisan pieces of legislation to improve chemical security and to strengthen DHS' cybersecurity mission and stature in the Federal Government.

Given our shared goal of protecting this country and the committee's continued legislative oversight efforts to strengthen DHS' cybersecurity functions, it is essential that the Department submit any proposal to Congress prior to reorganization or realignment.

It is Congress' role and responsibility to authorize the key responsibilities of the executive branch to include strengthening our cybersecurity posture and ensuring the security and resiliency of our Nation's critical infrastructure.

I would like to thank Mr. RICHMOND for the work that he and his staff have done to come together in a bipartisan way on this legislation.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3510.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. RATCLIFFE. I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MCCAUL, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, who all signed on and support this legislation.

H.R. 3510, the Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015, will require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy and implementation plan for carrying out its diverse and complex cyber and information security missions.

Today the Department of Homeland Security is not only responsible for working with Federal agencies to protect Federal civilian networks, but also for helping to bolster information security within the private sector, principally through the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center.

It also plays a major role in information security research and development, cyber crime investigations, and international engagement with cybersecurity partners.

My bill requires DHS to put in place a strategy that includes necessary strategic and operational goals for executing the Secretary's broad responsibilities.

In September, the inspector general issued a report highlighting the need for such strategy. The report, entitled ''DHS Can Strengthen Its Cyber Mission Coordination Efforts,'' found that intradepartmental coordination was lacking and recommended that the Department develop a comprehensive cross-departmental strategic implementation plan that defines each component's cyber missions and responsibilities.

The Department operates frontline programs that protect this Nation from manmade and natural disasters. With cyber threats increasingly at the forefront today, it is essential that all of the Department's day-to-day programs, policies, and activities are effective and meeting its multi-layered cybersecurity responsibilities.

As the lead Federal agency responsible for securing Federal civilian networks and as the vital cyber information-sharing partner to national critical infrastructures, it is crucial that the Department have a comprehensive and achievable strategic plan in place.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, Congress has provided significant resources to the Department to expand its cyber operations and workforce.

A lot of money has been spent to respond to cyber events and persistent information security threats. We must make sure our investments in operational plans and research and development are technically achievable and transparent where they can be.

Fundamentally, my bill seeks to ensure that the Department takes a measurable, strategic posture that can be a model for others and to help protect our Nation's vulnerable information security networks.

I ask for my colleagues' support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3510.

I thank Congressman RICHMOND for his bipartisan approach in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 3510, the ''Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015,'' which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security.

The strategy must include information on the programs, policies, and activities that are required to successfully execute the full range of the cybersecurity programs, policies, and activities in furtherance of the Department of Homeland Security's mission regarding the National Cybersecurity and Communication Integration Center.

The National Cybersecurity and Communication Integration Center addresses cybersecurity risks faced by federal and non-federal entities.

In July of this year it was reported that the Office of Personnel Management lost personal information on 21.5 million current and former federal employees and their families.

In 2014, the following agencies reported breaches: The State Department revealed that its unclassified email network had been breached in a cyberattack; the U.S. Postal Service reported that 800,000 personnel files were potentially affected by a cyber breach; the Department of Health and Human Services reported cyber intruders had accessed a server used to test code for the healthcare.gov website and installed malicious software; and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the agency that oversees the U.S. nuclear power industry, revealed a number of attempted intrusions and three successful intrusions into its computer systems.

In cyber time, which is near the speed of light—federal computer networks will not get a warning from a determined enemy that an attack is occurring.

Our nation's critical infrastructure and civilian government agencies depend on the cybersecurity talent and resources that the Department of Homeland Security can provide on the frontline to defend against attacks.

As with other threats that this nation has faced and overcome, we must create the resources and the institutional responses to protect our nation against cyber threats while preserving our liberties and freedoms.

We cannot accomplish this task without the full cooperation and support of the private sector, computing research community and academia.

This level of engagement requires the trust and confidence of the American people that this new cyber threat center will be used for the purpose it was created and that the collaboration of others in this effort to better protect computing networks will be used only for protection and defense.

There are people with skills and those with the potential to develop skills that would be of benefit to our nation's efforts to develop an effective cybersecurity defense and deterrence posture.

It is my hope that as we move forward the Committee on Homeland Security will continue in a bipartisan manner to seek out the best ways to bring the brightest and most qualified people into the government as cybersecurity professionals.

Toward that end, I am hosting a Town Hall on Wednesday, October 7, 2015, Town Hall'' on Minority Representation in the Cybersecurity Workforce.

I am pleased to have the Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus join me in support of this important Town Hall.

The message from the federal government to the public regarding the employment opportunities available in STEM careers that include cybersecurity.

It is my commitment that Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, Native American Colleges and Women's Colleges and Universities should be actively engaged when agencies conduct outreach and program development on cybersecurity.

The Brookings' Metropolitan Policy Program's report ''The Hidden STEM Economy,'' reported that in 2011, 26 million jobs or 20 percent of all occupations required knowledge in 1 or more STEM areas.

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

There will be STEM winners and losers, but not because the skills needed are too difficult to obtain, but because people are not aware of the jobs that are going unfilled today, nor do they know what education or training will create job security for the next 2 to 3 decades.

I am very aware of the importance of STEM job training and education.

A third of Houston jobs are in STEM-based fields.

Houston has the second largest concentrations of engineers (22.4 for every 1,000 workers according to the Greater Houston Partnership.)

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

STEM jobs are at the core of Houston's economic success, but what we have done with STEM innovation and job creation in the city of Houston is not enough to satisfy the regions demand for STEM trained workers.

We anticipate that in the next 5 years the gap in the number of people with STEM skills and training will not keep up with the number of positions requiring those skills.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3510, the ''Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3510, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOPTIVE FAMILY RELIEF ACT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1300) to amend section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1300

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 ''Adoptive Family Relief Act''.

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF FEES FOR RENEWAL OF IMMIGRANT VISA FOR ADOPTED CHILD IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.

Section 221(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) PERIOD OF VALIDITY; RENEWAL OR REPLACEMENT.—

''(1) IMMIGRANT VISAS.—An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding six months, as shall be by regulations prescribed, except that any visa issued to a child lawfully adopted by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United

States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time, for a period not to exceed three years, as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service, employment, or business.

''(2) NONIMMIGRANT VISAS.—A nonimmigrant visa shall be valid for such periods as shall be by regulations prescribed. In prescribing the period of validity of a nonimmigrant visa in the case of nationals of any foreign country who are eligible for such visas, the Secretary of State shall, insofar as practicable, accord to such nationals the same treatment upon a reciprocal basis as such foreign country accords to nationals of the United States who are within a similar class; except that in the case of aliens who are nationals of a foreign country and who either are granted refugee status and firmly resettled in another foreign country or are granted permanent residence and residing in another foreign country, the Secretary of State may prescribe the period of validity of such a visa based upon the treatment granted by that other foreign country to alien refugees and permanent residents, respectively, in the United States.

''(3) VISA REPLACEMENT.—An immigrant visa may be replaced under the original number during the fiscal year in which the original visa was issued for an immigrant who establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that the immigrant—

''(A) was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity because of reasons beyond his control and for which he was not responsible;

''(B) is found by a consular officer to be eligible for an immigrant visa; and

''(C) pays again the statutory fees for an application and an immigrant visa.

''(4) FEE WAIVER.—If an immigrant visa was issued, on or after March 27, 2013, for a child who has been lawfully adopted, or who is coming to the United States to be adopted, by a United States citizen, any statutory immigrant visa fees relating to a renewal or replacement of such visa may be waived or, if already paid, may be refunded upon request, subject to such criteria as the Secretary of State may prescribe, if—

''(A) the immigrant child was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity as a direct result of extraordinary circumstances, including the denial of an exit permit; and

''(B) if such inability was attributable to factors beyond the control of the adopting parent or parents and of the immigrant.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 1300 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When I hold and kiss my little children good-bye to come to this place every week, the pain that I feel in leaving them for several days is mitigated by the conviction that I will be seeing them again very soon.

But I stand here tonight, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of hundreds of American families who are separated from their children with no sense of certainty or knowing when they will be allowed to see their children again or to know when their children will be home for good. That is because, in September of 2013, now more than 2 years ago, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, or the DRC, ceased issuing exit visas, including visas for the more than 350 children who had been fully legally adopted by American families. These families had fully complied with international adoption laws in both the United States and the DRC, had already spent months or years going through the tedious intercountry adoption process, and some of them had already arrived in the DRC with the belief that they would be bringing their adoptive children home at last to their forever families in America.

Despite significant, ongoing efforts by both Congress and the State Department to alleviate any of the DRC Government's concerns and resolve the exit permit process, Mr. Speaker, it is unknown when that suspension will be lifted. Meanwhile, American adoptive families are being faced with the added burden of having to repeatedly renew their adoptive child's adoption paperwork and visas in order to keep it up to date.

Thus, the Adoptive Family Relief Act grants flexibility to the State Department to waive the immigration visa renewal fees of $325 per child for adoptive families in America in extraordinary circumstances like this where the cause of delay is out of the family's control. Mr. Speaker, waiving the visa renewal fee would alleviate one portion of the overwhelming burden that these American families are enduring until their adoptive child or children can travel to the U.S.

While the U.S. Government continues to work toward the Democratic Republic of the Congo lifting the exit permit suspension, this legislation is critically important and will offer some practical relief to the American families held powerless in a very difficult situation.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the many families waiting to bring their adopted children home will receive encouragement from the strong bipartisan effort here in Congress to support them during this time, as we work collectively to engage the DRC Government and work toward the suspension being fully lifted. This bill is a reminder to them that the Congress has not and will not forget their plight, and we will not cease working on their behalf until their families are finally permanently united and whole.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman ROYCE for their noble and principled leadership in helping to elevate this issue and bring this legislation to the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1300, the Adoptive Family Relief Act.

As has been mentioned, 2 years ago, the Democratic Republic of the Congo suspended issuing exit permits to children who had been adopted and trying to leave the country to be with their parents. To this day, that country continues to suspend issuing these permits; and without permits, the children can't join their mom and dad, the people who have adopted them, even though the children are in possession of immigrant visas.

Now, we know to be separated from a child and not to be able to provide love and care for that child is a stressful and tormenting episode for any parent. For the families that adopted children in the DRC, this is exacerbated by the fact that their children are stuck in a country that has one of the worst healthcare systems in the world.

There are hundreds of families throughout the United States—and about 350 of them are waiting simply for an exit permit—missing their children and worried about the health of their children stuck in the DRC. The only thing that is preventing them from bringing their child or children home is this exit visa.

Now, our visas are valid only for 6 months, unfortunately, and I think, as was mentioned, it costs $325 to renew a visa even though, really, there is no work involved. We have checked with the State Department, and there is minimal expense. So this is not going to be a hit on the State Department's budget, but it is a hit on the budget of families. Some families have spent $1,000 over the past 2 years, and since we don't know when the DRC is going to start issuing these visas, we don't know how much money these families are looking at in the future.

This bipartisan bill doesn't solve the exit problem, but at least it solves the financial burden that we have put, not intentionally, on these families. It is the right thing to do. It will show support for these families during this distressing time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1300, the Adoptive Family Relief Act.

For many, family is everything, and as any parent knows, not seeing your child for even one day can be hard. Now, imagine you are separated from your child by over 6,000 miles for more than 2 years. This is the reality for too many Americans. Hundreds of adopted children are stuck in the Democratic Republic of the Congo because their government has refused to provide the paperwork required for these children to leave.

For over 2 years, the Meyers, a family in my district, have been waiting to bring home their son and daughter, Papy and Octavie. We can do better for Papy and Octavie and all the other children waiting to come home to their families.

As the Department of State continues to work to bring home these children, S. 1300 would provide much-needed relief to American families going through this harrowing experience. I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation. It is the right thing to do and worthy of your support.

Ms. LOFGREN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1300, the Adoptive Family Relief Act. This bill seeks to remove obstacles for immigrant visas to be issued to adopted children from other countries. It eliminates fees for such visas.

Clearly, the challenge of caring for orphans due to crises worldwide is increasing. Rather than frustrate, however, or undermine the compassion and the love of American families who seek to adopt, this legislation modestly seeks to remove some of those barriers and some of those obstacles.

I would point out to my colleagues that I have held of number of hearings on adoption in my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations. At one of those hearings several months ago, one of our witnesses made a very keen observation that there are more than 50 million children orphaned on the continent of Africa; and if you put that number in perspective, that would make that number of children, if they were in a single country, the fourth largest country in all of Africa after Nigeria, Ethiopia, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

One remedy, of course, for this crisis is intercountry adoption, which sometimes brings children from Africa to our shores to provide them with loving homes. Of course, this is only a partial remedy. Many do find a place to live, a home with family members, but many others are left to fend for themselves.

This legislation recognizes that countries' policies do matter. Look at the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Currently, there are more than 400 American families who have successfully adopted children from the DRC. However, due to the DRC Government's suspension of exit permits, which was implemented beginning in September of 2013, many of these families have been unable to bring their adopted children home to the United States. About a dozen of those children have paid with their lives, dying in the country before they could receive medical attention. Others are in dire need of medical aid which, again, this legislation would help, at least, in terms of the families to give them a bridge for the financial burdens they face.

I would point out that at one of my hearings, one of the witnesses really, in a very powerful way, said—and her name was Jovana Jones, an adoptive parent—''As adoptive parents, we spend years preparing, and it is imperative that our children come home immediately. We have done our part. Our families have done all we can, and we are at our limit.''

And then she said: ''Our arms are open now, and our homes are ready to receive them today. We pray that our government mirrors our dedication and acts now so that our children come home soon.''

This is a very important piece of legislation that hopefully will facilitate the adoption and, at least, help those parents who are putting their money on the line; and it allows them to facilitate that adoption, to just hang in there until they can get their children.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, before coming to the floor, I wanted to reassure myself that the State Department did not have the authority to waive these fees just administratively. It is pretty clear that they need this legislation in order to waive these fees. In fact, they want to waive the fees; they want to support the families. So there is no argument here between the House and Senate, between Republicans and Democrats, between the administration and the legislative branch. This is something that we can all agree on.

You know, to raise kids is one of the most wonderful experiences you can ever have, and we have wonderful American families that want to provide a home for orphans, not only in the DRC, but to orphans all around the world. So it is really important for those of us in the government, administration, and Congress to do what we can to support American families who want to raise these adoptive children.

It is worth noting that the DRC is the problem today, but we have had other problems in the past in other countries, in Latin America and Asia. So this change in the law is going to provide the necessary basis for relieving parents from excessive fees should this occur, God forbid, with other countries.

We would ask our State Department to redouble its efforts with the DRC to get these exit permits underway. It is really unfair to the children and their parents to keep these kids stranded.

□ 1745

Finally, I would just note that we have not done very much by way of anything touching on immigration where we could have bipartisan support. I still wish that we had before us comprehensive immigration reform. That is not this, but it doesn't mean that we shouldn't support this. I think that it is important that we pass this and show these American parents that we are on their side and we hope that they can use the funds that they save to provide for their new sons and daughters.

Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman has additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few things that we do in this body more important than trying to make sure that parentless little children have hope in life. Through our State Department, all across the world we do very laudable things to try to make sure they have this chance in life. Sometimes it is orphanages; sometimes it is just other types of help through NGOs.

In this particular case, we are doing everything that we can to facilitate children being put into a loving family on a permanent basis. To bring sometimes childless parents together with often parentless children is, I think, a very beautiful and noble effort on our part. I hope that this bill allows that in a greater way with the DRC and, as Ms. LOFGREN mentioned, with other states across the world if it becomes necessary.

I am grateful for all the bipartisan support. I know this is something that we have come together on. Again, I express appreciation to Chairman ROYCE, Chairman GOODLATTE, and to the gentlewoman who has expressed her support for this.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1300.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1553, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 1839, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

SMALL BANK EXAM CYCLE REFORM ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1553) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—411

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

NOT VOTING—23

Capuano
Clyburn
Conyers
Dingell
Engel
Fitzpatrick
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hudson
Hunter
Jenkins (WV)
Kelly (IL)
Lummis
Marchant
Rooney (FL)
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (TX)
Walorski
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Yarmuth

□ 1857

Mr. HONDA and Ms. BASS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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:

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 534 I was not present due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING VICTIMS OF UMPQUA COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRAGEDY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and remember the lives of those who were taken too soon at Umpqua Community College on Thursday, October 1, 2015.

I ask that all Americans pray for the friends and families of these nine victims as they grieve and rebuild from this tragedy.

We must also keep in our thoughts and prayers those who were injured physically and emotionally by this event. It will take time, our support, and patience as they grieve and recover.

Mr. Speaker, Roseburg is a small, strong, and tight-knit community. I am heartened, and not surprised, by the acts of kindness and generosity in response to this unthinkable act. We call that ''UCC Strong,'' ''Roseburg Strong.'' It is this strong spirit that will carry everyone through this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House pause for a moment of silence in honor of those impacted by the tragic events at Umpqua Community College last week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will observe a moment of silence.

REFORMING ACCESS FOR INVESTMENTS IN STARTUP ENTERPRISES ACT OF 2015

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—404

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

NOT VOTING—30

Capuano
Cicilline
Clyburn
Conyers
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Engel
Gosar
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hudson
Hunter
Jenkins (WV)
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Lummis
Marchant
Reed
Rooney (FL)
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (TX)
Vela
Walorski
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Yarmuth

□ 1909

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 535, I was not present due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Tuesday, October 6, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 534 and 535.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record votes on the postponed questions will be taken later.

WEST COAST DUNGENESS CRAB MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2168) to make the current Dungeness crab fishery management regime permanent and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2168

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 ''West Coast Dungeness Crab Management Act''.

SEC. 2. DUNGENESS CRAB FISHERY MANAGEMENT.

Section 203 of the Act entitled ''An Act to approve a governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the Republic of Poland, and for other purposes'', approved November 13, 1998 (Public Law 105–384; 16 U.S.C. 1856 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (i); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and the gentleman from Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering H.R. 2168, sponsored by my friend and fellow Washingtonian, Congresswoman JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER.

This bipartisan, consensus-based legislation makes permanent the longstanding management of the Dungeness crab fishery by Washington, Oregon, and California. The three States manage this crab fishery under the umbrella of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. Management is funded by the participating States.

We must pass legislation to continue this management. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that H.R. 2168 would save the Federal Government up to $1 million in discretionary Federal spending since State management would continue under this bill.

If State management expires and this bill is not enacted, then the Federal Government would have to expend new resources to manage the fishery. This bill keeps that from happening. The States have shown that they are exemplary at handling this management and it is unnecessary for this authority to fall to the Federal Government.

This bill is a win for the American taxpayer, a win for the seafood consumer, a win for my home State as well as the States of Oregon and California, and a win for those employed by the sustainable harvest of the species.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 2168 would repeal the sunset clause from legislation that allows the West Coast Dungeness crab fishery in Federal waters to be managed cooperatively by the States instead of by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA.

□ 1915

The Dungeness crab fishery is one of the most valuable fisheries on the Pacific Coast, and it is a model of effective marine resource management.

The specifics of the fishery, including robust stock assessments, accurate catch reporting, and harmony between Federal waters commercial fishermen and near-shore recreational crabbers, make regional management a good choice.

California, Oregon, and Washington have managed the fisheries together with oversight from NOAA since 1980 and have proven they can do so responsibly.

H.R. 2168 would allow the States to continue managing the Dungeness fishery without having to return to Congress every several years for permission.

As opposed to a fishery like the Gulf of Mexico red snapper, management of the Dungeness crab is based on cooperation among States and fishing sectors as well as respect for the best available science, and the States have proven to be good stewards of the resource.

I agree with the goals of this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to stand with me in support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), my colleague and friend, who has committed to me that she will go to every effort to make sure she has samples of Dungeness crab in her office so we all know what we are talking about.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2168, the West Coast Dungeness Crab Management Act. This bipartisan bill is an important solution for residents of coastal communities in southwest Washington.

The successful, two-decades-old tri-state Dungeness crab management agreement will expire September 30 of 2016. This bill simply makes permanent the management authority between Washington, Oregon, and California. This management authority has worked.

For the last 20 years, these States have overseen one of the most valuable fisheries in the Pacific Northwest. In 2014, fishermen delivered 53 million pounds of crab, totaling $170 million. This economic activity helped support the 61,000 jobs relating to the seafood industry in Washington State alone.

How has it maintained this success? The fishery has been managed in a sustainable way. And, importantly, it doesn't cost taxpayers a dime.

However, should this authority expire, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, says its management of the fishery will cost taxpayers over $1.15 million each year.

So, simply put, this bill maintains local control on the West Coast and ensures sustainability of the Dungeness crab fishery, and it saves taxpayer dollars.

I want to thank Chairman BISHOP and the House Natural Resource staff for bringing this bill to the floor. It is common sense.

I urge the House to vote ''yes'' on this bill to ensure a bright, sustainable economic future for coastal crab-dependent communities like Ilwaco, Washington, and many others on the West Coast.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2168.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support this good, bipartisan piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2168, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN SCHOOL LAND TRANSFER ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 986) to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 986

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 ''Albuquerque Indian School Land Transfer Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) 19 PUEBLOS.—The term ''19 Pueblos'' means the New Mexico Indian Pueblos of—

(A) Acoma;
(B) Cochiti;
(C) Isleta;
(D) Jemez;
(E) Laguna;
(F) Nambe;
(G) Ohkay Owingeh (San Juan);
(H) Picuris;
(I) Pojoaque;
(J) San Felipe;
(K) San Ildefonso;
(L) Sandia;
(M) Santa Ana;
(N) Santa Clara;
(O) Santo Domingo;
(P) Taos;
(Q) Tesuque;
(R) Zia; and
(S) Zuni.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''The Town of Albuquerque Grant, Bernalillo County, within Township 10 North, Range 3 East, of the New Mexico Principal Meridian, New Mexico—Metes and Bounds Survey'' and dated August 12, 2011.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. LAND TAKEN INTO TRUST FOR BENEFIT OF 19 PUEBLOS.

(a) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take into trust all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land described in subsection (b) for the benefit of the 19 Pueblos immediately after the Secretary determines that the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) have been satisfied regarding the trust acquisition of the Federal land.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) take such action as the Secretary determines to be necessary to document the transfer under paragraph (1); and

(B) appropriately assign each applicable private and municipal utility and service right or agreement.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the 4 tracts of Federal land, the combined acreage of which is approximately 11.11 acres, that were historically part of the Albuquerque Indian School, more particularly described as follows:

(1) ABANDONED INDIAN SCHOOL ROAD.—The approximately 0.83 acres located in sec. 7 and sec. 8 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(2) SOUTHERN PART TRACT D.—The approximately 6.18 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(3) TRACT 1.—The approximately 0.41 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(4) WESTERN PART TRACT B.—The approximately 3.69 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(c) SURVEY.—The Secretary shall conduct a survey of the Federal land to be transferred consistent with subsection (b) and may make minor corrections to the survey and legal description of the Federal land described in subsection (b) as the Secretary determines to be necessary to correct clerical, typographical, and surveying errors.

(d) USE OF LAND.—The Federal land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall be used for the educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development of the 19 Pueblos.

(e) LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS.—The Federal land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall remain subject to any private or

municipal encumbrance, right-of-way, restriction, easement of record, or utility service agreement in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 19 Pueblos shall allow the Bureau of Indian Affairs to continue to use the land taken into trust under subsection (a) for the facilities and purposes as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be free of any rental charge; and

(B) continue until such time as the Secretary determines there is no further need for the existing Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities.

SEC. 4. EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), Federal land taken into trust under section 3(a) shall be subject to Federal laws relating to Indian land.

(b) GAMING.—No class I gaming, class II gaming, or class III gaming (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)) shall be carried out on the Federal land taken into trust under section 3(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and the gentleman from Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 986, which would direct the Secretary of the Interior to place 11 acres of Federal land into trust for the collective benefit of 19 Pueblos in the State of New Mexico.

These 11 acres were historically part of the Albuquerque Indian School site, which are culturally and historically significant to the Pueblos. Upon transfer, the lands may be used by the 19 Pueblos for the educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development purposes by these Pueblo tribes. One important thing to note is this land may not be used for gaming purposes under this bill.

Since 1976, the 19 Pueblos have used the lands of the former Albuquerque Indian School for the cultural and economic benefit of the 19 Pueblos. This is the last portion of Federal lands of the former school site, which has not been conveyed to the 19 Pueblos.

This bill is supported by the entire New Mexico congressional delegation. Recognizing the support of the local delegation, the House companion bill, H.R. 1880, sponsored by Congresswoman LUJAN GRISHAM, was favorably reported by the Natural Resources Committee on September 30 of 2015.

I urge passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Senate bill S. 986 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey approximately 11 acres of land to the United States to be held in trust for the 19 Pueblos of New Mexico.

The land taken into trust shall be used for the educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development of the 19 Pueblos.

Passage of this bill will finally complete the process started in 1969 when the United States began converting the Albuquerque Indian School Reserve into land under the jurisdiction and control of the 19 Pueblos.

I would like to thank our colleague, Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM, for introducing and championing the House version of the act and to Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for moving it swiftly through committee.

I would also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Washington, for joining me tonight in managing this bill.

Just as Mr. NEWHOUSE stated, this legislation is supported by the entire New Mexico delegation. I urge its quick adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), the sponsor of the House version of the bill.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SABLAN and Representative NEWHOUSE for their support. I also thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their help in bringing this legislation to the floor. Of course, I extend my gratitude to our Senator TOM UDALL for working with me on this important piece of legislation.

I am the proud sponsor of the House companion to the Albuquerque Indian School Land Transfer Act, which, as you have heard, directs the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust four tracts of land for the New Mexico 19 Pueblos.

The land taken into the trust would be used for educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development of the New Mexico Pueblos. The four parcels are located within a former Federal Indian boarding school site called the 1884 Albuquerque Indian School Reserve in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

In 1969, the United States started the long process of converting the Reserve into land under the jurisdiction and control of the New Mexico Pueblos. Since then, Congress has enacted legislation in 1978, 2001, and 2008 to convey additional land from the Reserve in trust for the New Mexico Pueblos.

Pursuant to the 2008 legislation, the Bureau of Land Management conducted a new survey of the former school properties and identified minor discrepancies in the previous trust deeds and, also, identified the correct boundaries of two additional tracts of land within the Reserve that the Bureau of Indian Affairs no longer needed for its administrative functions.

This legislation addresses those technical discrepancies identified by BLM's survey, and it would complete the process of transferring BIA's portion of the Reserve to New Mexico's Pueblos.

This transfer allows the Pueblos to expand their current economic development plan for the region, which creates jobs, expands educational and cultural opportunities, while continuing to generate revenue for the New Mexico Pueblos.

I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial legislation, which, as you have heard, has the support of the entire New Mexico delegation and would benefit the New Mexico 19 Pueblos.

Mr. SABLAN. We have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support S. 986.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 986.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW ENGLAND FISHERMAN PRESERVATION ACT

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, heavy new fines the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is proposing could destroy New Hampshire's remaining fishermen who are carrying on a proud New England tradition.

That is why I recently introduced legislation to stop the Federal agency from shifting its funding responsibility to our struggling Granite State fishermen.

NOAA mandates that at-sea contractors monitor their daily catch, but will cease to pay for this government mandate in December, forcing fishermen to pick up the more than $700 per day tab.

These small family businesses will be on the hook for thousands of dollars in new fees each month. That is a figure that would simply eradicate the industry in my home State.

This is not a partisan issue. The New England Fisherman Preservation Act simply asks the Federal agency to continue paying for a program it has funded for years rather than forcing hard-working, middle-class families to pay for it.

I am asking colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of this bill, so important to hardworking fishermen who put food on our tables so that they can continue with their task.

□ 1930

AMERICAN VETERANS DISABLED FOR LIFE MEMORIAL

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am the proud mother of a United States Marine war veteran, and our family is blessed he returned home with sound body and mind, but too many of our courageous heroes did not.

October 5 marks the 1-year anniversary of the dedication of the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial. It is a beautiful tribute to the brave men and women who suffered permanent injuries on the battlefield. This memorial sits just south of our Capitol, and it reminds us every day of the selflessness of those who fought for our freedom and returned home with the scars of duty.

I offer my great thanks and appreciation to the 4 million veterans who are living today with service-related disabilities and the friends and the family who take care of them. The American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial celebrates your lives every day, as we all do in our hearts and our minds.

HONORING THE DEDICATION OF THE TOTI MENDEZ CARDIOPULMONARY DIAGNOSTIC SUITE

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tragically short life of Ramiro ''Toti'' Mendez and to honor the dedication of the Toti Mendez Cardiopulmonary Diagnostic Suite at Florida International University, my alma mater, in Miami.

Toti was an accomplished 20-year-old FIU student baseball player who passed away, sadly, on April 2, 2000, as a result of an undetected heart problem. Florida International University will celebrate the dedication of this important health resource on Monday, October 19. Parents of student athletes may now find the peace of mind that their sons or daughters are clear of any underlying heart issues before they ever hit the field.

Through the Toti Mendez Cardiopulmonary Diagnostic Suite, Toti's legacy will continue to live on at FIU in support of other student athletes throughout south Florida, indeed, throughout our great State.

I congratulate Toti's mom and the entire family for helping keep his legacy alive and for saving so many student athletes' lives.

THE ROBOGALS ARE AN INSPIRATION TO YOUNG WOMEN

(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, I rise today in honor of the triumph of the RoboGals, a student robotics team from the 11th Congressional District of Illinois.

The RoboGals are Kaiya Hollister, a fifth grader at the John C. Dunham STEM Partnership School, and Jensie Coonradt, a fourth grader at The Wheatlands Elementary School, both in Aurora, Illinois. They met at an after-school robotics club hosted by Chasewood Learning, an educational organization that uses Lego robots to teach students how to build and program their machines for competition.

After winning the regional competition at SciTech Hands On Museum in Aurora, Illinois, the RoboGals went on to win the national championship of the World Robotic Olympiad in Michigan. Now they advance to the world championship round in Qatar, taking on over 50 countries from all over the globe. I, together with all Americans, wish them the best of luck.

The RoboGals are an inspiration to young women across our country who are enthusiastic about science and engineering, and the 11th Congressional District is proud to have such bright young women representing our country on the global stage.

NUMBERS NEVER LIE—UNLESS THEY DO

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the numbers never lie—unless they do.

Each month we all react to the release of the employment report as the supposed indicator of economic health around our country. The most recent jobs numbers show an unemployment rate of 5.1 percent, but that headline number paints a picture that simply doesn't exist. It distorts the economic outlook and distracts this Chamber from working toward the creation of better jobs and more opportunities for millions of Americans.

Economists of all persuasions have criticized this method as overstating job market strength, noting that the Bureau of Labor Statistics only considers limited factors when reporting the unemployment rate and ignoring things like underemployment or the number of workers who have left the labor force. What we are left with is a flawed view of labor market strength.

With that in mind, I have joined with colleagues in introducing the Labor Statistics Improvement Act, which would clear the way for changes in methodology that could help the unemployment rate more accurately reflect the strength of the labor market.

If the jobs report dictates how this Congress addresses real economic challenges, we can't afford to get it wrong.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERMA JOHNSON HADLEY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a dedicated Fort Worth community leader, Erma Johnson Hadley, who passed away last week after a very long battle with cancer.

Mrs. Hadley was born in Leggett, Texas, where she graduated from high school in 1959 and became the first Black woman from Leggett to attend college. Mrs. Hadley attended Prairie View A&M University.

When she finished her career teaching in high school, she came to Tarrant County College, where she served in a variety of different roles, including vice chancellor, and was ultimately named the interim chancellor and chancellor in 2010 of the Tarrant County College system.

Chancellor Hadley was known for her passion for ensuring accessible and affordable education for students in Tarrant County. I will never forget Mrs. Erma Johnson Hadley telling me a story about how while all kids are not necessarily gifted equally, all kids that put their mind to it, if their parents work with them, can get a good education and make something of themselves.

Mrs. Hadley believed in each and every student that attended Tarrant County College, and I know that the campus and the students are going to continue to benefit from her legacy and her belief in them.

She is survived by her husband, Bill Hadley; Ardenia Johnson Gould, who is her daughter; and Spencer Gould, her son-in-law; and a grandchild.

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult time for Americans as we mourn with our fellow citizens in Oregon. I offer my deepest sympathy to the congressional delegation here in the Congress, as we join them in their expression of deep sympathy to those who were injured and those who lost their lives, to the families of those individuals.

I spoke to a member of the United States military, and he indicated that in battle he had two guns. We understand that the perpetrator of this horrible act had at least 14 guns, or double-digit guns.

I have heard the refrain: ''What else will have to happen before we address

the question of gun regulation and gun safety?'' Mr. Speaker, it is time now to ask the question of an extended waiting period so that someone would not amass 14, 15, 30 guns, more than the United States military, and a serious background check dealing with any issues that would impact a person's stability in having guns.

Yes, people do kill, not guns, but they use guns to kill. I have been through too many of these, Mr. Speaker, from Columbine to this incident. Every single one I have been through since being in the United States Congress. It is time for the Congress to act.

IMPORTANT ISSUES THAT AFFECT AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the House is drawn to many, many issues this week. Certainly, the tragedy in Oregon draws all of our attention, our sympathy, but unfortunately not our vote. We have never really had a vote here on the floor of the House to deal with this issue of gun safety; although, legislation has been passed around many, many times.

Even the most conservative columnists are now saying that we must take action, and we really should. So I will just start by saying to all of our colleagues: Let's vote, vote up or down on the various proposals that have been made.

Certainly the attention of this body is turned to who is going to be the next Speaker. It seems to occupy most of the discussion and most of the articles in the newspapers around this town. It is important, but there are many, many other issues that come before the House. Some of them are really going to affect America.

I want to talk about one of them today, and it is in the context of something we have been discussing here for the last 4 or 5 years. We call it Make It In America. It is about rebuilding the American manufacturing sector. It is about rebuilding the American middle class. It is about creating jobs in America by doing what we once did so very, very well, which is manufacturing. Make things: big things, little things, all kinds of things. We call it our Make It In America agenda.

I am going to go through it very quickly here and then focus on one piece of this agenda. Here it is: trade policies. This is going to take a lot of time to discuss this. We are not going to go into it today, but the President announced just in the last couple days that the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal is done.

Now, we don't know what is in it. We have—at least I have—great concerns about this and that it will be one more step in hollowing out the American manufacturing sector, but it is all secret. We don't know yet. We will find out soon enough, and we will undoubtedly come back and talk about trade.

Taxes and tax policies, I will hit on this in a few moments.

Labor issues, well, that ties back to the trade issue and whether we are going to send more of our jobs overseas.

Education, research, infrastructure, today I really want to focus on this energy and infrastructure. If you bear with me a few moments, I want to go into this in some detail.

For many, many years, we have tried to make America energy independent, and in the last 5 years, 6 years now, we have seen an enormous increase in the production of energy in the United States.

Now, a lot of that energy has come from green technologies—solar, wind, and biofuels—and many other ways of producing renewable energy called green energy. That is good because all of that reduces greenhouse gas emissions, and we need to do more of it.

Frankly, we need tax policy.

Maybe I will put this back up again so I can point out the way in which the Make It In America agenda fits all of this.

Tax policy has a great deal to do with green energy. There are tax breaks for solar installation on your home, solar installation for businesses, the production tax credit for wind and solar. All of these things make it really possible to advance the green energy agenda.

Tax policy also has a great deal to do with the other part of our energy independence—we are not quite there, but we are making great advances on it—and that has to do with petroleum products: natural gas and crude oil.

There has been much talk about the Bakken revolution in Wyoming and North Dakota producing a lot of energy. We are talking about different techniques to extract oil, enhanced oil production, otherwise known as fracking. All of these things have led to an explosion—well, literally, in the case of the Bakken fuel because it is highly volatile, and it does explode when trains tip over.

But what we are talking about here is an explosion in the volume of oil and natural gas produced in America. We have literally doubled the production of natural gas and oil over the last 5 to 6 years, bringing down the cost of fuel. Also, around the world, the slowdown of the Chinese economy and Europe have reduced the demand for oil, and we are seeing a reduced price of oil on the world market, even at a time when we are seeing more and more production of crude oil and natural gas here in the United States.

What does all this mean to the oil industry, to the petroleum industry? It means they have got a lot of oil, and the United States is not consuming all of it or as much as they would like to keep the prices up. So guess what they want to do. They want to export oil. Isn't that something?

□ 1945

How do we become energy-independent if we are exporting oil? Well, we have got a lot of interesting economic arguments about how that could be done. I am saying I don't think so.

I don't think it is in the interest of the United States to take a strategic national asset—natural gas, crude oil—and export it to China. It may be good for China. It certainly would be good for the energy industry, the petroleum industry. Wow, they have got a new market.

You see, right now there is a Federal ban on the export of crude oil to other countries, with the exception of Mexico and Canada. We swap crude oil back and forth. A little bit of crude oil is also shipped out of the United States from the North Slope of Alaska.

A very interesting law was established back in the seventies, when there was this energy crisis and there were long lines at the gasoline pumps. That law said: No. You cannot export crude oil.

And then later, in the 1990s, there was a little opening provided for Mexico and Canada and for Alaska North Slope oil. It could be shipped to other countries—exported—with this caveat: You cannot increase domestic oil prices.

I don't know that that was ever enforced. We certainly saw the gasoline prices zip to the top last year. Now it is coming back down, and that is good. It is bad that it went up, good that it is coming down.

But I don't think the Department of Energy or the Department of Commerce really enforced what was in the law about the export of crude oil from Alaska.

So we have got this strategic asset—natural gas and crude oil—that has allowed us to have a resurgence of American manufacturing. They are coming home. American manufacturers are coming home to make it in America.

Dow, a big chemical operation, is coming back to America because natural gas prices are low. Other companies are doing the same thing. Because the United States has a strategic advantage as a result of strategic assets: oil and natural gas, together with green energy.

So what does the petroleum industry want to do? They want to ruin all of that. They want to take the strategic assets and ship them overseas.

This week the House of Representatives is going to take up a piece of legislation that opens the spigot for the export of crude oil. There is already an open spigot for the export of natural gas. I will come to that in a few moments.

So is this in the interest of the United States? Well, if you are in the oil patch—North Dakota, Texas, maybe

even California—maybe it is good. Maybe you will be able to make a little more money.

But at the expense of who? America, American consumers at the pump, truckers, trains. All of those use diesel produced here in the United States from our refineries.

So good for the petroleum industry, but bad for America. We ought not do that. And if you would consider for a few moments that, should we ever allow the export of crude oil, we ought to put some serious caveats on that piece of legislation.

But just today the Rules Committee of this House decided no, no, no caveats. Just a bare bill. Open the spigot. Send the crude oil overseas. Don't worry about the price of fuel. Don't worry about the price of energy in the United States. Worry about the bottom line of the petroleum industry.

I say time out. Wait a minute. This is America. This is about the American economy. This is about men and women that go to the gas pump and buy gasoline, farmers out there having to buy diesel in order to plow their fields and harvest their crops, trains moving goods and services back across the United States, the airline industry.

This is not just about the petroleum industry. This is a big deal for America. If we take a strategic national asset and just allow it to go anywhere in the world so that it is to the benefit of a small, but important, slice of the American economy, we are making a big mistake.

So let me just put some caveats on this piece of legislation. Harken back to the Alaska situation back in 1995 where they opened the spigot. They put in a caveat that said: No. You can't do it if it results in an adverse effect on the price of transportation fuels and home heating fuels in the United States.

Does the legislation we have this week have any caveats on it? No. It doesn't have that one.

Let me give you another caveat. If we are going to ship a strategic national asset overseas, why don't we look at other strategic assets in the United States, shipbuilding?

The entire United States Navy is dependent on American shipyards for all of their ships. Those shipyards no longer produce large, ocean-going commercial vessels. All of that has been off to China, off to Korea and Japan. All of those countries subsidize those shipyards. We don't do it in the United States.

But we can put caveats on the export of this crude oil and simply say, if we are going to export crude oil, caveat one, not at the expense of American consumers; two, not at the expense of American refiners and other strategic asset—the refinery of these petroleum products; and, three, ship it on American-built ships with American mariners.

Right now there are over 400,000 men and women working in the shipyards producing smaller ships for trade within the coastal zone of the United States and for the barges up and down the rivers and canals of the United States, but not building ocean-going tankers. What does it mean? Well, let me just give you an example.

It has been estimated that the maximum amount of oil that could be shipped is somewhere about 3.6 million barrels a day. That is at the top level. Hopefully, they will never get close to that because that is almost certain to raise prices. But let's say that they do.

For the largest tanker currently on the ocean today—these are the maximum tankers, too large to even go through the new Panama Canal and larger than the Panamax ships—it would take 180 ships to handle 3.6 million barrels of oil a day.

What if those ships were American-built ships? This isn't Saudi Arabian oil. This isn't Iraqi oil, Venezuelan oil. This is American oil. What if we require that that oil be shipped on American ships and suddenly, over the next decade or two, our shipyards were to build 180 supertankers or, if they are Panamax-size ships, 384 Panamax-size ships?

Think of the employment that would take place in the American shipyards and then through the entire supply train, all of the engines, all of the communications, all of the electronics, all of the pumps, all of the valves. We could see a resurgence in American manufacturing.

Who benefits from this? Americans benefit. Americans benefit in the shipyards and in the manufacturing facilities all across this Nation.

But, no, we are not going to do that here on the House floor. We are going to simply take a bill that opens the spigot and that gives the benefits to the oil patch, to the petroleum industry.

And I am not saying that is not good for them. There will certainly be jobs. There will be some construction jobs, and there will be oil rigs that will have to be built. That is good.

But think what we could do if we had a law that said: Okay. We are going to ship, but we are going to protect the domestic price of refined products, we are going to protect the American refineries, we are going to build American ships, and we are going to put American mariners on those ships.

We are talking about tens of thousands, if not a hundred thousand, new jobs in the United States. That is a good thing for the middle class. That is a good thing for America.

We can do it by simply amending the oil export bill. But it is not going to happen. The majority here isn't going to allow that. They are simply going to pass a bill that opens the spigot.

It is a shame. Shame on all of us if we would allow that to happen. Shame on us if we do not protect the American consumer. Shame on us if we do not protect the American maritime industry, the shipyards of America, the American middle class.

Watch closely. It is going to happen. It is going to happen here on the House floor this week while all of the attention of America is looking at this Speakership thing.

Okay. That is where we are on one critical issue. I want to take up one more and then I will call it a night.

That is a new Amtrak locomotive for the Eastern Corridor, and it is 100 percent American-made. Why is it 100 percent American-made for the first time in decades—well, at least a decade and a half—and that the United States is once again producing locomotives?

By the way, that is made near my district, in Sacramento. It is about 4 or 5 miles from the edge of my district. Several hundred men and women are employed doing this.

Why did this happen? Because the Congress wrote policy that said your taxpayer dollars are going to be used not to buy a locomotive made in China or Japan or Europe, but to buy a locomotive made in America, made in America. Your tax dollars are being used to build locomotives in America.

It is part of a transportation policy, which is where I want to go now. Before I do, I guess I forgot this.

This is a liquefied natural gas tanker. I was just talking about crude oil and what could be done. This is another one. If we are going to export our natural gas—that strategic asset—it ought to be exported on American-made liquefied natural tankers.

A new facility is opening down in Texas to export liquefied natural gas. That facility will take 100 tankers for that one facility. Not to worry. Those tankers are going to be made in China, Japan, Korea. They are not going to be made in America.

But under 16 lines of law—all we need to do is write 16 lines of law—we would be manufacturing these tankers in the United States.

It is the same argument that I made about the crude oil tankers. I won't go into it in any more detail. This is one of the great could-do's, should-do's, ought-to-do's for America.

So the export of these strategic national assets—natural gas, petroleum—why don't we build them in America? Why don't we make it in America?

I started to talk about the locomotives. October 29 is just about 23 days from today. The highway trust fund is out of money. Once again, we are on one of those cliffs—this time, a transportation cliff—and we have got to do something.

And so what are we going to do? The President proposed the GROW America Act. It provides money for our crumbling transportation system, the infrastructure structure.

There is a rail portion of it, locomotives, improving the rail system. There are buses, ports, bridges, and highways. It is a very, very good piece of legislation. It is $476 billion over the next 6 years. It is a big deal.

□ 2000

It helps America come from number, I think, 18 in the infrastructure capability compared to other nations of the world.

China has, I don't know, 5,000, 3,000 miles of high-speed rail. The United States has zero. Chinese airports, Japanese airports. I think even Cuba is now in the process of building a new deep-water port to take the Panamax ships.

And what are we doing? Not much. The Grow America Act is totally stalled. It is not going anywhere right now.

But we have got 23 days. So what are we proposing? Are we proposing something that will increase the rail capacity in the United States, that will combine rail, ports, and highways into a system to provide for goods movement, freight movement, integrated? No, we are not going to do such a thing. Other countries do it. Hey, but this is America. We just like to fall behind.

So where are we with the Grow America Act? Well, some of us have introduced it. Some of us think we ought to do something like this, that we really ought to pay for our infrastructure.

Oh, by the way, this doesn't raise gas taxes. It doesn't raise diesel taxes, but it does require that those American corporations that have skipped out on their obligation to their home country to bring their profits back to the United States and be taxed.

So we maintain the existing excise tax on gasoline and fuel, and we pay for the rest of this by having American corporations pay their just due to this Nation by repatriating their foreign earnings hidden off somewhere in Ireland or some other tax havens, not taxed, even though they are American corporations.

Oh, and some of this stuff is just too good.

Apple, an American company, all of their manufacturing is overseas, and most of their profits are overseas also because, even though it is invented here, even though the software, even though the new equipment is invented in California, it is licensed in Ireland, and the profits stay in Ireland and are taxed there at a very low percentage—not fair to America.

So those profits would come home from other companies as well, and it would fill this $476 billion over 6 years.

I want to just go through some of this, and then we will wrap this up.

The Grow America Act would provide $52 billion a year for highways. We are presently spending $41 billion a year for highways, so we are looking at something $11 billion more for highways. Maybe there won't be so many potholes. Maybe one out of four bridges in the United States will get repaired. Right now, they are deficient. They could fall down. They are insufficient in capacity. Maybe we could do that.

Now, the Senate has done a little better. The Senate has passed a highway bill that is $46 billion a year, which is $5 billion more than we are currently spending, and that is good. It is a 5-year program that is only paid for in 3 years.

Huh? How does that work? It doesn't, but it is a good start. But the Grow America Act, $52 billion a year.

Anybody take buses in the United States? Anybody take BART in California, or the Metro system in Los Angeles, or here in Washington, the Metro, or the subways in Chicago, New York, Atlanta and so forth? That is called transit. We are presently spending about $10 billion, $10.6 billion a year on transit, supporting these transportation systems. The Senate bill adds about $2 billion, so they go to $12.5 billion.

The Grow America Act, let's get on with it. Let's build those systems. $19 billion, without raising your fuel taxes.

But if you happen to be those American companies that have skipped out on their obligation to this Nation, they are going to wind up paying their fair share.

So we go from 10.6 for transit, $10.6 billion annually for transit, to $19 billion in the Grow America Act.

Remember, I put some of these trains up here? We presently spend $1.4 billion on our rail system—not the transit. This is the heavy rail system. The Senate would go to $2.2 billion, and the Grow America Act would go to $4.7 billion.

Are we going to do this? Not likely. Not likely.

We have perfected a childhood game here in the House of Representatives and the Senate. In fact, your American Government has perfected this game. Something, when you didn't have a ball to kick around, you would kick a can around. It is called kick the can down the road. We have perfected that. I think we have done it more than 30 times to transportation over the last decade and a half.

We are highly likely to do it again, as the attention of America and the attention here amongst all of us is focused on the Speakership fights, which will culminate at the end of October when the Speaker retires and we will have a new vote. But in the intervening 23 days, are we going to focus on a transportation program for America or are we going to focus on the internal politics of the House of Representatives?

I will tell you where I would put my money. I would put my money on the House of Representatives worrying about the internal politics of who is going to be the next leader and not paying attention to what America wants us to do.

America wants us to pay attention to their needs, not to the internal politics of this place, but to the needs of America, American jobs for American workers.

Can we build ships? Oh, yeah, we can build ships.

Can we build liquefied natural gas tankers? You bet we can. We are already building ships that are fueled by liquefied natural gas. We are doing it in San Diego. We know how to do this. We would have to ramp up. We are not going to build 180 ships in 1 year, but we sure could over the next two decades.

But maybe we care more about the petroleum industry than we do about the American worker and the American sailor and the shipyards of America. I am afraid that is the way it is likely to be here.

I notice that I am joined here by an extraordinary woman from what used to be the manufacturing center of the United States, the Midwest, Ohio, to be quite clear.

MARCY KAPTUR, I have been going on for more than I probably should have in time but, boy, these are important issues. These are really important issues. Please join us.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman from California for being an extraordinary leader on Make It In America and restoring prosperity to all corners of this country. The citizens of California really have sent an amazing Congressman to speak on behalf of the Nation and the importance of making items in America.

It is probably a tragedy, over the last three decades, that we have accumulated over $9 trillion in trade deficit, which translates into lost wealth, lost income for America's families, and, ultimately, a budget deficit that we just can't get under control because people aren't earning enough. So much economic activity has been outsourced that there are many who have forgotten how much manufacturing actually matters.

So I agree with the gentleman. Make it in America, grow it in America, use the technology of America to transform farm field products into ethanol and biodiesel.

Let us use the sun. Let us invent our way forward to become energy independent because, at some point, not in our lifetime, but at some point over the next 100 years, the oil wells will run dry, and even the natural gas fields currently being discovered in Ohio and Pennsylvania, which are mother lode supplies with horizontal drilling, those are finite and they will be gone. So the world with many more people is going to have to figure out how to sustain life.

The gentleman has addressed many of these issues in terms of energy production, America's need to become energy secure, which would create prosperity here at home, and also all the investments of hard infrastructure on rail, on over-the-road, air transportation.

I have to add, obviously, our ports and, in my part of the country, the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway so in need of infrastructure improvement, several billion dollars actually.

We are having a Great Lakes St. Lawrence Seaway meeting tomorrow

morning, inviting in many of the business interests along the seaway and looking for ways in our transportation bill where we can make more investment in that region so it can sing fully economically again.

So I thank the gentleman for a moment here. And believe me, I unite with you in your efforts to make America fully strong again, and Make It In America can lead us down that path.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You have been a leader on these issues for many, many years and certainly in your territory of Ohio. You saw what happened when the manufacturing plants left; but they are coming back, and we can make policy to do that.

I think you may have other things that you would like to bring to our attention. You are certainly welcome to do so.

I think with that, it is time for me to say ''enough,'' or maybe I have said too much already.

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

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this evening, just before votes, I went outside on the balcony here of this Capitol to watch the sun set. It was one of those beautiful evenings of crimson and gold and gray clouds silhouetted against the twilight glow of the evening. And then I glanced over to the buildings here at the Capitol and was suddenly brought back to reality when I saw so many flags on our buildings flying at half mast, flying at half mast because, once again, we are remembering the tragedies that have shaken our Nation time and time again.

This has been a bloody summer, a bloody summer of many attacks that have been associated with folks with mental illness.

I know most people with mental illness are not violent, and I know that there are many other tragedies that occur; but tonight, during this week, which is Mental Health Week in America, I want to highlight, Madam Speaker, what we must do as a nation, what we cannot continue to push aside.

Just think of what happened this summer, just a few examples:

June 13, attack on the Dallas Police headquarters by a man who had a history of family violence and mental instability;

July 23, Lafayette, Louisiana, a shooting in a movie theater by a man who had had a judge's orders to send him to a mental hospital in the past;

August 16, Antioch, Tennessee, a movie theater attack;

August 26, Roanoke, Virginia, a live, on-air shooting, a tragic scene of a reporter being killed, and a cameraman;

August 28, 2015, Houston, Texas, while a deputy police officer was at a gas station, riddled with bullets by a man who had a history of mental illness;

September 22, the son of a State senator, former State senator of Virginia, killed a man, and also killed himself in Bowling Green;

And this last week, October 1, in Roseburg, Oregon, nine people were killed, and the gunman killed himself in another tragic scene.

There is more to it than this, of course. In this country last year, 125 people with mental illness were killed in some sort of a police shooting where the police oftentimes did not even know, but the confrontation grew and ended in a death.

It is estimated there were somewhere between 1,200 and 1,500 murders in this country this last year by people with mental illness. But more than that, there are 10,000 or more, maybe 20,000, maybe 100,000 people with mental illness who are the victims of crime. Some are killed.

There are thousands and thousands of people who are homeless, who die that slow-motion death of homelessness, of their physical ailments and their illnesses.

There were 41,000 suicide deaths, 1.2 million suicide attempts that required some medical care, 43,000 substance abuse overdose deaths. This list goes on and on and on.

And what happens is, when we treat people with mental illness early in their life, their prognosis is improved. In many cases, they can go on to have fruitful lives. But when it is untreated, they likely develop other problems, not just with mental illness, but social, job, and physical health.

Persons with serious mental illness, in treatment, are 15 times less likely to engage in an act of violence than those who are not in treatment.

□ 2015

In America, some 60 million people in any given year will have some diagnosable mental illness, from the very mild and transient ones, which we all experience, to severe mental illness, such as schizophrenia or bipolar or extreme depression. But of those with serious mental illness, about 4 million of those 11 million will not have any treatment for a variety of reasons: treatment may not be available; they may refuse treatment; or what happens so often with those with serious mental illness, they are characteristically unaware that they have an illness—it is a brain illness, a serious mental illness—like a person with Alzheimer's or stroke or traumatic brain injury, a person who may not even know that they have a problem.

What do we do about this as a nation? Mostly we just talk. Sadly and tragically, what we do here in the House of Representatives, we will have a moment of silence, but it is not followed by action. What we need is not more silence. We need action.

Madam Speaker, we need people in this country to rise up and say: This is the time. This is the day. This is the issue where we are, once and for all, going to do comprehensive reform of our mental health system in America.

Our mental health system in America is fragmented at best, a system with regulations that are abusive and neglectful towards those with serious mental illness. And more so, it is worse if you are a minority or low-income.

This is odd because in a field that is filled with some of the most compassionate and caring people I know, people I have had the pleasure to work side by side with in my role as a psychologist, we have Federal policies and State policies that leave their hands tied, their eyes blinded, and their mouths gagged to prevent treatment from occurring. Ultimately, the individuals suffer and their families suffer.

Tonight we will review what the problem is and what can be done systemically, thoroughly, and definitively, what this country must do if we are serious about treating mental illness.

One of my colleagues from the Toledo area, who represents northern Ohio, is with us now. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank you, Congressman MURPHY, for yielding to me. I want to say how fortunate the country is that the people of Pennsylvania have elected you here to serve the people of our Nation with the strong background that you have and with the obvious depths of knowledge that you have about those who are mentally ill and the compassion you have in a field that is very difficult, where the answers still remain incomplete.

I want to be on the floor this evening to say to those who are listening in the Chamber, to those who may be listening outside, your efforts to draft the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646, is a watershed moment in this Congress.

I have served in this Congress a lot longer than the others on the floor this evening. I was here in 1998 when, sadly, we lost two of our Capitol Police officers, Jacob Chestnut and John Gibson. A diagnosed schizophrenic receiving Federal SSI benefits but off his medicines and estranged from his family headed on a rampage all across the country, all the way from the West to here, and delusionally, he set out to quash, I guess, a purple force he had tracked here to the Capitol.

He broke into the majority leader's office. All the staff went under the desks. I thought, well, maybe this is the moment that Congress will finally face up to the violent impulses that have fallen right at our knees. I said, but I would wager one of two things will happen: either we will finally cut the mustard and do what is right, or we will have more barricades and armed officers. Well, it was the latter option that actually happened.

As we mourn the deaths of nine innocent victims at Umpqua Community

College, I commend Congressman MURPHY of Pennsylvania for putting a bill forward that forces us to probe deeply the pattern of these mass shootings. We need to know the perpetrators.

We understand the perpetrator in Oregon had served in the U.S. military for a very brief time. He was discharged. And my question to the U.S. military is: Why? Why was he discharged? Did you discharge him to care if you saw a pattern that needed treatment? Or did you close your eyes too? Because that has happened repeatedly in the U.S. military, though I must say that they are doing a little bit better, because some of their own members have now been killed around the country because of individuals who face very severe illnesses in their own lives and have simply never had the kind of doctor to help them come out of the dark shadows of the existence in which they have been living.

Many of these individuals have been abandoned by their families. Many times they are expelled from school.

As you look around the country and you see the people who commit these heinous, heinous crimes and then many times take their own life, they are completely alone or they are living with one member of their family, abandoned by their other family members and, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, many times ending up homeless, the victims of attacks themselves, or many times, out of whatever is happening in a very ill brain, taking it out on the rest of society.

Probing deeply into mental illness requires a discipline that Congressman MURPHY has and an understanding that no Congress yet has had. That myopia is symptomatic of what is happening across our Nation: more security but no significant attention to those who show out-of-control and violent tendencies, those tragically mentally ill citizens who are driven by their illness to harm others.

If someone has a broken back, we have special wards. What happens to the mentally ill in the district that I represent and across this country, some of them end up in the jail. Seventy-five percent of those incarcerated in northern Ohio have dual diagnoses of mental illness and substance abuse. What does that tell us? Our jails have become the depositories for this Nation's mentally ill.

I am not saying that individuals diagnosed with mental illness are more likely to commit crimes. I agree with Congressman MURPHY that most of them become victims of crimes because they aren't thinking straight, and it doesn't have to be this way.

The bill that Congressman MURPHY has written and has vetted and has worked with different groups and individuals, and which I support and a host of other Members do on a bipartisan basis, is supported by one of the most important organizations in our country: the National Alliance on Mental Illness. I have the highest respect for them.

H.R. 2646 fixes the Nation's broken mental health system by refocusing programs, reforming grants, and removing Federal barriers to care. It names an assistant secretary for mental illness at the Department of Health and Human Services, and it encourages more meaningful involvement from family members and caregivers who, frankly, at this point, many times, just give up because they have this force within their homes that they cannot contain.

Rather than just paying tribute to those among us who have been lost and those who save them at risk to their own lives, cannot we elevate the solution to efforts that could help to prevent further tragedies?

We think about the Capitol shootings. We think about Sandy Hook. We think about Virginia Polytechnic. The U.S. leads the world in mass shootings. There have been 294 mass shootings in 2015 alone, and each one gives us an indicator of the possible sign of untreated mental illness. Each one represents a failure of our society, and dispelling the stigma of mental illness for those who suffer remains a task unfinished.

When do the elected Representatives of the American people say, ''Enough. America can do better. America must do better''? Let's create a pathway, by passing H.R. 2646, to immediate treatment for those mentally ill citizens dangerous to others and dangerous to themselves.

Congressman MURPHY, I can't thank you enough. I don't recall a bill which has had such broad bipartisan support. You have worked so hard to go around the country. This is not a partisan issue; this is an American issue. I hope America can lead the world in trying to find a better way.

The suffering that we see in our districts, in community after community after community, broken families, broken people, this doesn't have to be in our country.

In the hearing that you conducted in Cleveland, I learned something really important that I didn't know, and that is that in the way that the reimbursement occurs to hospitals for people seeking care, that research in mental illness is at the bottom of the list because reimbursement doesn't flow the same way. So as we try to find answers to what is going on in the human brain, with the secretion of such chemicals like dopamine and serotonin and these different chemicals that those who are healthy have being secreted at a normal level, those who do not have that system working for them have big problems; but yet, if doctors try to get research dollars to solve and figure out what is going on in the human brain, the reimbursement system we have today simply doesn't work. I didn't know that.

So I thank you for coming to Ohio because I am focused on that like a laser beam, and it is a part of the answer. So thank you for allowing me some time tonight on the floor. The people I represent thank you. We want to help you. I hope those listening will find cosponsors from their different parts of the country to help you move this bill forward. We couldn't do anything more important for the country. Thank you.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a cosponsor of this bill.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Thank you to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I, too, want to thank him for his tireless work on this effort. This is such an important piece of legislation in dealing with mental health and putting necessary reforms in place. The gentleman has truly been an absolute champion on this issue, and H.R. 2646 is such a meaningful piece of legislation that will help in so many different ways.

Mental health in this country is a crisis and it is an epidemic, and there are so many families across this country that are dealing with this issue.

The gentleman came to my district a little over a year ago, and we had a wonderful roundtable discussion. There were so many individuals who came to it, so many family members who came to it to speak on this issue. They were so appreciative of the fact that there was actually some legislation that was being developed to deal with this issue. These are families that have nowhere else to go.

In my experience as a nurse, in health care, but then also as my experience has gone forward in taking care of those in my district and then traveling across the country and meeting with families and talking with individuals about how much this affects their lives, and it is almost amazing when you start having the conversation about this piece of legislation because I don't even think they think that anybody wants to help them anymore. I think they feel so far and left behind that it isn't even in their mind that someone is out there looking for an answer and helping in a way that will be meaningful into the future.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has done extensive work with so many groups, so many patient advocacy groups. His own personal knowledge as a child psychologist has played into this issue. There are certain barriers that are in place, and they are in place because we have put them there. Well-meaning, well-intended HIPAA laws, all of these things that have been put in place to help protect patients and their privacy and their issues, yet it prevents us from being able to understand the situation. It prevents families from being able to get care for their loved ones.

Maybe an adult child of parents who are struggling to help their child, their son, their daughter. They may be out

on the streets; they may be at home; they may have issues; they may not be working. I mean, there are so many different things that can be happening, and they know that that individual needs help, and they have no one to go to.

□ 2030

Madam Speaker, this legislation will change much of that. It is a step in the right direction. There is much more that needs to be done. We were just talking a moment ago about our jails, our prisons, and how many of those who are within those walls and behind those bars literally are there because they have mental health issues. Yes, they may have committed a crime; yes, they may have found themselves in a terrible situation and ended up in jail, possibly even drug abuse; but the bottom line is the mental health issue that lies there.

We are talking even about issues of fiscal responsibility in this country, and I think of how much money we will save and how much of a difference it will make if we deal with this issue in the way that it needs to be dealt with.

So, Madam Speaker, I am a cosponsor of this legislation. This is an incredibly important piece of legislation. It is bipartisan, and it is for every American in this country, every American in this country that is dealing with this issue with a loved one or with a friend. We all have them. We all walk down the streets and see individuals who we know are homeless, and we know that the root cause is mental illness. We can change something in this country. This is one change we need to make. We need to come together as a whole House of Representatives to pass this piece of legislation.

Again, I just want to finish by thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania one more time for his tireless efforts. You have truly been the champion for every mental health issue, and this piece of legislation passed by the House of Representatives will be a monumental step in the direction of mental health reform.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and for her continued pursuit of making sure we pass this.

This bill was first introduced over a year ago, reworked with a lot of bipartisan input, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, and also from many, many organizations. The other day, some 23 organizations delivered a letter to some Members of Congress saying they want to see comprehensive mental health reform.

This is the first and the most comprehensive mental health reform our country has seen. The last time some efforts were made, it was the very last bill that President Kennedy signed before he was assassinated to begin to make some change in our country to move away from the asylums and towards community mental health. Unfortunately, that dream only came partially true because what happened is we closed those asylums.

Back in the 1950s, we had 550,000 psychiatric hospital beds in this country. At that time the population of the country was 150 million. Now the population of the country is over 316 million, 320 million, and we only have 40,000 psych beds.

Now, Madam Speaker, some of that is because we have come up with more effective treatments, better ways of identifying and diagnosing people, better medications, and, quite frankly, those asylums of yesteryear needed to close. Many times they were homes of abuse and given nicknames like snake pits, cuckoo's nests, and other derogatory terms because they were so bad. But then along came community medical health centers, and that was supposed to pick up the slack. As States found that they could close these asylums, they looked and saw that they could save some money, and they didn't put the money into mental health services, nor did the Federal Government. What happened instead was the people traded the hospital bed for the jail cell, for the homeless shelter, and for the morgue. That is where we are today.

Now, it is not for lack of trying because, indeed, the Federal Government has spent a lot of money—some $100-plus billion a year—on this, mostly through disability payments, but some for Federal programs.

Madam Speaker, what I want to do tonight is now talk about 10 things we can do as a nation to deal with this, 10 things we must do.

First of all, the General Accounting Office report that we commissioned from the Energy and Commerce Committee, we said: Tell us what programs there are in the Federal Government that deal with mental health and, more specifically, serious mental illness.

I was amazed to hear how many there were, 112 agencies scattered across eight departments. It is a dysfunctional and uncoordinated system. It is a system that really does not have central control. It is a system that has not even met among these agencies for years, even though one of the agencies, SAMHSA, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, is supposed to be the lead agency to say get together and meet. They hadn't even met since 2009.

By the way, when we had a hearing on this in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, they said: Oh, we will start doing that soon. But this report that came out that excoriated the Federal programs said that they are not only uncoordinated, but nobody even checks to see if what they do works. They are programs with the Department of Defense; Veterans' Affairs; Education, Health and Human Services; HUD. The list goes on and on. I think there are 20-plus programs for homelessness. There was redundancy and there was overlap, but it is not coordinated. We make it the most difficult for those who have the most difficulty.

So here is number one of what we want to do. We want to have the office of the assistant secretary for mental health and substance abuse created—a new office, but not new money. We do not need any money for this. We take the current office of SAMHSA and elevate that title of the person who runs that agency to the level of an assistant secretary. That person's job will be to create an annual report to Congress to tell us the state of the States, tell us how they spend their money that they get from the Federal level, tell us what are the best practices out there that can serve as models for other States, collect that data.

Right now what we do get is data on numbers of suicides. We get some homicide data, but we really don't get that much on homeless data. We have so-so quality of data for substance abuse, what happens there. But for the most part, no one asks about these agencies and coordinates them. This person's job is to do this. More so, this person is going to have to be a mental health provider, someone who understands the field. The last Director of SAMHSA was an attorney, perhaps well-intended, but did not understand the field. Just like you would not appoint someone to head the Joint Chiefs of Staff to run the Army who is not a general or the Navy who is not an admiral, you need someone to run this who knows what they are doing.

In addition to coordinating these agencies, what they would do is give a report to Congress of which ones can be eliminated because they are redundant, merge the money together, make more money available, and send more money out to communities. Let Congress then act to revamp these multiple organizations to do what is most effective to get funding back to the communities and to the people where it is needed, not to stay in Washington, D.C.

I think President Reagan talked about perhaps some proof of eternity is a Federal program. What we don't want to have here is the continuation of programs that exist just for the sake of employment. Programs should exist for the sake of doing the right thing for people out there, and right now, we have a failure.

The second item is to drive evidence-based care. Another General Accounting Office report which came out talked about some of the abysmal conditions here. They were saying that agencies had difficulty identifying programs supporting individuals with serious mental illness because they didn't always track whether or not such individuals were among those served by the program.

Again, SAMHSA in the past—which is supposed to lead these organizations—doesn't really track to say: What are the evidence-based programs you are doing? When we had a hearing on these issues, SAMHSA told me afterwards they would change nothing.

They do list some evidence-based programs, but the evidence base is oftentimes people who do programs and say: Take my word for it, it works.

If it works, why do we have millions of people with mental illness? Why do we have 4 million people not getting any care at all? Why do we continue to fill our jails, homeless shelters, and morgues with people with mental illness? There are some excellent programs out there, quite frankly, but there are also many that need to be changed.

As part of this process, it was stated in the GAO report that many of the programs hadn't completed their evaluations, many had no evaluations, some were underway, and 17 programs had no evaluation completed and none planned. So the government was not even looking to see if what they were doing had any value. We are going to change that, Madam Speaker. We are going to make sure the programs that are out there have evidence-based care.

The National Child Traumatic Stress Network is an excellent program that does a great job. Another program is called RAISE, Response After Initial Schizophrenia Episode. It does a great job because they work in terms of getting care early in someone's life when they first show symptoms. It is called the prodromal stage. When you get to someone early, you improve their prognosis. But a lot of these other programs—and I will highlight some of the sloppy and irrational programs we have out here tonight—can make a difference if they are done the right way.

Madam Speaker, it is important to note that with regard to serious mental illness, about 50 percent of those with serious mental illness, it will emerge by age 14, and about 75 percent of the cases by age 24. Every time a person has what the public popularly knows as a breakdown, or we refer to it as a psychological or psychiatric crisis, there is harm that occurs to the person, psychological harm and neurological harm, because it is a brain disease. So it is important to get to people early on. That is why we want evidence-based care that really and truly does that and not programs that are fluff. We want them to have outcome measures and determine them.

By the way, Madam Speaker, just the opposite of that, some of the things that SAMHSA has funded in the past have also been programs specifically geared toward telling people to stop taking their medication. When people have anxiety, they have plans in telling you how to drink a fruit smoothie. None of those are evidence-based care, and none of those treat people with serious mental illness.

Number three, go to the mental health workforce. We have a serious, serious shortage here of providers. Even if you wanted to get care, you can't get care in many counties. I think perhaps one-fourth or one-third of counties in Oregon do not even have a psychiatrist in them. Many do not have a clinical psychologist or clinical social workers or peer support teams with the adequacy to meet the need. It is the same across the Nation.

What happens here is there are about 9,000 child psychiatrists in this country. We need 30,000, precisely for the reason I said before, that these problems emerge during those adolescent and young adult years. If you don't have the right qualified people, you can't treat them. Similarly, clinical psychologists, counseling psychologists, clinical social workers, and peer support teams specifically trained and available to be out there, we have massive shortages.

Part of the job of the assistant secretary is going to be to identify what do we need in communities and how do we get them. Our bill authorizes, for the first time, minorities to work with fellowships.

We also authorize people to be volunteers at community health centers. This is one of the bizarre things that only the Federal Government can do. If you want to work at a community health center, you can work, and your medical malpractice insurance is covered. If you want to volunteer, it is not there.

Now, think about this. If there are some well-intended and compassionate—as I know many are—mental health providers who want to volunteer maybe an afternoon a week, give of their time to help, they are not allowed to do it because the center can't afford their malpractice insurance because they would have to pay the regular rate as opposed to a Federal plan rate. Our bill also authorizes that they can volunteer.

We also authorize programs with telemedicine so that when a pediatrician or a family member identifies someone in need of care, they can access them immediately if need be, especially in rural areas and faraway areas where there is not enough support there.

The next one is the shortage of mental health beds. I had mentioned earlier this grave shortage where we had 550,000 beds in the 1950s; we have 40,000 today. It is a serious crisis-level shortage in every community.

During one of our hearings, Senator Creigh Deeds, a State senator in Virginia, testified. Many are familiar with his story. He was a former gubernatorial candidate in Virginia, and he took his son, Gus, with him oftentimes campaigning around the State of Virginia.

Gus played a musical instrument, and they enjoyed their time together; but sadly, Gus deteriorated. When his father, who raised him, fed him, and clothed him, took him to a hospital for care, the hospital said: We don't have any psych beds.

As they made calls and tried to find more in Virginia, they couldn't find any. Young Gus was sent home with his father. They wouldn't provide many details, but they sent Gus home. Gus took a knife and attacked his father, nearly killing him. Creigh escaped, and Gus then killed himself, all because of a lack of beds.

Madam Speaker, there was a story last week in The Washington Post about another Virginia man, a 24-year-old man who was arrested for $5 worth of shoplifting at a 7–Eleven in Virginia. He was taken to jail for shoplifting. But upon recognizing that he had a serious mental illness, they wanted to get him to a hospital. Again, there weren't beds available. So he stayed in that jail, I believe, over 70 days, often naked, covered in his own feces, refusing to eat, and losing 40 pounds. Ultimately, he died for lack of a bed.

Now, that is not the only problem that is out there. Understand that we don't want to bring back those asylums, but when a person is in that crisis mode, it is not appropriate to bring them to a jail.

□ 2045

It is not appropriate to leave them in an emergency room for hours or days or weeks sometimes waiting for a hospital bed to open up, and it certainly is inappropriate to discharge someone without any wraparound services or care.

But what happens is, when you have a bed shortage, you cannot get care for crisis by qualified persons. We don't have the providers. We don't have the places.

It is important for someone to have a clean and calm and caring environment separate from other environmental stresses and problems so you can work with them and stabilize them, perhaps get them on medication, help them relax, help organize things for home care or outpatient care for them. Sometimes that takes a few days. Sometimes that takes a couple weeks. But the idea is you need a place for them.

Without beds, oftentimes a staff simply cannot do a thorough evaluation and they sometimes then will simply make an uninformed and premature release of the individual, of the consumer, saying, ''Well, he doesn't seem that bad. We will send him home,'' not really understanding whether or not that person is a threat to themselves or someone else.

Understand this, that even with the brain diseases of schizophrenia and bipolar, when questioned, someone could be in a position where, when asked if they are going to harm themselves or someone else, they would say, ''No. I am fine. Really, it is okay. It was just a disagreement I had.'' They can keep it together for a little bit.

And if a staff is already saying: Look, we don't have hospital beds. Let's send him home,'' they will be sent home without really knowing the seriousness of their illness or providing full services.

Further, if you want to evaluate if someone is a threat to harm themselves or someone else or in imminent

danger of that, many times the doctors and the courts are reluctant to go through that process. Many times they are looking for another out.

And many times—like in Pennsylvania, it is called a 302 procedure—they will bypass that or they will say to the patient, ''Can you just voluntarily commit yourself or promise you will be okay and you will go out and get care?''

I want to add this because it is very important while the President and other people are talking about access to guns and talking about background checks. You can't do a background check if you don't have a background record—you can't do a background check if you don't have a background record—and if there is no place to help people when they are in crisis.

And if doctors and judges are not going to have someone involuntarily committed, there is no record. There is nothing that can appear on the national list to prevent a person from purchasing a firearm.

There was no time spent in a hospital where staff can truly evaluate are these delusions and hallucinations which can be controlled with medication, will the person be stabilized, are they a risk threat. You can't do that. We need more beds, and our bill says there will be more.

This is one of those areas of incredible prejudices and bigotry. You see, Medicaid has this rule that, if you are between the ages of 21 and 64, you cannot go into a private hospital that has more than 16 beds. Now, think about that.

If you have money, you can go in a hospital. If you are low income, you are out of luck. You are on the street. It is a different standard that is grossly unfair and incredibly prejudicial. And again I go to this point, that those who are minorities or low income are treated the worst.

A person is ten times more likely to be treated in a jail cell than in a hospital if they are seriously mentally ill—ten times more likely. And, yet, that treatment in a jail cell is not appropriate at all.

It is not treatment. Oftentimes they are put in isolation. They may get in a fight with a guard. What started off as a small charge may end up as a felony assault charge.

A person with serious mental illness oftentimes for the same crime will spend four times the amount in jail as a person who is not mentally ill. And all along, if we had the proper place to treat them, we could have done that.

Our bill lifts this 16-bed cap, this ridiculously absurd 16-bed cap, and says, instead, we would like to have an average length of stay of less than 30 days. That can be achieved. In about 98 percent of cases, it can be achieved.

And, by the way, it is far less expensive to have someone in a psychiatric hospital bed than an emergency room by about four times. Some studies have gone as high as saying it is about 20 times less expensive to have them in outpatient care than in a jail cell.

We would save a lot more money if we fixed this crisis shortage, worked on other outpatient care to transition people out, and wrap them around with the necessary services so they could go out more stable.

Point number five: We eliminate the same day doctor barrier, another one of those ridiculously prejudicial rules out there that Medicaid has that harms those of low income.

I mentioned a number of times that the prodromal stages of adolescents and young adulthood is when serious mental illness begins to emerge, those first symptoms that sometimes someone may think is a little bit strange, there is something different about this person. Perhaps their grades are dropping. Perhaps they are not taking care of themselves the way they used to. Perhaps they are withdrawing from relationships and friends.

Those could be early signs of a bigger problem. But it takes, between first symptoms and first professional treatment, on average, 110 weeks, over 2 years, of waiting time between first symptoms, in part, because people are not aware of what to look for in the symptoms, but, in part, because they are not connected with other providers here and, even when they are, they are not allowed to do anything.

The same day doctor rule is a Medicaid rule which says you can't see two doctors in the same day at the same location.

So here is the problem. If a pediatrician says to a mother or father, ''We are very concerned about your teenage son''—who is in the later years, 17 or so—''I would like him to see a psychiatrist right away because I am very concerned about the behaviors you are describing to me'' and then, when that doctor realizes that that person is on Medicaid, basically, Medicaid says, ''We are not paying for it,'' how cruel and abusive is that, to say to someone, ''Just because you have low income we are not going to cover the services here'' when this is a critical time?

When you have that warm hand-off in the doctor's office, there is a 95 percent likelihood that the person will follow up, according to a study by Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh.

When you wait and you say, ''Here is the number. Call it another day,'' that likelihood drops below 45 percent.

And when you miss that golden opportunity to help a person in times of need, that person may be very reluctant to come back for care in the future. We fix this by saying we are going to drop that same day doctor rule.

Number six: We have to empower parents and caregivers to be part of the solution. Twenty years ago HIPAA laws came out that said, ''In order to help your insurance be portable, we want to protect the records.'' Good idea. ''We wanted to make sure records had privacy.'' Good idea.

But HIPAA moved from the place where we are supposed to assist care and confidentiality to the point where it impairs care. It has gone too far. Let me give you a couple of examples.

Right now a doctor—and I am a psychologist. If I know a family member brings someone in to see me, I can listen to them in a very passive mode, but I can't provide them any information. That is helpful. They are giving me vital information for history.

If I don't have the accurate history, a provider does not have accurate history, you can't accurately diagnose. You don't know if the person has been on medication before, does it work or not work, who has this person seen before, what sets them off, are they doing better, what are their symptoms.

If I don't have or a provider does not have that information, they may miss making the accurate diagnosis and then not be able to provide proper treatment and follow-up. When that occurs, harm can follow.

Now, if I get the information, great. But what happens if that family member is not there? The provider can't go out and seek other family members and friends to get that information because HIPAA laws are seen as barriers to that.

Because as soon as a doctor at a hospital calls and says, ''Your adult son is in the hospital. I need to ask you some information about it,'' that doctor has already violated HIPAA laws by identifying the person's son is in a hospital.

Now, think about this, though. A parent, the person who was caring and loving throughout a lifetime, committed to their family member, a brother, a sister, someone's mother or father, they are prohibited from being part of the care team by HIPAA laws.

A stranger, some appointed worker, someone who may see them as they roll in and out of their job, even if they care and they burn out, they will be maybe sitting next to a family member in court and simply say, ''I can't tell you anything about this family member. You will have to find out for yourself.''

Here is another problem, though. Not only are you impaired from getting diagnostic information, you can't evaluate medications. But understand that people with serious mental illness are often at high risk for other medical problems, in part, because their hygiene may be poor, they may not take care of themselves, may not see doctors, et cetera.

But they also are in a situation where they may take some medications that make them high risk for diabetes or heart disease. And without getting a family member to help them with that, they do not have the ability to properly treat them.

My goal in this bill is to simply say that, in cases where someone has diminished capacity to take care of themselves where, in absence of treatment, they become gravely disabled, a provider may tell a known caregiver—so notice I have already set the bar pretty high—may tell a known caregiver a few simple facts: the diagnosis,

the treatment plan, the treating doctors, time and place of appointment, and what are the medications they are on. No therapy notes are allowed to be exchanged. We specifically prohibit that in this bill. But that is important.

And, by the way, I might add one other thing. As I hear a lot of people talking about the concerns of why didn't a parent do anything, why didn't they know anything in some cases, like the young man at Virginia Tech who killed so many students or the gentlemen in Oregon or at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, it is because providers cannot do a risk assessment.

They cannot contact a family member and say, ''Can you tell me if this person has any morbid fantasy and fascination with death, with extremely violent video games, with dark Web sites? Do they have weapons that are unsecured? Do they talk about violent issues? Have they made threats before?'' You can't do that risk assessment. Without that, you end up not knowing the risk.

Number seven: States receive money for mental health services and substance abuse disorders. Those dollars are about $500 million for mental health and about $600 to $700 million for substance abuse. The odd thing about this is States are not allowed to mingle that money. They can't braid it together.

Even worse is that many people with a substance abuse disorder have a mental illness and many people with mental illness will turn toward other substances to self-medicate. And, yet, the person will have to go to two different providers, two different clinics, to get care instead of one. We drop that barrier and say Federal grants should go to States in a way that help the States work this best.

Number eight: We want to bring accountability to the spending of Federal funds. Now, here is where we have seen in another GAO report the absolute absurdity and cruelty of how money is spent.

A GAO report done this last summer told us that many times documents and applications for many who receive grants were not reviewed. They couldn't tell you what the application criterion was to get an award. They didn't have program-specific guidance. Information was missing or not readily available. They didn't even know where it was stored. You couldn't follow the paper trail to see where it was. And so what happens is no one knows how this money was spent.

But let me tell you some of the absurd things we have found money is spent on, our tax dollars. How about this? A Web site last winter was posted by SAMHSA for the people of Boston to help them with their worries about snow. That is right. They posted a 1–800 number you could call if you had snow anxiety. These are people from New England, for goodness sake. They know how to handle snow. But our tax dollars went to help them understand it.

There are Web sites that tell you to drink a fruit smoothie if you are anxious, programs that tell you how to make a mask, programs that we fund to how to make collages, a painting in SAMHSA's headquarters that cost $22,500 of two people sitting on a rock surrounded by other people—$22,000.

When we asked the director of SAMHSA what that was for, they said it is more mental health awareness. The only thing I am aware of is it is a waste of money and that money could have gone to help pay someone's salary to actually treat a patient.

Well, it gets worse. A Web site for 3-year-old children, the cost of $426,000, with animated characters and sing-along songs. The purpose, we asked the director of SAMHSA, prevention. ''Prevention of what?'', we said. ''Well, we think prevention is good.'' ''Well, what does this prevent and what does it do and does it work and does it do anything?'' We waited for weeks to get an answer and we still don't have it 1 month later. By the way, they took the Web site down when we shined a bright light on it, saying, ''What does this do?''

We want accountability to this spending. There will be different grant programs now—demonstration grants, innovation grants—where people will know what these grants are. They can look at them as scientific studies in a blind review to make sure it is going to quality programs that really make sense. No more of this behavioral wellness stuff, but truly working at things that make a difference.

Number nine: Develop alternatives to institutionalization and have real jail diversion. I said already what happens to so many people with mental illness. They end up in jail. Forty to sixty percent of people in prison have a mental illness.

And what this does is it helps provide some extra funding for States that have wraparound services for those who have this history of violent incarcerations, arrests, mental illness.

□ 2100

New York has a program called Assisted Outpatient Treatment. Their program, which means a judge will say you need to stay in treatment at an outpatient level, has found they reduced incarcerations by 81 percent. They reduced homelessness by over 70 percent. They reduced admissions to emergency rooms by over 70 percent. They had patient satisfaction, consumer satisfaction at over 90 percent. And they cut costs in half.

States have different programs here. About 46 States have something on the books. But many of these States do not put these programs in practice because of the big cost. We know States will save a lot of money once they start doing this.

But what we want to do is take people out of this cycle, this revolving door of jail and risk and more damage, and say that States need to have programs where it wraps around services for that person. Don't just dump them from jail onto the streets and expect a problem because it will erupt again. Make sure those services are there. Make sure the person stays in treatment.

Now some say, well, that is unfair. Some say that might be an involuntary commitment, that it puts people there against their will and you impair their rights.

But I say this, that a person with serious mental illness 40 percent of the time is not even aware they have a problem and so many times they refuse treatment or their past run-ins with the police and other hospitals because they don't want to be there, they don't want to get treatment.

If we provide quality, compassionate, accessible care, they may get that, but not under the current system. We want to make sure they have that care, and we will provide the funding to do it.

Number 10, advance early intervention and prevention programs: A lot of what our government spends money on is what is called primary prevention, the things we do for everybody, like don't smoke, wear a seat belt.

But what happens is, in the area of mental illness, those wellness programs like I described before that are out there, the silly things that SAMHSA does, are not an effective use of dollars.

Secondary and tertiary prevention is valuable. Secondary is when you recognize someone is at risk, but not with symptoms. Tertiary is when they have symptoms and you try and help them get better.

By focusing money on the programs I mentioned before—the RAISE program or others, the Child and Adolescent Traumatic Stress Network—you can move the dollars where they need to be funded and stop this silliness.

Now, I should say this while I am talking about SAMHSA, that despite two GAO reports that criticize them—and one time afterwards I had the director of SAMHSA in my office and I said, ''Okay. Here is your opportunity. Would you change anything?'' And she said, ''No. I wouldn't change a thing.''

Another time during one of our hearings one of my colleagues said, ''On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate yourself on your programs?'' And the director said, ''I would give myself a 10,'' despite all these failures.

That is the reason why we need to have an assistant secretary of mental health. That is the reason why we need to make these changes. This is the current reason why we have so many of these problems.

Before I wrap up here, I want to yield a couple of minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), who has also been involved in the field of wellness and is also a supporter of this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding and for

leading on this incredibly important issue that is before us.

I rise in support of Congressman MURPHY's bill, H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2015. You know this significant piece of legislation aims to address the fact that millions of Americans who suffer from a serious mental illness are going without treatment, as families and caregivers struggle to find support in a disorganized healthcare system.

I practiced rehabilitation services for 28 years before I had the privilege and honor in 2009 to come to work on behalf of the citizens of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. Part of my career was working acute psychiatric services, working with people that were experiencing some of the most chronic and reoccurring disabling conditions that are out there.

Many times the system that we are in only really responded when people were in crisis, but it only responded to the point that the person was no longer a danger to themselves or someone else.

The system did not allow for the types of resources to be deployed and the care to be provided to really meet the needs of these individuals to stop the cycle.

It was really a privilege and honor to work with many different individuals and many different family members.

But I am so excited about this step that we are taking with this bill, and I really encourage leadership. This is a bill whose time is now. We need to elevate it to the House and to the Senate. This needs to be on the President's desk because we can make a difference in people's lives with this bill.

It is hard to deny the staggering consequences of neglecting our mental health system. Suicide rates are at the highest they have been in more than 25 years. Our nationwide shortage of psychiatric beds is nearly at 100,000. The three largest mental health hospitals in the United States are classified as criminal incarceration facilities, prisons.

I have taken the opportunity—I think it is important—to make visits to our prisons within the congressional district. I have done that. I have more of those visits coming up.

It is very apparent to me that, as we have closed in the past facilities that perhaps we could have improved upon versus closing, all we did was shift people to the streets and from the streets to the prisons.

So many people today have a dual diagnosis, some type of psychiatric diagnosis, but also a substance abuse diagnosis, which tends to be a part of that spiral. And your heart breaks to see that.

If we want to reduce our prison population and the cost that it takes to maintain individuals, then this bill is a good step in that direction of breaking that cycle. I would argue that this bill will help have a cost savings over time, short term and certainly long term.

Congressman MURPHY has taken a compassionate and evidence-based approach to reforming the way the Federal Government addresses mental health.

H.R. 2646 breaks down barriers for families. It encourages innovative models of care. It advances early intervention and prevention programs.

Notably, it employs telepsychiatry to reach underserved and rural population areas where patients have difficulty accessing needed care. I know for a fact using telepsychiatry reduces the stigma of reaching out for help.

I authored a bill that has become law. It is called the STEP law, the Servicemember Telemedicine Electronic Portability Act, which we really did this for our military, our Active-Duty military Reserve and Guard.

We changed the law a few years back with a piece of legislation that has expanded telemedicine that is used by the Department of Defense, and it really has helped save lives. It has not been the only thing we have done, but it was a valuable part in the reduction of the suicide rate among our military.

So we know the many provisions within this bill are tested. They are proven. There are lives to be improved and lives to be saved. It recognizes the important role of the family, the caregiver.

Now, these are some of the most chronic and recurring conditions, and you need a strong support system. The way our system is today, it excludes those family members.

So there is just a lot to support here, and I am certainly proud to do it.

It is important that we make a commitment to address mental health with the same urgency as we do physical health.

I will remain steadfast in my support for H.R. 2646, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. In my closing minute, let me say this: As I opened up, this will be known as the bloody summer of 2015. Let this time be the autumn of our compassion in 2015.

The time is now. We have 40 newspapers around this country that have published endorsements for this legislation. We have 133 bipartisan cosponsors.

I plead with my colleagues to please become a cosponsor to this bill. I beg leadership. Let's no longer have a blind eye to this, let's no longer have a moment of silence, and let this be the time of our action.

Let's pass H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, and let's bring compassion and care to the many families in America who are suffering from mental illness and show them that that twilight, as the sun sets, is indicating that there soon will be a dawn of great hope in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF ESTABLISHING A SELECT INVESTIGATIVE PANEL OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Ms. FOXX (during the Special Order of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–288) on the resolution (H. Res. 461) establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3192, HOMEBUYERS ASSISTANCE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 12, 2015, THROUGH OCTOBER 19, 2015

Ms. FOXX (during the Special Order of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–289) on the resolution (H. Res. 462) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3192) to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from October 12, 2015, through October 19, 2015, 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. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and October 7 on account of family reasons.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2835. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection officers.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 5, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1624. To amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to revise the definition of small employer.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 7, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3029. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31035; Amdt. No.: 3659] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3030. 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-2015-0245; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-135-AD; Amendment 39-18268; AD 2015-19-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3031. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31034; Amdt. No.: 3658] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3032. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0676; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-164-AD; Amendment 39-18238; AD 2015-17-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3033. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Jet Route J-513; North Central United States [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3601; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3034. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Vulcanair S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0656; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-027-AD; Amendment 39-18259; AD 2015-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3035. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0583; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-130-AD; Amendment 39-18258; AD 2015-17-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3036. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1044; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-18245; AD 2015-17-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3037. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2047; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-013-AD; Amendment 39-18243; AD 2015-17-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3038. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3375; Amendment No.: 71-47] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3039. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1130; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-18250; AD 2015-17-17] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3040. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0625; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-18253; AD 2015-17-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3041. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0900; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-18251; AD 2015-17-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3042. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0779; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-052-AD; Amendment 39-18260; AD 2015-18-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3043. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31036; Amdt. No.: 3660] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3044. 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-2015-0242; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-18240; AD 2015-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3045. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31033; Amdt. No.: 3657] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3046. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1050; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-123-AD; Amendment 39-18241; AD 2015-17-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3047. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0363; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-18252; AD 2015-17-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3048. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Burbank, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0690; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWA-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3049. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0680; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-165-AD; Amendment 39-18236; AD 2015-17-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3050. 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-2014-0772; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-090-AD; Amendment 39-18233; AD 2015-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October

5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3051. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0277; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-18262; AD 2015-18-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3052. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Portland, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1137; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-4] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3053. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0823; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-211-AD; Amendment 39-18249; AD 2015-17-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3054. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Douglas, WY [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1089; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-11] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3055. 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-2014-0777; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-088-AD; Amendment 39-18257; AD 2015-17-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3056. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Delta, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0343; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ANM-10] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3057. 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-2015-0085; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-078-AD; Amendment 39-18255; AD 2015-17-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3058. 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-2015-0926; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-18263; AD 2015-18-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3059. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Iron Mountain, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1871; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-10] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3060. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Newberry, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1869; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-9] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3061. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0673; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-034-AD; Amendment 39-18244; AD 2015-17-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3062. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tracy, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1623; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-10] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3063. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tracy, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1623; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-10] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3064. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Aurora, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1070; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ANM-9] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3065. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31039; Amdt. No.: 522] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3066. 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-2014-0523; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-050-AD; Amendment 39-18246; AD 2015-17-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3067. 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-2014-0455; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-006-AD; Amendment 39-18247; AD 2015-17-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3068. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0822; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-210-AD; Amendment 39-18248; AD 2015-17-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3069. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the final Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan integrated project implementation report and environmental impact statement, pursuant to the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, Sec. 601; (H. Doc. No. 114—65); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

3070. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on modifications to Calcasieu Lock, inland navigation project, pursuant to the River and Harbor Act of 24 July 1946; (H. Doc. No. 114—66); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

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. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1525. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10–K and regulation S–K, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1553. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle (Rept. 114–280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1839. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2091. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify the ability to request consumer reports in certain cases to establish and enforce child support payments and awards (Rept. 114–282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3102. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, streamline transportation security regulations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3510. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2295. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to identify and designate National Energy Security Corridors for the construction of natural gas pipelines on Federal land, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2288. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2358. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands; with an amendment (Rept. 114–287, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 461. Resolution establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (Rept. 114–288). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 462. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3192) to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from October 12, 2015, through October 19, 2015 (Rept. 114–289). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2358 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 3684. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that an individual may remain eligible to participate in the teacher loan forgiveness program under title IV of such Act if the individual's period of consecutive years of employment as a full-time teacher is interrupted because the individual is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3685. A bill to direct the United States Trade Representative to initiate negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Turkey to seek to enter into a bilateral free trade agreement with Turkey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3686. A bill to direct the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs to make certain reports publicly available and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 3687. A bill to modify the prohibition on United States assistance and financing for certain exports to Cuba under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 3688. A bill to provide for the authority for the successors and assigns of the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company to maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Rio Grande City, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3689. A bill to establish a worker adjustment assistance program to provide assistance and job retraining for workers who have lost their jobs due to unplanned closures of coal and coal dependent industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3690. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3691. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the residential treatment programs for pregnant and postpartum women and to establish a pilot program to provide grants to State substance abuse agencies to promote innovative service delivery models for such women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3692. A bill to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3693. A bill to require a report on whether Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps is a terrorist entity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TROTT (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 3694. A bill to combat trafficking in human organs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 3695. A bill to simplify and improve the Federal student loan program through income-contingent repayment to provide stronger protections for borrowers, encourage responsible borrowing, and save money for taxpayers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 463. A resolution recognizing October 7th as National Trigeminal Neuralgia Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H. Res. 464. A resolution affirming that private equity plays an important role in growing and strengthening United States businesses throughout all sectors of the economy and in every State and congressional district and that it has fostered significant investment in the United States economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 465. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the justices of the United States Supreme Court should make themselves subject to the existing and operative ethics guidelines set out in the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, or should promulgate their own code of conduct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: ''. . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states that ''Congress shall have the power . . . [t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations . . .''

and that

''Congress shall have the power . . . [t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 3686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 3687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 3688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with forign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 3690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 3691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 3692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 3695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 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. 10: Mr. COLE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. FOXX, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 167: Mr. DENHAM and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 174: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 192: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 213: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 228: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 302: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 403: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 410: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 446: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 542: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 546: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 563: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 581: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 590: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 662: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 670: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 699: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 721: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 757: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 814: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 829: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 837: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 870: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 879: Mr. WALKER and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 953: Mr. HANNA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 957: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 969: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 986: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1055: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1093: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1107: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1148: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1188: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1197: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1217: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. FARR, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1233: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1256: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1258: Ms. MENG, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1283: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1288: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1309: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1312: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1401: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1422: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1453: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1475: Mr. FARR, Mr. BEYER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1482: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1516: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1550: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1567: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1571: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1603: Mr. GARRETT and Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 1608: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1625: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1632: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1653: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1684: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1728: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1737: Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 1752: Mr. BLUM and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1761: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1769: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1786: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1814: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Ms. Graham.

H.R. 1843: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1850: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1854: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1877: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1919: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1934: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1941: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1942: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KATKO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2009: Ms. MCSALLY and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2013: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2050: Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2083: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2090: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2293: Ms. MENG, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 2304: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 2315: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 2368: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2404: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2405: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2406: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2460: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REED, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 2473: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2492: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2513: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 2519: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
H.R. 2540: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2568: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 2597: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2611: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2646: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2661: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2663: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 2675: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2698: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2710: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2726: Mr. HONDA and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2728: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2737: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2759: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2799: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2802: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 2855: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2858: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MENG, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2869: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2872: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2873: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2880: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2903: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 2906: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2916: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2917: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2920: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2922: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 2948: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2957: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2962: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2965: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 2987: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3011: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3018: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 3033: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3081: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 3099: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3119: Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3193: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3221: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 3223: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 3255: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 3286: Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 3293: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 3308: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 3310: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3326: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 3337: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3338: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3381: Mr. HARPER and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3411: Mr. BEYER and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3412: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3428: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3463: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3471: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 3473: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 3477: Mr. COLE and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3480: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3497: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 3510: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3514: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VELA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3516: Mr. PERRY, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3517: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 3519: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3549: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 3573: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 3623: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 3626: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 3643: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 3644: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 3646: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 3651: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BLUM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRAT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VELA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MESSER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 3665: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3666: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3678: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. BASS, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. PITTS.
H. Res. 54: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 112: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 130: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 230: Mr. WALDEN.
H. Res. 354: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 396: Mr. TROTT.
H. Res. 422: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 428: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CAPPS.
H. Res. 429: Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. ROBY.
H. Res. 436: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 437: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 443: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H. Res. 445: Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 451: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. POSEY.
H. Res. 452: Mr. NOLAN.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2015 No. 146

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our hope, You fight our battles for us, for You continue to work for the good of those who love You. Be a shield for our lawmakers, delivering them from cynicism, pessimism, and despair. Give them such respect for themselves that they will never do anything of which they would be ashamed. Remind them to never do in the present that which in the future they would have cause to regret. Lord, give them such respect for others that they will find joy in serving and not in selfishness, in giving and not in getting, in sharing and not in hoarding.

And, Lord, we pray for the many Americans who are dealing with the ravages of flooding.

We pray in Your strong 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Richard Burr, Daniel Coats, Ben Sasse, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Chuck Grassley, Susan M. Collins, Thad Cochran, James Lankford, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Henry Kissinger recently said our country faces the most ''diverse and complex array of crises'' since World War II. It is really hard to disagree with that.

Consider the daily situation reports received by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs: Taliban forces overrunning Kunduz in Afghanistan, retaking their first provincial capital in 14 years; Beijing exerting greater will in its aggressive military expansion, even deploying ships to patrol off the coast of Alaska; Russia deepening its aggression in Ukraine and in Syria deploying the largest number of troops outside the former Soviet Union since the U.S.S.R.'s collapse; Tehran showing its determination to expand the Iranian sphere of influence as it deploys additional forces to the Syrian battlefield; and in the tribal areas of Pakistan, Al Qaeda terrorists reminding us of their continued resolve to attack the homeland.

There is all this, Mr. President, to say nothing of the resilient, versatile threat posed by ISIL, to say nothing of ISIL's consolidation of gains inside Iraq and Syria.

We stand here 1 year after the President described a strategy for degrading and destroying ISIL. So far, this strategy has resulted in a seeming stalemate. We know from nearly daily news stories the administration is reconsidering that plan and crafting a new strategy to combat ISIL. We also know the war against the terrorist group will be protracted. That is one reason the President sought $585 billion in defense funding in his budget request.

So today the Senate has the capability to provide the level of funding authority the President actually asked for. Today the Senate has the power to help America navigate a treacherous world. Today the Senate has the opportunity to help the Defense Department begin the hard work of rebuilding America's combat capability as we seek to protect America's interests across the globe.

That is why I am calling on every colleague to join me in voting to advance the bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act. The last time the Senate considered this legislation 84 Senators—84 Senators—including a large majority of Democrats, voted to advance this bill. That was just this summer—a couple of months ago.

I would urge Democrats to vote the same way now, because we have heard

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

some worrying rhetoric from across the aisle. We have even heard a suggestion that this bipartisan reform bill is just ''a waste of time.'' I strongly disagree.

Is it a waste of time to transform bureaucratic waste into crucial investments for our troops and their families, such as the raises they have earned and the quality of life programs they deserve? Is it a waste of time to provide hope for wounded warriors and extend a hand of compassion to heroes who struggle with mental health challenges?

The bipartisan bill before us is hardly—hardly—a waste of time. That is why it passed the Senate once already with overwhelming bipartisan support. Our troops should be able to count on that overwhelming bipartisan support again today. This is not the time to flip-flop on the men and women who protect us. This is not the time to flip-flop on America's defense, certainly not in this age of daunting global threats.

Secretary Kerry called the situation in the Middle East ''a catastrophe, a human catastrophe really unparalleled in modern times.'' He is right. It is tragic. It is dangerous. And it only underlines the duty each of us has now to meet our responsibilities—meet our responsibilities—not filibuster the bipartisan legislation that ensures our troops have the tools and equipment they need in this time of global crisis.

This bipartisan bill will support our troops, help our military to rebuild and face the challenges of both the present and the future, and provide President Obama the level of funding authorization he actually asked for in his budget request. We passed this bipartisan defense bill once already. We need to pass it again now.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2129, S. 2130, S. 2131, AND S. 2132

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are four bills at the desk due a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2129) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, Energy and Water Development, and Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2130) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, energy and water development, Department of Homeland Security, military construction, Department of Veterans Affairs, and Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2131) making appropriations for Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies and Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2132) making appropriations for financial services and general government, Department of the Interior, environment, and Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar en bloc.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THE KOCH BROTHERS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Charles and David Koch are trying to buy America. They have the money to try and do just that. Because of the Supreme Court's wrong and disastrous Citizens United ruling, the Koch brothers' dark political money has infected our democracy.

One need only look at our national politics to see how the Kochs are influencing our government. Even now, these two billionaires are committed to spending $900 million to advance a radical agenda during this election cycle. It is no surprise, then, that virtually every Republican Presidential candidate kowtows to these two oil, tar sands, and coal barons from Kansas. Republican Presidential hopefuls all kiss the rings of the Kochs, hoping that some of their filthy money finds its way into their campaign coffers. It is disgusting, and it is wrong.

But the Koch brothers aren't just trying to buy the highest office in the land. They are not just trying to help themselves at the Federal level. They are also trying to buy our democracy from the bottom up. In statehouses and city halls all across our great country, the Koch brothers and their vast spending network are turning local governments into agencies of the Koch empire. They are trying to turn America into a Koch-financed oligarchy.

It seems there is no issue too local nor policy matter too small to escape the Koch brothers' wrath. They want to impose their radical agenda on the American people on every issue, no matter the cost to families and communities.

Just look at what they are doing in Colorado Springs, CO. ''The Potholes of Colorado Springs draw the attention of Koch brothers' group.'' This is a headline from last weekend's Washington Post. The Koch brothers are fighting the city's efforts to fix its crumbling roads. Reading from the article:

This much everyone can agree on: The streets of this large city on the Rocky Mountain Front Range are a wreck. Sixty percent are in disrepair, cracked and rutted; driving on them is often a game of vehicular Minesweeper. One local TV news channel runs a segment called ''Pothole Patrol.''

I continue to quote:

But when this city's newly elected conservative mayor urged voters to approve an increase in the sales tax to pay to improve the roads, he drew fire from an unexpected source: a branch of Americans for Prosperity, a powerful conservative advocacy group backed by the billionaire industrialists Charles and David Koch.

The Koch brothers aren't interested in advancing solutions. They are interested in sending a message. They are willing to attack everyone, even conservative Republicans who cross their extreme agenda.

This is the basic work of government the Koch brothers want to destroy. All Colorado Springs and its Republican mayor want to do is to determine their own fate, fund their own roads, and make their own laws. But in March, Americans for Prosperity, beholden to Charles and David Koch's pocketbook, simply shut down the entire process of local, community-based government. It is unbelievable they would do this.

The Koch brothers don't want the people of Colorado Springs to find their own solutions to fix potholes in Colorado Springs, and they are willing to pay to make sure that doesn't happen.

That is only one city, and I don't have time to mention all. The Kochs are doing this all over America. Here is another headline from the Nashville Tennessean. ''Koch brothers group works to stop Nashville Amp.'' Here is the quote:

The movement to stop a Nashville mass transit plan has gotten an extra boost of horsepower from an unexpected source: the Koch brothers, out-of-state billionaires.

But there are many more examples. ''Americans for Prosperity spent $62,795 to defeat zoo levy.'' Think about that. They are so focused on doing everything they can to run this great Nation not from the top down but the bottom up. This was the headline from the Columbus Dispatch last year.

The Koch brothers' main political arm in Ohio fought against the Columbus Zoo and Aquarium tax levy. Why? Because the Kochs have a Georgia-Pacific plant nearby and they did not want to pay their fair share of taxes. Think about that. These are multibillionaires. It is estimated to be worth $150 to $200 billion. They are afraid their company, Georgia-Pacific, may have to pay a few extra dollars in taxes in Ohio.

The Los Angeles Times: ''Koch brothers, big utilities attack solar, green energy policies.''

This is a headline from the L.A. Times, as we can see, and it reads:

The Koch brothers, anti-tax activist Grover Norquist and some of the nation's largest power companies have backed efforts in recent months to roll back state policies that favor green energy. The conservative luminaries have pushed campaigns in Kansas, North Carolina and Arizona, with the battle rapidly spreading to other states. . . . Both sides say the fight is growing more intense as new states, including Ohio, South Carolina and Washington, enter the fray.

Potholes in Colorado—they want to stop anything to do with renewable energy in Tennessee. They are going to stop a zoo and aquarium in Columbus, OH, or nearby. They want to stop any

type of renewable energy because it slows down their tar sands business, their oil business, and their coal business.

In Nevada, the Koch brothers and their foot soldiers are meddling in many issues—really, too many to count. They have been trying to upend Nevada's open primary process. They have encouraged young Nevadans to stay out of the State's health exchanges. They fought attempts to raise Nevada's cigarette tax. They have used the State legislature to undermine labor unions. These are only a few examples of the Kochs' ''Buy America'' plan.

What the Koch brothers are doing in Nevada and all of the States that we talked about this morning is shameful. They are using their deep pockets and their shadowy organizations to try and buy a government that serves them, not the American people. They aren't even trying to hide it anymore. As one radical activist happily noted to the Washington Post, ''the Koch brothers, they may write a check'' to promote their ultraconservative ideology. They are writing more than a check or two. Charles and David and their allies are writing $900 million worth of checks—$900 million spent against rebuilding our Nation's roads and bridges, against a fair shot for all Americans, against raising the minimum wage, and against the hundreds of thousands of American jobs supported by the Export-Import Bank.

The Kochs have a lot of money to spend. They are using a tiny bit of it, which is huge amounts of money—about $1 billion this election cycle—to do other kinds of things. They want to promote criminal justice reform. That is nice. I am glad they are on the right side of something—finally. That could be one reason they are interested in this—because they have been in the past prosecuted for doing things that have been illegal and criminal in the nature of prosecutors. They have fought back against these things.

We have been talking about the criminal justice system long before the Kochs got involved. That is well and nice that they are embracing reform now, but it does not negate the many bad things they are doing to hurt American families.

The Koch brothers' priorities are wrong for the middle class and they are wrong for all America. It is time that we let the Koch brothers know that our country isn't for sale. It is time that we let every power-hungry billionaire know they can't buy our government. Whether it is the city hall of Colorado Springs or the halls of Congress, you should not be able to buy America's democracy. The question is this: Are the Kochs going to buy America, because they are certainly trying to? It is up to every American to say no.

Mr. President, I note that there is no one else on the floor. So would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our ranking member on the Armed Services Committee is here on the floor. He has done an exemplary job working with Senator JOHN MCCAIN to move legislation forward. I have followed his lead, and I am not going to vote for this conference report, as he is not going to vote for this conference report. I would say that the House had a vote similar to this one a few days ago, where they had more than enough votes to sustain a veto if the President does veto this, which he says he is going to do. I want everyone to know that as to Democrats who voted for this in the past, not all of them will vote the same way they did last time. But our Democrats have stated, without any question, if it comes time to sustain a Presidential veto, that will be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the conference report of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, which we will be voting on in the next hour. This conference report is the product of months of negotiation and compromise between the House and the Senate. I want to commend Chairman MCCAIN, Chairman THORNBERRY, and Ranking Member SMITH for a thoughtful, inclusive and cordial process.

There are many provisions in this bill that provide the support we owe to our servicemembers and their families—the funding, authorities, and equipment necessary for our troops to succeed in combat; and significant and critical reforms to the military retirement, compensation, and acquisition systems—many of which I will talk about in further debate on this bill in the days and hours ahead.

However, I regret that I am unable to support this conference report because it shifts $38 billion requested by the President for enduring or base military requirements—the base budget, if you will—to the overseas contingency operations, or OCO, account, essentially, skirting the law known as the Budget Control Act, or BCA.

Again, this is a maneuver to get around a statute that was signed by the President, voted for by Congress, and which has imposed budget caps on every department. Central to that agreement was the significant consensus that domestic and defense discretionary spending would be capped. What this conference report does is violate that consensus by using OCO in a way that it was not originally intended to be so used.

This budget gimmick allows the majority to fully fund the Defense Department without breaking caps imposed by the BCA on both defense and nondefense spending. However, the OCO account provides no relief for nondefense departments and agencies, and that includes many agencies that are critical to our national security. Because of this device, I and nearly all of the Democratic conferees on the bill did not sign the conference report.

Abusing OCO, as this bill would do, is counter to the intent of the Budget Control Act. The BCA imposed proportionally equal cuts to defense and nondefense discretionary spending to force a bipartisan compromise to our ongoing budget difficulties. OCO and emergency funding are outside budget caps for a reason. They finance the cost of ongoing military operations or they respond to other unforeseen events such as national disasters. In my view, to suddenly ignore the true purpose of OCO and treat it as a budgetary gambit in order to skirt the BCA caps is an unacceptable use of this important tool for our warfighters in the field.

Adding funds to OCO does not solve—and actually complicates—DOD's budgetary problems. Defense budgeting needs to be based on our long-term military strategy, which requires the Department of Defense to focus at least 5 years into the future. A 1-year plus-up to OCO does not provide DOD with the certainty and stability it needs when building its 5-year budget.

Just to highlight how this OCO gimmick skews defense spending, consider the amount of OCO in relation to the number of troops deployed. Again, I think it is a useful metric because OCO evolved when we were deploying troops overseas—first in response to Afghanistan during Operation Enduring Freedom and then with respect to Iraq. And there is a correlation, at least in the minds of most people, between our efforts overseas with troops engaged and the size of OCO.

In 2008, at the height of our Nation's troop commitment in Iraq and Afghanistan and with approximately 187,000 total troops deployed, we spent approximately $1 million in OCO for every servicemember deployed to those countries. Under this bill, we will spend approximately $9 million in OCO

for every servicemember deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan—roughly about 9,930 people, in DOD projections. So this increase has gone some place. It hasn't gone overseas, directly to the men and women who are fighting, but it has gone to other accounts within the Department of Defense.

In addition to this phenomenon, within the next few years the services will begin procuring new weapons systems while modernizing and maintaining legacy weapons systems. For example, in the Future Years Defense Program, or FYDP, the Department will spend $48 billion to procure the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter; $10.6 billion for the Ohio-class replacement program; $13.9 billion for the Long Range Strike Bomber; and $29.7 billion for the Virginia-class submarine program.

Each of these programs is critically important to our national defense, and we must ensure they are robustly funded. But if the BCA caps remain in place, it is likely tough budget choices will need to be made. As a result, if we decide to stay within the stringent budge caps, we may be forced to fund these programs at the expense of other, equally meritorious programs. We will have a choice of not investing fully in these necessary strategic improvements or using legacy systems, which are still important, to pay for them—tough choices.

Alternatively, and what I think is more likely to happen, these programs will be funded in the base budget. However, in order to ensure the budget caps are not breached, funding will be shifted from the operations and maintenance accounts to the OCO account in order to accommodate increased procurement for new weapons systems. In many respects, that is what is happening with this $38.3 billion that shifted from the traditional base budget into the OCO budget account for O&M requirements.

What you have here is a sense of budgetary sleight of hand. We know we have these increased demands coming to us because we do have to recapitalize on strategic systems, in particular. If we have the BCA caps in place, we have to find money some place, and that is likely to be the OCO account. We will see a fund, OCO, which was designed to support ongoing operations overseas suddenly be used to pay for long-term base budget items, i.e., recapitalization of our strategic deterrent forces.

If we use this scheme this year—maybe with good intentions and the only honest intention of 1 year to get us ahead—it will be easier to do it next year and the year after that, ensuring that this imbalance between security and domestic spending continues. As we all recognize, effective national security requires that non-DOD departments and agencies also receive relief from the BCA caps. The Pentagon simply cannot meet the complex set of national security challenges without the help of other government departments and agencies—including State, Justice, and Homeland Security.

Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Christine Wormuth made this point when she was before the Armed Services Committee a few weeks ago to testify on our strategy to counter ISIL, which many Americans believe to be the top national security threat facing our country. The Department of Defense is only one part of a whole-of-government approach to defeating ISIL. Secretary Wormuth said:

> ''It will take more than just the military campaign to be successful [against ISIL]. We also will need to dry up ISIL's finances, stop the flows of foreign fighters into Iraq and Syria in particular, protect the United States from potential ISIL attacks, provide humanitarian assistance to rebuild areas cleared of ISIL forces, and find ways to more effectively counter ISIL's very successful messaging campaign.''

Unfortunately, we will effectively diminish our national capabilities to do all these things by underfunding non-DOD departments and agencies that are critical to our national security. Use of the OCO gimmick—it has been referred to that by many people—in this bill facilitates underfunding those departments, and it should not be supported. We need an all-out governmental effort to provide for our national security. Underfunding State, Treasury, and other departments is not going to get us that all-out effort. And when it no longer becomes easy to underfund nondefense agencies, my suspicion is that nondefense programs will begin appearing in OCO. There is some precedent to this. For example, in fiscal year 1992, Congress added funds to the defense bill for breast cancer research. At the time, discretionary spending was subject to statutory caps under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990—the follow-on legislation to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act of 1985. That was a situation where they were capping discretionary domestic spending, but defense spending was uncapped, and this is a situation that I think we are recreating in this conference report. That initial funding led to the establishment of the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program, and I think every Senator is familiar with this important program. It has strong bipartisan support, and each fiscal year Congress authorizes and appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to the program for cutting-edge and critically essential medical research.

In fact, since 1992, this program has received over $13 billion in funding. While this program is funded through the annual Defense bill and the program is managed by the Army, the Department of Defense does not execute any of the money itself. It is a competitive grant process, and proposals are subject to stringent peer and programmatic review criteria. Essentially, the money goes out to medical research facilities throughout the United States. For all intents and purposes, it is a medical research program much like we fund through NIH.

I am a strong supporter of medical research and a strong supporter of this program, and indeed this program has, through its research and through its efforts, saved countless lives, but my concern is that under the aegis of OCO, approaches and budgetary maneuvers like this will become common. It will be a way to skirt the budget caps. If we do it this year, we have set a precedent for next year and the following year, and 10 years from now the Defense bill could authorize billions of dollars of funding for programs that may be meritorious but will have little or nothing to do with national defense and should be properly budgeted within our base budget from other departments. Indeed, some programs should be properly funded within the Department of Defense's base budget.

Simply put, this approach, which circumvents the Budget Control Act, is not fiscally responsible or honest accounting. It is time we come together as a Congress—before the short-term continuing resolution expires—to fulfill our responsibilities to the American people, especially our troops and their families, to fully fund our government by revising or eliminating the budget caps proposed by the BCA on both defense and nondefense spending.

In fact and indeed, if it were not for the OCO issue, I would have likely signed the conference report and voted for this bill. However, I believe this OCO issue is too important. The Secretary of Defense believes it is too important, the President believes it is too important, and he said he will veto this bill and any other bill that relies on this OCO gimmick. As Secretary of Defense Carter said last week:

> ''Without a negotiated budget solution in which everyone comes together at last, we will again return to sequestration-level funding, reducing discretionary funding to its lowest real level in a decade despite the fact that members of both parties agree this result will harm national security. . . . Making these kinds of indiscriminate cuts is managerially inefficient, and therefore wasteful, to taxpayers and industry. It's dangerous to our strategy, and frankly, it's embarrassing in front of the world.''

These are the words of the Secretary of Defense, echoing the comments that we have heard from uniformed military leaders about the inherent dangers of sequestration if it is allowed to continue forward.

The BCA was created by Congress to address the immediate threat of what would have been a catastrophic national default and to compel Congress to come together and reach a balanced compromise on the budget. It is time for Congress to make the hard choices, modify or eliminate the caps in the BCA, and end the threat of sequestration. It is not just an appropriations issue. It is affecting everything we do. Unfortunately, it affects the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act and therefore I will not be prepared to support this legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

PASSING APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Democrats have spent a lot of time lately talking about the importance of keeping the government open. Well, the Senate Republicans couldn't agree more. We know Congress has a responsibility to ensure that our Nation's priorities are funded, and we spent a lot of time this year working on that.

In May, we passed the first joint House-Senate balanced budget resolution in more than a decade, and by the end of July the Senate Appropriations Committee had approved all 12 appropriations bills for the first time since 2009. It was the first time in 6 years that the Senate Appropriations Committee approved all 12 of the appropriations bills, but there is one problem. For all their talk about providing for the government, apparently Democrats are reluctant to take any action when it comes to actually passing these bills through the Senate. Republicans tried to bring up the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill last week, but Democrats refused to allow the Senate to even consider it. We couldn't get on the bill. They blocked the motion to proceed to even get to debate that bill.

That is right. Senate Democrats, who spent weeks talking about funding the government, refused to allow the Senate to even debate a bill that would fund military construction, protect our homeland, and keep the promises we made to our veterans.

I might be able to understand Democrats' position if they had been shut out of the process on this legislation, but they weren't. The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill was debated in the Appropriations Committee, where Members of both parties were given an opportunity to offer amendments and to help shape the bill's contents. The bill passed out of the committee with an overwhelming bipartisan majority. If Democrats had allowed the bill to reach the floor, they would have had yet another opportunity to debate and amend the legislation, but the Senate Democrats wouldn't even let the bill come to the floor to be debated. They blocked the motion to proceed to the bill that would even allow us and allow them an opportunity to be heard and an opportunity to offer amendments.

Some Democrats have threatened to block the bill that we are currently considering this week, which is the National Defense Authorization Act, which again is a bicameral agreement that authorizes funding for our Nation's military and our national defense. This is the bill that ensures our soldiers receive the bonuses and the pay they have earned, that their equipment and training will be funded, and that our commanders will have the resources they need to confront the threats that are facing our Nation. Like the bill Democrats blocked last week, this legislation is the product of a bipartisan committee process, and it received bipartisan support when it came out of the committee. More than that, it received strong bipartisan support on the Senate floor when it first came up for consideration in June.

This bill, the National Defense Authorization Act, which funds our military's priorities, was reported out of the Senate Armed Services Committee—a big vote—it came to the floor of the Senate, received a big bipartisan vote in the Senate, but now some of the very same Democrats who supported this bill a little more than 3 months ago are planning to vote against it. On top of that, President Obama has threatened to veto this bill when it gets to his desk.

The question is, Why are Democrats opposing a bill that would authorize the funding our troops need to operate?

Historically the National Defense Authorization Act has received strong bipartisan support, and there is a good reason for that. Historically both Democrats and Republicans have known that we have a great responsibility to the men and women who keep us safe, and we have made a habit of working together to try and meet that responsibility.

Why are things different this year?

Well, basically Democrats have decided that since they can't get everything they want, they are going to take their ball and go home. Republicans knew Democrats were considering this, of course, but we had hoped that after months of successful collaboration, they would rethink that strategy because, as I said, all 12 appropriations bills were reported out of the Senate Appropriations Committee with bipartisan majorities, collaboration, input from both sides, amendments offered and amendments voted on, but unfortunately it has been clear over the past week that Senate Democrats and the President are committed to following through on their plans to obstruct these bills.

Their argument is that they want more money for this or for that, and they are not going to fund the military until they get more money for whatever their domestic priority is—whether it is more funding for the EPA or the IRS or some other agency of government. That is what this is about. It is somewhat staggering to think that some Senate Democrats would think of blocking the National Defense Authorization Act after supporting this bill in June. It is pretty hard to explain why one would think a bill is good one day and not the next. Let's just remind ourselves what they are voting to block and what the President is threatening to veto. The National Defense Authorization Act authorizes funding for our Nation's military and our national defense—from equipment and training for our soldiers to critical national security priorities, such as supporting our allies against Russian aggression overseas.

In my State of South Dakota, we are proud to host the 28th Bomb Wing at Ellsworth Air Force Base, one of the Nation's two B–1 bomber bases. The B–1s are a critical part of the U.S. bomber fleet, and bombers from the 28th Bomb Wing have played a key role in armed conflicts that the United States has engaged in over the past 20 years.

During Operation Odyssey Dawn, B–1s from Ellsworth launched from South Dakota, flew halfway around the world to Libya, dropped their bombs and returned home all in a single mission. This marked the first time in history that B–1s launched combat missions from the United States to strike targets overseas.

Without the National Defense Authorization Act, however, the funding levels needed in 2016 to maintain these bombers and the readiness of our airmen at Ellsworth will not be authorized. It is that simple. That is what is at stake with this bill.

If the President chooses to veto this legislation, he is vetoing the bill that authorizes benefits for our troops and the funding our military needs to operate. He is also vetoing authorization for the weapons, vehicles, and planes our military needs to defend our country against future threats, such as the Long Range Strike Bomber, which is one of the Air Force's top acquisition priorities, and it also represents the future of our bomber fleet.

By vetoing this bill, the President would also be vetoing a number of critical reforms that will expand the resources available to our military men and women and strengthen our national security.

For instance, this year's National Defense Authorization Act tackles waste and inefficiency at the Department of Defense. It targets $10 billion in unnecessary spending and redirects those funds to military priorities like funding for aircraft, weapons systems, and modernization of Navy vessels.

The bill also implements sweeping reforms to the military's outdated acquisitions process by removing bureaucracy and expediting decision-making which will significantly improve the military's ability to access the technology and equipment it needs.

The act also implements a number of reforms to the Pentagon's administrative functions. Over the past decade, Army headquarters staff has increased by 60 percent. Yet in recent years the Army has been cutting brigade combat teams. From 2001 to 2012, the Department of Defense's civilian workforce grew at five times the rate of our Active-Duty military personnel.

The Defense authorization bill we are considering changes the emphasis of the Department of Defense from administration to operations, which will help ensure that our military personnel receive the training they need and are ready to meet any threats that arise.

This bill also overhauls our military retirement system. The current military retirement system limits retirement benefits to soldiers who served for 20 years or more, which does not

apply to 83 percent of those who have served, including many veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The National Defense Authorization Act replaces that system with a modern retirement system that would extend retirement benefits to 75 percent of our servicemembers.

No time is a good time to veto funding for our Nation's troops. But with tensions in the world where they are, the decision by Senate Democrats and the President to block this funding authorization is particularly unconscionable.

As we speak, ISIS is carving a trail of slaughter across the Middle East, Russia is becoming increasingly aggressive, and Iran is continuing to fund terrorism. Thanks to Iran's nuclear deal, Iran will soon have access to increased funds and the ability to purchase more conventional weapons. That is right. While President Obama is threatening to veto a bill that funds our Armed Forces, he has agreed to a deal with Iran that gives Iran access to over $100 billion to fund terrorism and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard. That same flawed Iran deal waives the sanctions on Iranian leaders, including General Soleimani, who is responsible for the deaths of American soldiers in Iraq, yet the President is threatening to veto pay bonuses and improved military retirement benefits for our soldiers here at home.

The President's Iran deal also gives Hezbollah and Hamas more funding to spread terrorism, yet the President is threatening to veto additional resources for our allies to defeat ISIS as well as missile defense systems for our allies, including Israel. Right now, President Obama is threatening to veto funding for our advanced weapons systems for U.S. military forces, yet his nuclear agreement gives Iran access to conventional weapons, ballistic missiles, and advanced nuclear centrifuges.

Now, above all, in the wake of this flawed Iran deal and growing chaos in the Middle East, holding up funding for our troops by blocking this authorization bill is unacceptable.

While Senate Democrats and the President may have decided to pursue a strategy of obstruction, it is not too late for them to change their minds. They can still cast a vote in favor of funding for our military and our national security priorities. I hope that before this vote happens today, they will rethink their opposition and join Republicans in supporting this critical bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, when the Senate took up the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, I opposed it. I did not believe that the Senate had fully debated some of the most consequential provisions of the bill. But a majority of the Senate allowed that bill to move forward, and now we have a compromise before us that is a step even further backward.

The biggest but by no means only problem with this bill is, of course, the overseas contingency operations account, which has been turned into an escape hatch for defense spending over Budget Control Act caps. Those caps imposed by the Budget Control Act—across defense and nondefense spending—were intended to force Congress to the table to realistically address fiscal concerns. Today, those caps are hurting defense spending, though not nearly as much as they are devastating domestic spending.

Other problematic sections are related to Bush-era detainees kept at Guantanamo Bay. The new Guantanamo restrictions contained in this conference report are a needless barrier to efforts to finally shutter that detention facility. The bill would continue the unnecessary ban on constructing facilities within the United States to house Guantanamo detainees and the counterproductive prohibition on transferring detainees to the United States for detention or trial. Even more troubling, this year's NDAA would undo the important step taken by Congress in 2013 to streamline procedures for transferring detainees to foreign countries. Section 1034 of this year's bill would reimpose onerous, unnecessary, and unrealistic certification requirements that must be satisfied before transferring detainees to third countries—a step in exactly the wrong direction. Transfers should be accelerating, not slowing down.

As long as Guantanamo remains open, it will continue to serve as a recruitment tool for terrorists and tarnish America's historic role as a champion of human rights. Maintaining the detention facility at Guantanamo is also a tremendous waste of taxpayer dollars. We spend an astonishing amount at Guantanamo—a single detainee costs approximately $3.4 million per year to maintain—at a time when budgets are tight and that money is needed elsewhere; yet this conference report does not even include the cost-saving measure from the Senate bill that would allow detainees to be brought to the U.S. on a temporary basis for medical treatment. Closing Guantanamo is the morally and fiscally responsible thing to do, and I strongly oppose the unnecessary statutory restrictions in this conference report.

The concerns with this conference report do not end with Guantanamo Bay. Massive changes to our procurement system that will recreate stovepipes we eliminated with the Goldwater-Nichols reforms and adjustments to benefits given to men and women who serve and have served in order to pay our bills are just two examples. But what's not included is significant, too. There are several provisions related to the National Guard that enjoyed strong Senate support and yet were stripped in this so-called compromise, most inexplicably a provision I authored to better account for the requirements placed on the Guard. A similar provision was included in the House-passed bill. Rather than compromising between the two as the rules call for, both were simply dropped from the bill.

It is too bad that, in exchange for these controversial provisions, good policy will be left behind. This NDAA would have promoted the bipartisan National Guard State Partnership Program Enhancement Act to strengthen the State Partnership Program, which leverages unique National Guard capabilities and relationships to bolster our national security agenda around the world, at pennies on the dollar. This would have been a considerable improvement.

I want to recognize Senator MCCAIN's efforts to ensure that the conference report includes the McCain-Feinstein antitorture amendment. That provision would codify in statute the interrogation standards in the Army Field Manual—not just for military personnel, but for intelligence agents as well. Last year, Senator FEINSTEIN and the Senate Intelligence Committee exposed the CIA's horrific practices under the Bush administration. The McCain-Feinstein amendment is the next step toward ensuring that America never tortures again. If this bill does not become law, the Senate should take action to make the McCain-Feinstein amendment law this year.

Every year, the National Defense Authorization Act provides an opportunity for Congress to support our men and women in uniform and align our national security priorities with our fiscal obligations. This bill falls far short, and I cannot give it my support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair.

The issue before us is a conference committee report on the House Defense authorization bill. It is not the spending bill; it is the authorizing of spending. It is a bill that largely is bipartisan. There is no argument on either side of the aisle to support our troops, no argument against providing the technology and weaponry they need to keep themselves and Americans safe. The issue before us is a larger budget issue that goes even beyond the Department of Defense but certainly includes it, and that is, how are we going to fund our government?

The Republican approach is to put in $37 billion to $38 billion of made-up money. In other words, they take $37 billion or $38 billion of what is known as OCO funds, or war funds, and just assume it is there and put it in the budget for the Department of Defense only, but they don't put money in for nondefense agencies. So they adequately fund the Department of Defense—in fact, some say generously fund it—and

then cut back in the rest of government. What is the difference? What difference does it make?

The cutbacks include, on the nondefense side, medical research at the National Institutes of Health. The cuts include adequate resources for the Veterans' Administration to keep our promise to the men and women who have served us in the military. The cuts include keeping America safe when it comes to homeland security and the FBI. So they make cuts in all of these agencies but provide the funding for the Department of Defense.

We argue: Let's have some balance. We want to give our troops the very best treatment, but we certainly don't want to shortchange the other side of government—the nondefense side—and that is what the budget negotiations are all about.

So Republican after Republican comes to the floor and says the Democrats don't care about the military. That is not true; both sides care about the military. But there are other parts of our government that are important as well for the safety of the United States and the future of the United States. Whether it is education or medical research or caring for our veterans, let's have a balance in our budget that acknowledges that reality, and let's look at a couple other things that are realistic too.

How many people in America think we are suffering from not enough handguns on the streets of America? There are some who do. There is a provision in this bill which is no surprise to people who follow legislation on Capitol Hill. The gun lobby is always looking for a way to expand their universe of more guns in America. So they proposed, in the House of Representatives—the Congressman from Alabama proposed—that the military sell 100,000 .45-caliber semiautomatic handguns without any background checks on the purchasers. That was the proposal in the House—100,000 semiautomatic handguns without any background checks on the purchasers. Did they really do that? They did. It was in the bill. JACK REED, the Senator from Rhode Island who is the ranking Democrat, changed that provision and limited it from 100,000 to 10,000—10,000 handguns—and said they have to go through dealers so there will be a background check.

I raise that point because guns are in the news again. Guns are in the news every day. Each day 297 Americans are shot with firearms, and 89 lose their lives. We saw the terrible tragedy last week. I was stunned to hear on NPR over the weekend that what happened at Roseburg, OR, was the 45th school shooting in America this year—the 45th this year.

We have to do something about it. It is not going to be solved with this bill alone, but it will be solved if Democrats and Republicans start looking for reasonable ways to limit the access of guns from those who have a history of committing criminal felonies or a history of mental instability. I am glad the Senate conferees cleaned up the House provision that would have dumped 100,000 handguns into the hands of purchasers without any kind of background check. I still believe this bill goes too far when it comes to that gun issue.

I will close by saying this: We are all committed to the military and the defense of the United States. Many of us believe the agreement with Iran that precludes their development of a nuclear weapon will lead to a safer world. We are going to carefully monitor it, as we promised we would, for the sake not only of Israel but for all of the nations in the region, as well as the United States. We want to make this a safer world. We want to turn to diplomacy before we turn to a military response. I supported it, and I will continue to support it.

I hope, in the closing minutes of debate, that Members will reflect on the fact that we can have a better deal not only to help our military but to help those others who are funded by the nondefense side of the budget, to have some balance too, to make sure it isn't lopsided with the money all going to the Department of Defense without acknowledging precious needs of America in many other nondefense subjects.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I say with respect to the Senator from Illinois, he just authenticated an old saying: ''Talk is cheap.'' This is really one of the more remarkable performances by the other side.

We are talking about legislation that is vital to the welfare of the men and women who are serving in uniform, yet the Senator from Illinois says we shouldn't take care of them because he has another problem. That is a logic which defies anything I have observed in a long time.

This is an authorization bill. It has nothing to do with the appropriations process and the money that needs to be spent or not spent on any kind of mechanism.

The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nevada, the Democratic leader, keep talking about the fact that the budget passed by the Budget Committee by a majority vote here in the U.S. Senate calls for additional funding for defense. So now, in direct contravention to that, my friends on the other side of the aisle object to that provision in the Budget Act and will now oppose legislation that authorizes a pay raise for our troops, authorizes special pay and bonuses to support recruitment and retention, makes health care more affordable, increases access to urgent care for families, and knocks down bureaucratic obstacles to ensure servicemembers maintain access to the medicines they need as they transition from Active Duty.

There are literally tens if not hundreds of provisions that take care of the men and women who are serving in our military. So what do my friends on the other side say? Turn this down because they don't like the way it is funded. The fight is on the appropriations, my friends, not on the authorization that defends this Nation.

To do this kind of disservice to the men and women who are serving in uniform is a disgrace. Please don't say that you support the men and women in the military, come to this floor and say that, and then vote no on this legislation. Don't do it. Any objective observer will tell us that the provisions in this bill are for the benefit of the men and women who are serving in an all-volunteer force.

The Senator from Illinois wants a ''better deal.'' I want a better deal. I am tired of our providing funds for the military on a year-to-year ad hoc basis. I don't like it. I hate sequestration. I think sequestration risks doing permanent damage to our ability to face this Nation at a time when there are more crises in the world than at any time since World War II—when there is a flood of refugees, when the Chinese are moving into the Spratly Islands, endangering the world's most important avenue of commerce, while Vladimir Putin dismembers Russia. And my colleagues from the other side of the aisle are now complaining that they didn't like the way it was funded.

I will tell my colleagues, this is a remarkable time. So apparently the President of the United States—and we will talk about it later—who has just shown his remarkable leadership with the insertion of Russia into Syria, which he did not find out about from his meeting with Vladimir Putin of 90 minutes, and which his Secretary of State has said is an opportunity, and which his Secretary of Defense said was ''unprofessional''—they are now slaughtering—slaughtering—young men whom we trained outside of Syria and sent into Syria to fight against ISIS and Bashar Assad, and the Russians are dropping bombs on them. It is an incredible situation.

There has never been a greater need to authorize and fund our military—which is facing more challenges since the end of World War II—than today, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will urge a ''no'' vote. They will urge a ''no'' vote for the first time in 53 years on an overall—not a specific issue but on a broad issue of the budget. My friends want to turn down our authorization and our responsibilities to the men and women who are serving in the military.

I urge my colleagues to rethink their misguided logic. Attack the appropriations bill. Let's all sit down and try to negotiate an agreement that takes care of all of these other aspects of our government, but let's not do this to the men and women who are serving. Let's not prevent us from improving their quality of life. Let's not prevent them

from having a pay raise. Let's not prevent them from having the medical care they need. Let's not do these things in the name of a budgetary fight.

Mr. President, I urge an ''aye'' vote on the motion to invoke cloture and on adoption of the conference report when the time comes. I will be speaking a lot more about it between now, if we approve the cloture motion, and when we vote on the conference report.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

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 conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

John McCain, Bob Corker, John Hoeven, Ron Johnson, Dan Sullivan, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Joni Ernst, Deb Fischer, Tim Scott, Orrin G. Hatch, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Cory Gardner, Kelly Ayotte, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 73, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Ayotte	Flake	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cantwell	Heller	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Scott
Casey	Inhofe	Sessions
Cassidy	Isakson	Shaheen
Coats	Johnson	Shelby
Cochran	Kaine	Stabenow
Collins	King	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Tester
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	
Feinstein	Murkowski	

NAYS—26

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Leahy	Sanders
Brown	Manchin	Schatz
Cardin	Markey	Schumer
Carper	Merkley	Warren
Coons	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Nelson	Wyden
Franken	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). On this vote, the yeas are 73, the nays are 26.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Texas.

CALLING FOR APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL COUNSEL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to spend a few minutes speaking about a topic we should all be able to agree on, even in this polarized environment in which we live and work, and that is the idea that transparency and accountability are key to good governance. Transparency and accountability are key to good governance.

Open government is a prerequisite for a free society, one in which the legitimacy of government itself depends upon consent of the governed. In fact, we can't consent on something we don't know anything about. My colleagues get my point.

As our Founding Fathers recognized, a truly democratic system depends on an informed citizenry so they can hold their leaders accountable at elections and between elections. But the American people cannot do that without transparency. Justice Brandeis famously said that sunlight is the best disinfectant, and he is right. That is why Congress has enacted numerous pieces of legislation that have promoted accountability and transparency in government so that good governance can hopefully flourish.

This is a bipartisan issue. When I came to the Senate, I found a willing partner in Senator PATRICK LEAHY from Vermont. Senator LEAHY and I are polar opposites when it comes to our politics, but on matters of open government and freedom of information, we have worked closely together on a number of pieces of legislation. As we both have said, when a Democratic President is in charge or a Republican President is in charge, the first instinct is to try to hide or minimize bad news and to maximize the good news. That is human nature. We all get that. But the American people are entitled to know what their government is doing on their behalf, whether it is good, bad, or ugly.

So I have made transparency a priority of mine, and I have pressed for more openness in the Federal Government through commonsense legislation. One of those bills was the Freedom of Information Improvement Act, which would strengthen existing measures found in the Freedom of Information Act that was first signed by a Texas President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. The Judiciary Committee passed that bill in February by a voice vote, and I look forward to it passing in the Senate soon.

But even the very best laws with the very best intentions can be undermined by those who are willing to ignore or even abuse them. More than 6 years ago, President Obama promised the American people that transparency and the rule of law will be the touchstone of this Presidency. He said, ''Transparency and the rule of law will be the touchstones of this presidency.'' Needless to say, his record has been a disappointment because it certainly doesn't meet the description of transparency and adherence to and fidelity to the rule of law.

For example, when an estimated 1,400 weapons were somehow lost by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms in Mexico, with one of them—actually two of them—eventually linked to the murder of a U.S. Border Patrol agent, the Obama administration stonewalled congressional investigations. This was the Fast and Furious debacle. As a matter of fact, the Attorney General—then Eric Holder—refused to comply with a valid subpoena issued by Congress so we could find out about it, so we could figure out where things went wrong and how we could fix them so they didn't happen again. Former Attorney General Eric Holder, rather than comply with Congress's legitimate oversight request, refused and was thus the first Attorney General, to my knowledge, to be held in contempt of Congress—in contempt of Congress. Then, of course, there are the IRS and ObamaCare—instances in which this administration has either refused to testify to Congress or failed to answer our most basic questions.

This administration has been equally dismissive of the press, who are also protected—freedom of the press under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution—leading dozens of journalists to send a letter to the President asking him to end this administration's ''politically driven suppression of news and information about Federal agencies.'' That is really remarkable.

So we can see the American people have been stiff-armed by this administration, and they have become increasingly distrustful of their own government. That is because secrecy provides an environment in which corruption can and does fester. In fact, according to a recent poll, 75 percent of Americans who responded believe there is widespread corruption in the U.S. Government. Seventy-five percent believe that. That is a shocking statistic and one that ought to shock us back to reality to try to understand what their concerns are and what we can do to address them because that is simply inconsistent with this idea of self-government, where 75 percent of the respondents to a poll think the fix is in, and the government is neither accountable nor adhering to the rule of law.

It was back in March that the public first learned that a former member of this administration, Secretary Clinton, used a private, unsecured server during her tenure as Secretary of State. It was just last Wednesday that the State Department announced the release of even more documents from Secretary Clinton's private email server. This ongoing scandal has been but the latest example of this administration's pattern of avoiding accountability and skirting the law. I will explain in just a few minutes why this is so significant and why this isn't something that ought to be just brushed under the rug and ignored.

Secretary Clinton's unprecedented scheme was intentional. It wasn't an accident. It wasn't negligence. She did it on purpose. It was by design. Her design was to shield her official communications—communications that under Federal law belong to the government and to the people, not her. I can't see any other way to explain it. It was deliberate. It was intentional. It was designed to avoid the kind of accountability I have been talking about today. There is just no other way to look at it.

Because her emails were held on this private server, the State Department was in violation of the legal mandates of the Freedom of Information Act for 6 years, and it is only now, through Freedom of Information Act litigation and more than 30 different lawsuits, that the public is finally learning what it was always entitled to know, or at least part of it. By the way, that is the power of the Freedom of Information Act and why it is so important. You can go to court and seek a court order to force people to do what they should have done in the first instance so the public can be informed about what their government is doing.

Secretary Clinton's use of a private, unsecured server as a member of the Obama Cabinet is also a major national security concern. We have learned that classified information was kept on and transmitted through this server. According to the latest reports, the newest batch of documents released just last week have doubled the amount of emails that contain classified information. News outlets are reporting that there are more than 400 classified emails on the server, and that is just the report so far.

It is no coincidence that along with this news, the media has also reported that Russian-linked hackers attempted at least five times to break into Secretary Clinton's email account. That should make obvious to her and to everyone else the vulnerabilities that exist for a private, unsecured email server, one used by a Cabinet member in communicating with other high-level government officials, including people in the intelligence community. This is absolutely reckless.

This Chamber is aware—we are painfully aware from the news—that cyber threats are all too prevalent today. It seems every week we read a new story about different cyber attacks, cyber theft, cyber espionage against our own country. This last summer we discussed at length the data breaches that occurred at the Office of Personnel Management. People who had actually sought and obtained security clearances so they could handle and learn classified material—that information was hacked and made available to some of our adversaries. Then, of course, there is the information we all learned about the IRS being hacked as well. The personal information contained in those two hacks alone covered millions of Americans.

At a time when our adversaries are trying to steal sensitive national security information, especially classified information, I find it incredibly irresponsible for Secretary Clinton or anyone else to invite this kind of risk and to conduct routine, daily business on behalf of our Nation over a private, unsecured email server. I find it even more egregious that she or her senior aides would send classified information over this same server.

I am not the only one who believes Secretary Clinton compromised our national security by doing this. Just last month, before the Senate Select Intelligence Committee, the current Director of the National Security Agency, ADM Mike Rogers, who also serves as commander of U.S. Cyber Command, said conducting official business on a private server would ''represent an opportunity'' for foreign intelligence operatives. In other words, foreign intelligence services would relish the opportunity to penetrate the private server of a high-profile leader such as Secretary Clinton or any other Secretary of State who, once again, is a member of the President's Cabinet, his closest advisers.

Some hackers clearly noticed this opportunity and tried to take advantage of it, and we don't know—perhaps we never will know—the extent to which that national security information, that classified information was compromised.

We need to come to terms with the fact that due to Secretary Clinton's bad judgment, it is probable that every email she sent or received while Secretary of State, including highly classified information, has been read by intelligence agents of nations such as China and Russia who we know are regularly trying to hack into our secure data and to learn our secrets or to steal our designs and to replicate those by violating our commercial laws. So this email scandal is more than just bad judgment; it represents a real danger to our Nation.

I am sorry to say, but it is true, that Secretary Clinton's actions may well have violated a number of criminal laws. Under the circumstances, the appointment of a special counsel by the Justice Department is necessary to supervise the investigation and ensure the American people that investigation gets down to the bottom line and we follow the facts wherever they may lead.

As I made clear in a recent letter to Attorney General Loretta Lynch, the Department of Justice regulations themselves provide for the appointment of a special counsel if there is potential for criminal wrongdoing and if there is a conflict of interest at the Department of Justice or if extraordinary circumstances warrant the appointment.

Let me start by explaining which criminal statutes Secretary Clinton may have violated.

Federal law makes it a crime to retain classified information without authorization.

> Whoever, being an officer . . . of the United States . . . knowingly removes [classified] documents or materials without authority and with the intent to retain such documents or materials at an unauthorized location shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

That is 18 USC, section 1924.

We know from media reports that Secretary Clinton retained classified documents on her server. According to those reports, more than 5 percent of the latest emails released by the State Department contained classified information. So we need a thorough, unbiased, impartial investigation to determine how those documents made it to Secretary Clinton's unsecured server and whether she knew that was happening. A special counsel would be the best person and in the best position to do just that.

While Secretary Clinton may argue—which I heard her argue on news reports—that none of this information was marked ''classified'' when it was emailed to her, under the Espionage Act, that is irrelevant even if true, and I certainly doubt that is the case. According to the act, it is a crime to deliver national defense information to unauthorized individuals. At 18 USC, subsection 793(d), it states that ''whoever, lawfully having possession of . . . any document . . . or note relating to the national defense . . . willfully communicates, delivers, transmits . . . the same to any person not entitled

to receive it . . . [s]hall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.''

So you can see this is serious. This is serious stuff and deserves to be treated with that same requisite seriousness, and that is again why it is so important to have an impartial investigation.

We know, for example, that information on North Korea's nuclear program was in Secretary Clinton's emails. I was recently with some of my colleagues at Pacific Command, and Admiral Harris, a four-star admiral, the head of Pacific Command, said that on his list of security threats confronting his region of the world, North Korea is at the top. It has nuclear weapons, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and it has a leader who is capable of doing just about anything he could imagine. It is a very dangerous situation and a very serious national security issue. Yet Secretary Clinton was communicating information or had communicated to her on her private email server information about North Korea's threat. We don't know whether that information was among the 200 classified emails released by the State Department last week. We know her lawyers and perhaps others reviewed every email on her server before turning them over to the State Department. We don't know who reviewed them, whether they had a proper clearance, whether they were actually entitled to see classified information, and that is why a special counsel would be important to answer that question too.

Under the Espionage Act, we see that it is a crime to remove national defense documents or permit them to be stolen. Here is a summary of the statute: ''Whoever, being entrusted with . . . any document . . . relating to the national defense . . . through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody . . . or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed . . . shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.''

Now we know that the server was not held in a proper place of custody, and we know from the testimony of experts in the intelligence community that the likelihood that something was removed from Secretary Clinton's server by foreign hackers is high. Last week, as I said moments ago, news outlets reported that they were certainly trying. So a special counsel could answer this question and determine whether this statute was violated and how it should be enforced if it was violated.

What greater example of gross negligence is there than for a high government official, such as the Secretary of State of the United States of America, a member of the President's Cabinet, to communicate all business on a private, unsecured server when it is likely—and maybe more than just likely—it is almost certain that sensitive national defense information would pass through it?

We simply don't know what other laws may have been broken or whether there are other explanations that Secretary Clinton might have that might shed some light on this. But this is certainly why a special counsel should be appointed. And I would say that if Secretary Clinton and the Obama administration are confident that no laws have been broken, then why wouldn't they embrace the appointment of a special counsel?

I would point out that in another case, the President's own Department of Justice has aggressively pursued the mishandling of classified information in the past. So my simple request in calling for a special counsel is that the same rules apply to Secretary Clinton.

The Department's clear conflicts of interest in this case and the extraordinary circumstances surrounding it could not be more obvious. As a high-level official in the administration for 4 years, Secretary Clinton is clearly allied with the administration. As a former First Lady and a U.S. Senator, Secretary Clinton has a deep professional and personal relationship with the administration, including the President's choice for Attorney General, Loretta Lynch. I would think Ms. Lynch, the Attorney General, would want the sort of integrity and proper appearance that would occur by appointment of special counsel rather than have it look as if she has simply sat on this information and not conducted a thorough investigation herself.

I am simply calling for that kind of investigation. As somebody who spent 17 years of my life as a State court judge and attorney general, I believe that sort of investigation is entirely warranted. Of course, some of my Democratic colleagues—including the Senators from Vermont and California—have already claimed that this call for a special counsel is some sort of political stunt. The senior Senator from California was quick to say that calls for a special counsel are purely political and completely unnecessary and would amount to wasting taxpayer dollars. Well, I would like to point out to both Senators from Vermont and California that each of them on more than one occasion has called for a special counsel in the past. Surely I don't think they would characterize their own call for a special counsel in the same terms that the current call for a special counsel is described.

While serving as Senators, the President of the United States, Barack Obama, and former Secretary Hillary Clinton, while both of them were Senators, called for the appointment of a special counsel.

All of that is to say that requesting an appointment of a special counsel is not uncommon, and it is clearly warranted in this case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the response from the Justice Department to my letter requesting a special counsel be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2015.

Hon. JOHN CORNYN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CORNYN: This responds to your letter to the Attorney General dated September 15, 2015, requesting that a Special Counsel be appointed to investigate the use of a private e-mail server by former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

The Special Counsel regulations, 28 C.F.R. § 6001, which were issued as a replacement for the former Independent Counsel Act, provide that in the discretion of the Attorney General, a Special Counsel may be appointed when an investigation or prosecution by the Department of Justice (the Department) would create a potential conflict of interest, or in other extraordinary circumstances in which the public interest would be served by such an appointment. This authority has rarely been exercised.

As you know, the Department has received a security referral related to the potential compromise of classified information. Any investigation related to this referral will be conducted by law enforcement professionals and career attorneys in accordance with established Department policies and procedures, which are designed to ensure the integrity of all ongoing investigations.

We hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may provide additional assistance regarding this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

PETER J. KADZIK,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would just say that for those who are interested in reading the response—interestingly, I didn't get a response from the Attorney General, to whom I addressed the letter; I got a response from the Assistant Attorney General. I read it over and over and over again, and it doesn't agree to the appointment of a special counsel and it doesn't refuse to appoint a special counsel. In other words, it is a non-answer to the question. I don't know what reason the Attorney General or the Department of Justice might have for leaving this open-ended and not actually declining at this time to appoint a special counsel, if that is their conclusion, but they simply didn't answer the question.

I would just say in conclusion that my constituents in Texas sent me here to serve as a check on the executive branch, and I am going to continue to press the Attorney General and the rest of the administration for answers because the American people deserve the sort of accountability and, indeed, in the end, justice that need to be delivered in this case—not a sweep under the rug, not a playing out the clock until the end of the administration, but answers that can only come from an independent investigation conducted by a special counsel.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy until about 3:40 p.m. with Democrats and Republicans who are going to

show up here—I think Senator VITTER, Senator INHOFE, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator MANCHIN, and we may have others who will be here.

I see my good friend Senator INHOFE is here.

Senator INHOFE, we are now beginning. And Senator WHITEHOUSE is here. So if the Senator would like to jump in with his statement, that would be great at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the unanimous consent request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you very much.

TSCA REFORM

Mr. President, let me first mention that you don't see many things around this Chamber that are truly bipartisan, and you are about to see one now.

I have to give credit to the Senator from New Mexico for the great job he has done in making it a possibility to even be talking about this now. I am honored to be chairman of the public works committee. We do a lot of significant work in that committee. We just passed out arguably the second most significant bill of the year, which was the highway reauthorization bill, and others. It is a very busy committee. However, the issue we are concerned about today—and I want to talk about it a little bit—is the bill we have been working on for a long period of time.

We had a great Member—Frank Lautenberg—of the Senate for a number of years. He and I became good friends on this committee when Democrats were for 8 years the majority party, and prior to that we were in the majority for a long time. During that timeframe, Frank Lautenberg and I became good friends. We had some things in common people were not aware of; that is, we both came from the corporate world. We were involved in doing things together and looking at things through a corporate mind.

But this bill we are talking about now is one where we are enjoying 60 cosponsors.

I would mention that Bonnie Lautenberg is in the Gallery today. She has been so cooperative. If you can single out one legacy of the great Frank Lautenberg, it would be this bill. I can remember calling Bonnie and asking if she would be willing to come and testify before the committee—this was some time ago—and she was more enthusiastic than I expected she would be, and she has been a big help.

It is great to see so many of my colleagues excited about TSCA reform and specifically the Lautenberg bill, which now has overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle. For a long time, we have been focused—and rightfully so—on the public health and environmental benefits of reforming this 39-year-old failed law. I know a lot of my friends across the aisle who are here will continue talking about that today, so I wanted to take my time on the floor to tell them some of the benefits of TSCA reform that they might not be aware of, from a Republican perspective.

TSCA reform, in addition to providing greater protections for families in my State of Oklahoma and the rest of the country, can play a pivotal role in boosting our economy, creating well-paying American jobs, and creating regulatory certainty for businesses not only in the United States but across the world.

Today, the U.S. chemical industry is experiencing a resurgence. Nobody had ever predicted it. For years, chemical manufacturing has been moving its way out of this country, relocating in places such as China, Saudi Arabia, and South America. One of the reasons for this is that we have this antiquated law on the books that made it very difficult for them to operate in the United States. So we kind of got used to this. Everyone was leaving the United States because of that. Now they are coming back. The interesting thing is, there are two reasons that I am going to mention to you in a minute for why they are coming back and what it means to us economically.

In the last few years, one thing has completely flipped the idea on its head that we are not going to be able to change the laws that are regulating the chemical industry. Natural gas liquids are the primary feedstock for chemical manufacturing in the United States. Due to the shale boom or the shale revolution—we are very sensitive to that in my State of Oklahoma—natural gas production from companies such as Continental Resources, Devon, Chesapeake Energy—all in my home State of Oklahoma—manufacturers have an abundant and reliable source of natural gas for decades to come.

This provides the stability and certainty that manufacturers need to once again make major investments in the United States. There is no better example of an industry reinvesting in this country because of our energy revolution than the chemical industry. As of this June, the chemical industry has announced 238 investment projects valued at $145 billion. Let me repeat that: $145 billion in new capital investments in the United States of America by the chemical industry in large part due to American natural gas production.

This investment is predicted to be responsible for over 700,000 new jobs along with $293 billion in permanent new domestic economic output by 2023. The benefits don't stop there. This investment is also predicted to lead to $21 billion in new Federal, State, and local tax revenue in the next 8 years and will lower our trade deficit by increasing our exports by nearly $30 billion by 2030.

Right now the U.S. chemical industry is capturing market share from around the world, and all of those facilities that packed up and moved to China, moved to the Middle East, and moved to Western Europe are rushing back. You don't have to look any further than comments by folks such as Antonio Tajani, the European Commissioner for Industry, who said:

> When people choose whether to invest in Europe or the United States, what they think about most is the cost of energy. The loss of competitiveness is frightening.

In North America as a whole, chemicals and plastics production is predicted to double in the next 5 years, while it falls by one-third in Europe. In other words, it will go down by one-third in Europe. At the same time, it doubles in the next 5 years in the United States. Some of you may be wondering what this has to do with TSCA reform because I am talking about the cheaper prices of energy. The main stock for chemicals is natural gas.

Specifically, the Lautenberg bill, what we are talking about today—let me tell you, passing this bill and getting TSCA reform signed into law not only provides these domestic industries with one manageable national rule book so products can be manufactured and distributed in all 50 States consistently, it also provides necessary regulatory certainty, the lack of which could be the one thing to drive away this much needed economic investment.

Moreover, today global chemical manufacturing and use, in the absence of a coherent and functioning U.S. chemical policy, is dominated by the European system called REACH. I will not get into much detail about the European regulatory system, but it is significantly more burdensome and costly than many of our businesses can afford to deal with.

Unfortunately, today it is the global standard. By enacting meaningful U.S. chemical policy, our Nation will be on the path to once again be the world leader, not only in chemical manufacturing or manufacturing in general but to set the global standard in how chemicals should be managed. That is what we are talking about. That is what this is all about. So there are two things that are bringing this industry back to the United States. One is our plentiful and cheap natural gas and the other is this legislation.

Imagine people anticipating that the legislation is going to pass and making corporate decisions bringing back many jobs to the United States. So there is going to be a surge in economic benefit, and consequently right now the price of natural gas, the main feedstock that goes into chemical manufacturing, is far cheaper in this country than it is in Europe.

So I say to my good friend who has carried this ball, Senator UDALL, that it is great that those two things are happening at the same time. Again, when I looked around at the press conference we had this morning—and we saw everyone ranging from the most liberal Democrats and the most conservative Republicans. That does not happen very often in Washington, DC. I think a lot of it is due to my good friend from New Mexico, along with

Senator VITTER, who has been carrying this ball.

I would vacate the floor and ask for any comments.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I thank Chairman INHOFE very much. I thank him for his leadership. He is the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I remember we came early on—Senator VITTER and myself—to him, and said: We have been working on this bill a couple of years. We think it is ready to go, but obviously it has to go through your committee.

The Senator worked with us all the way along the line. A lot of this has to do with his leadership and helping us with—amending it in a way to keep making it bipartisan. That has been the history of this bill; that it has grown. As we know, it passed his committee 15 to 5.

I say to Chairman INHOFE, our next speaker, Senator WHITEHOUSE, who is on your committee, was able to work with you and three other members of the Environment and Public Works Committee to get the bill in shape so we could then get it ready for the floor. Working with you, we have made a few additional tweaks and things, but I think it is ready to go; don't you?

Mr. INHOFE. If the Senator will yield, I would observe the number of people who said—when the bill first started out, there was a lot of opposition. There was opposition in our committee. I think a lot of the people on the committee were surprised when we passed it on a bipartisan basis. Then, of course, once it got down to the floor—this is going to have support from all corners.

Again, yes, it was a bipartisan effort. It is kind of rewarding to have that happen now and then. This is a good example.

Mr. UDALL. This is a great example. Thank you so much. Once again, we could not have done this without your leadership, your chairmanship of the Environment and Public Works Committee. You helped us shape this and helped us move in a bipartisan way.

I am going to next ask Senator WHITEHOUSE to talk a little bit because Senator WHITEHOUSE has the ability—the experience of a State official, a former State attorney general.

He took a look at this bill. It was ready to go in front of the Environment and Public Works Committee. He looked at it as a former AG. He looked at it in terms of the States being able to participate on enforcement and was able to help us craft a bill that could get out of committee 15 to 5.

Senator WHITEHOUSE, we appreciate your help and your hard work on this. You did an amazing job. Any thoughts, comments? Is this something the Senate can take up and get done, in terms of where we have it right now?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I would answer my colleague's question by saying that I think we are very definitely ready to go. We are particularly ready to go because of Senator UDALL's achievement in securing the 60th vote, a filibuster-proof majority who are on this bill as cosponsors. That does not count people who are willing to vote for it. I think we always had 60 people voting for it, but to have 60 people willing to cosponsor it so it is clear from the get-go that if this bill is called up, it will get through.

I think that is very important. There was some dispute on the Environment and Public Works Committee. We had a very lively hearing. I think the impact of that hearing caused people to go back and say: We really do need to improve this bill in some way. I commend Senator MERKLEY and Senator BOOKER for joining me in I guess a little mini ''Gang of 3'' to pull the bill to a place where we would all support it in the committee. That is part of how it got to 15 and 5.

I think, since then, what Senator UDALL has been able to accomplish is some of those 5 have now come over to join the 15. So to say that it is a 15-to-5 EPW committee-supported bill actually understates this support because of Senator UDALL's continued work.

There is one issue on which I want to make a particular point because I know both Senator UDALL and I have served as attorney general of our States. We take this question of a sovereign State's ability to defend its own citizens very seriously. We both were attorneys general. We had the responsibility to very often lead for the State those public protection efforts.

So we wanted to be very careful about making sure there was a significant role for the States in this bill to look out for the health and the safety of their citizens. What we came up with is a provision that I believe tracks very closely with the constitutional provisions that govern this. A State is restricted from taking action here if it would unduly burden interstate commerce. Well, that is a statutory restriction. But guess what. As Senator UDALL knows, that is also the constitutional restriction under the so-called dormant commerce clause. So we were not going to be able to move much further than that anyway. That is essentially the commerce clause written into legislative text.

The next is if the action by the State would violate a Federal law or regulation. There is another part of the Constitution called the supremacy clause, which says that when Congress has made a decision, the States cannot overturn it. Once again, the restriction that we have on States coming to protect their citizens mirrors and matches a restriction that exists in the Constitution.

The last piece says that if a State is going to regulate in this area, it has to be based on peer-reviewed science. There is a third clause in the Constitution called the due process clause. Under the due process clause, the regulatory agency cannot just willy-nilly regulate. If it does, its regulation can be challenged as being arbitrary and capricious. In order to meet the challenge that it is arbitrary and capricious, it has to be based on a sound factual foundation.

Here in the realm of science, that foundation is peer-reviewed scientific evidence. So as a former attorney general working with a former attorney general, I think we are confident that where this bill is now gives our colleague attorneys general the ability to have a very strong case to be made that they still have the authority to take action where their State has a real problem and people's health and safety is suffering and somebody needs to act, even if somebody at EPW will not.

I will close by saying this. This has been an education in legislating for me. I came out of being a prosecutor, I came out of being an executive official, I came out of being a staff person for a Governor, and I came out of being a practicing lawyer. But watching Senator UDALL work has been instructive because—he will not say but I am prepared to say that he cosponsored this bill at a time when he did not like it. I think he cosponsored this bill at a time when what he saw was not that ''this is the bill I am going to go with,'' but he saw that we need to fix TSCA, we need to have a bipartisan solution to this, and ''if it takes me signing up for a bill I don't like as the opener to begin building that consensus''—that went first with TOM, then with Senator CARPER coming on, then with our MERKLEY-BOOKER-WHITEHOUSE contingent, and now most recently with Senators DURBIN and MARKEY joining us—he has been the thread that has made all of that possible.

I wish to close by expressing a personal appreciation to him for hanging in there—particularly through that early period when there was not a lot of support for this in our caucus—and working with us and Senator INHOFE and Senator VITTER to build the coalition that has today made 60-plus cosponsors possible.

Congratulations to Senator UDALL, and I thank him for letting me say a few words.

Mr. UDALL. I say to Senator WHITEHOUSE, thank you so much.

I just want to say about Senator WHITEHOUSE—I mean, this bill would not be where it is today had we not had that trio working in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I really believe that. They took the bill that was coming up, we had a hearing on it, and they really analyzed it and applied all the principles Senator WHITEHOUSE and I have both talked about, and they came up with a very significant improvement. We are here today because of his hard work.

I have been very open. I think Senator VITTER, who will join us in a minute, has been very open. Both of us said: Give us your ideas, give us your input, and we are going to take a look at it. We got technical advice from the

EPA and asked, ''Will this work?'' because they are over there running this bureau.

So the Senator should feel very good about moving it down the field to the point where we are today.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. My only caution going forward is that, for all the wonderful work that has been done by Senator VITTER and Senator UDALL to pull us together, for all the support that has been reached here, this is still a fairly delicate compromise. We first have to figure out and solve the procedural blockages that are preventing this from going through this Chamber.

I would suggest that the majority party ought to be supporting the passage of legislation that is led by the majority party. It is the minority party's role to throw up objections and to make demands against legislation proceeding. So maybe not everybody on the other side is completely taken aboard, but they are in the majority now. So I think those blocks will be cleared and we will have the chance to go forward. But then we have to do something with the House. Either they have to pass something or they have to pass this or we end up in conference. I think it is important that the record of this bill reflect that there is not a whole lot of wiggle room here for mischief to be accomplished between the House and the Senate.

My confidence is that—I really do think the industry supports this bill. They have worked with us, they have worked with you, and so I don't think there is a huge incentive for mischief, but I think we do have to be on our guard that the spirit, the structure, and the key points of this piece are preserved in anything that goes forward because otherwise we will be back where we started, with everybody back in their seats again.

Mr. UDALL. I say to Senator WHITEHOUSE, I couldn't agree more. I think those are the delicate phases we have to go through.

What we have been telling our House colleagues all along is we have worked long and hard on this, we have been more comprehensive than they have, and so we need their patience to work through it with us. There is not a lot of room. I couldn't agree with you more that that is where we are today.

I have good relationships in the House. I served there 10 years. FRED UPTON, JOHN SHIMKUS, and FRANK PALLONE are all willing to work with us. I believe that if we look at what our goal is—to protect the American public and to protect vulnerable populations—we can get this done.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. While we have the floor and until Senator VITTER comes, might it be a good time to say a kind word about our staffs?

Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I know that during our process, our staff worked enormously hard, and the Senator's has been at this for a longer time than just that intense period of negotiation where we moved the bill in our section, so I defer to the Senator to make those comments. I would applaud the Senator's staff and Senator VITTER's, who have been doing a terrific job.

Mr. UDALL. I couldn't agree with the Senator more.

I also wish to talk a little bit about Senator Frank Lautenberg. I have a picture here of him with his grandchildren.

But let me first say, Senator WHITEHOUSE, did you wish to mention your staff member who worked on it, who I know spent time with Jonathan Black and with the whole team? We have a great team of staff members who are very goal-oriented and who want to get things accomplished.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. My team was led by Emily Enderle, who leads my environmental team. She has terrific credibility in the environmental community, and she knows these laws very well, but even with that it was an enormously complicated task. This was a big bill. I forget the number of changes we actually put into it in the course of that negotiation, but it was 20, 22. It was a large array of changes, so it was a lot of work in a short period of time. Emily, the Senator's staff, and everybody who was involved in that really dove in and worked hard in the best traditions of good staff work in the Senate with the intention to get to ''yes.''

Mr. UDALL. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE. I very much appreciate his comments here today and especially appreciate his participation in terms of moving this forward in a bipartisan way.

I worked with my staff diligently on this bill. I was lucky to have a chief of staff by the name of Mike Collins who spent many hours working on this. My legislative director, Andrew Wallace—Drew Wallace—worked on this. He is a lawyer by training. Jonathan Black was the legislative assistant in the main policy area. He has been with this bill all along, and he is very even-handed and very good at dealing with the other staff members in getting people to focus on the goal and not get into the arguments and not get sidetracked.

I think this is true of the staff on the Republican side and the staff on the Democratic side. We have had tremendous support, and I expect that to go forward when we start. Indeed, if we can get floor time and get this out—and I believe the bill is ready to go—I think we have the kind of staff effort in the House and the Senate that can resolve most of the major differences without too many problems. So that is what we are looking forward to.

As I said earlier, I would like to say a few words about Senator Frank Lautenberg. This is a picture of Senator Lautenberg and his grandchildren. I served on the Environment and Public Works Committee with Senator Lautenberg for a number of years, and there couldn't have been anything he was more passionate about than his grandchildren. You saw that in his public work.

Before I got onto the committee, Senator Lautenberg was a champion in terms of smoking and indoor smoking and tobacco smoke hurting people and passed some significant legislation. So it was particularly moving to me to hear him say—when he got on this compromise bill with Senator VITTER, he said he thought that bill, the Lautenberg-Vitter bill, would save more lives than all the work he had done in the public health and environmental arena. I know he said that to Bonnie Lautenberg. And that really hit all of us. He saw the legislation, he saw how it was going to evolve, and he really believed this would make a difference.

I saw that in Senator Lautenberg over and over again on the committee. Whenever an issue would come up—it didn't matter what issue it was—he always came back to his grandchildren: Are we doing the right thing by our children? So if we were looking at a infrastructure issue and the question was ''How do we frame the best possible infrastructure package?'' he was looking out a couple of generations in the future and saying ''Are we going to pass on a better infrastructure system so we can grow jobs and do those kinds of things?'' He had passion about it, and he brought up his grandchildren on a frequent basis.

We all miss him very much, and we have named this bill after him. This bill is the Frank Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act. Everybody is going to know how it started because he was one who believed in fighting for the very best, but he always believed in compromise.

I will never forget when Senator Lautenberg had what I would call the perfect bill—I guess that is the best way to describe it—and he was able to pass it through the Environment and Public Works Committee, but it passed without a single Republican vote. When it passes out of committee, it is now ready for floor time. But everybody realized that without any Republicans on the bill, it wasn't going to go anywhere. So leadership said: You know, you better go back to square one. You can't get this out of the Senate the way it is currently crafted.

To Senator Lautenberg's credit, he then took the opportunity to visit—I believe Senator MANCHIN was involved with this in terms of them going together, and they started talking and saying: Maybe we can come up with something which is bipartisan and which can attract people from both sides. And that was the original Lautenberg-Vitter bill that was introduced. This is one of the interesting things: It immediately had 24 cosponsors—12 Republicans and 12 Democrats. I was one of those cosponsors. I think that was due to the very good staff work—he had some great people on his staff—but it was also due to his meeting of the minds with Senator VITTER, coming together, and finding that common ground.

I will never forget that on that bill, the New York Times came out almost immediately—they had huge respect for Senator Lautenberg, and they said: You know, this is much better than current law. Congress ought to pass this. Of course, it needs a couple of changes—and I think they mentioned three things in their editorial. We eventually made those three changes they were talking about. But that just shows the respect Senator Lautenberg had. He was able to work with everyone, he was able to convey to the media what he was trying to do, and he had tremendous support for engaging the other side.

One of the things that has helped us come such a long way is—we lost Frank, and then I joined with Senator VITTER on the bill. We lost Frank, but we haven't lost Bonnie, his widow. Bonnie Lautenberg has been in this from the very beginning, wanting to see this bill become law and wanting to see that her children and grandchildren are protected. I remember very well the speech she gave on the floor of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Senator INHOFE was very generous in terms of saying: If Senator Lautenberg's wife, Bonnie Lautenberg, wants to come and testify on the bill, we are going to put her right up front.

She spoke very eloquently at the EPW Committee earlier this year:

> Frank understood that getting this done required the art of compromise. . . . This cause is urgent, because we are living in a toxic world. Chemicals are rampant in the fabrics we and our children sleep in and wear, the rugs and products in our homes and in the larger environment we live in. How many family members and friends have we lost to cancer? We deserve a system that requires screening of all chemicals to see if they cause cancer or other health problems. How many more people must we lose before we realize that having protections in just a few states isn't good enough? We need a federal program that protects every person in this country.

That was Bonnie Lautenberg testifying before the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Earlier today, we also had a large number of groups, which I will talk about in a little bit, and Bonnie Lautenberg came down once again and spoke eloquently about the need to get this done for our children and to have a tough cop on the beat who is going to look out there, analyze these chemicals, and try to do the right thing when it comes to that regulatory effort—at the same time, as Senator INHOFE said, working with the business community.

It has been great having Bonnie Lautenberg work with us. I know she feels so passionate about this, she picks up the phone from home and calls Senators and says: The bill is at this particular point. We need your help. Will you take a look at it, and get with your staff?

She has been quite an advocate in terms of moving this legislation along.

Now, I just want to say a little bit about what happened earlier today because it was really a remarkable experience to see the coming together of Democrats and Republicans and for us to finally reach the 60 votes we need in order to break a filibuster and get the bill on the floor. We had a variety of groups represented from the public health and environmental side. There was my good friend Fred Krupp from the Environmental Defense Fund, Collin O'Mara from the National Wildlife Federation, and then we had representatives from the March of Dimes, the Humane Society, the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, Moms Clean Air Force, and other groups there on that NGO side.

We also had business leaders such as former Congressman Cal Dooley, with whom I served in the House of Representatives. Cal is now the head of what is called the American Chemistry Council. And there were other leaders who were there also from the business side: the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the American Petroleum Institute.

When we got them all there and saw them together, the big question I asked was this: Who would have ever thought that all of these groups would be together supporting this bill and wanting this bill to move forward?

So that is one of the reasons we say to the leadership now that this bill is ready to go. It has 60 Senators. We believe the actual votes would be higher than that, but clearly we have 60 cosponsors now, and we are ready to roll here. So that is something that is very important for both the leadership on our side and the leadership on the Republican side to know, that we are willing to do the hard work on the floor and willing to make sure that these kinds of issues that will arise as we move through this we can take care of.

Now, I want to say a little bit about—I am hoping Senator MANCHIN or Senator VITTER will arrive at some point here because they have crucial things they want to talk about. But people should understand that the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 is there to protect American families, and it doesn't. There are over 84,000 known chemicals and hundreds of new ones every year, and only 5 have been regulated by the EPA—only 5 out of 84,000.

What is absolutely clear here is that the American people want and deserve a government that does its job to keep families safe. That is why I rise today to urge support for the passage of the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act. Senator VITTER and I introduced this legislation for one reason and one reason only—to fix our Nation's broken chemical safety law.

Ever since the EPA lost a lawsuit in 1991, it hasn't been able to regulate asbestos, a known carcinogen. So that was one of the key things that Senator Lautenberg knew a lot about. In 1991—so imagine, 20-plus years back—the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in a ruling said that in their analysis and in the tests they put forward—and the lawyers at the EPA looked at it and said: We are unable to regulate asbestos now. We are unable to move forward. And no real activity has taken place since then.

There is nothing that says something is more broken than when an agency is unable to move forward with the regulatory activities it was set up to do. So for decades the risks have been there, the dangers have been there, but there is really no cop on the beat taking a look at chemical safety. The current system has failed. It fails to provide confidence in our consumer products. It fails to ensure that our families and communities are safe. So there is just no doubt that reform is overdue—40 years overdue. On this Sunday, TSCA will be 40 years old.

I see my good friend Senator VITTER has arrived on the floor. Let me just take a moment, before I introduce Senator VITTER, to say that I couldn't have a better partner. I remember that over 2 years ago, Senator VITTER and I met for dinner, and we talked about this bill. We said: Let's work on it with each other, and let's grow bipartisan support. The Senator has worked actively on both sides of the aisle, as have I, and we have come a long way. We think we are ready to go. We think this bill is ready to go. I sure appreciate the partnership that Senator VITTER and I have formed on this. He has been a man of his word. When he said he was going to do something, he did it, and that is the way we have worked through all of the issues. And we have had many issues.

Just to inform the Senator, we are in a colloquy situation now until about 3:40. I think we have about 5 more minutes of the colloquy, and then Senator DAINES, who has arrived, is taking time at about 3:40, unless we can persuade him to give us a minute or two more.

So I thank the Senator for his good work on this. He has really pulled long and hard to get the bill to this point, and we are ready to go; are we not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, absolutely we are ready to go, and I want to join my friend and colleague Senator UDALL. I want to join the chairman of the committee, Senator JIM INHOFE, and urge all of us to come together, as we have been doing over these many months, and actually pass a good solid bipartisan TSCA reform effort.

It was over 2 years ago that I sat down with the late Senator Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey in an attempt to find compromise and work together on updating the drastically outdated Toxic Substances Control Act, what we are talking about and sometimes known as TSCA. Updating this law was a long-time goal and passion of Frank's, as has been noted, and I am

saddened he is not here today to see it finally moving forward because he worked so hard for that.

After Frank's passing, Senator TOM UDALL stepped in to help preserve Frank's legacy and continued working with me to move bipartisan TSCA reform forward. But in the time since, Senator UDALL and I have worked tirelessly to ensure the bill substantively addresses the concerns of our fellow Republican and Democratic colleagues as well as concerns and ideas from industry and the environmental and public health communities.

If you need any evidence of this being accomplished, look no further than the 60 bipartisan cosponsors of this bill—60 bipartisan cosponsors—as well as endorsements from groups ranging from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Chemistry Council, the Environmental Defense Fund, the March of Dimes, and the Humane Society.

The Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act was created to balance the needs of the regulatory bodies, the chemical industry, and the affected stakeholders in an effective and transparent way. Our bipartisan legislation ensures that Americans will have the certainty they deserve that the EPA is overseeing the safety of chemicals in the marketplace without stifling industry's success and innovation.

That work has been a long time in coming, as many of my colleagues have noted, but it is here, and now we need to move forward. We have a moment of opportunity we need to act on, and I urge all of us to come together here on the floor and get this done now. In our work in the Senate, these opportunities don't come a dime a dozen. They do not come every day. They are here before us right now, and so I urge all of us to act.

We have virtually unanimous agreement about a way to move this through the Senate on an extremely short time frame. The only issue is Senators BURR and AYOTTE and their desire to have a vote on a completely unrelated piece of legislation. I am completely sympathetic to their wanting a vote, but we have an agreement otherwise to deal with TSCA on the floor in 2 hours and move it through the Senate. So we must take up this opportunity in an effective, bipartisan and responsible way, and I urge all of us to do that.

I look forward to doing that in the very near future, and I thank again everybody who has worked so tirelessly on this, including my lead Democratic partner in this effort, Senator TOM UDALL.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the Senator so much. As I have said, he has been a great partner to work with on this. He has always been a man of his word.

Senator MANCHIN is now on the floor, and I thought it would be good for him to talk a bit about his involvement. I know he was an early cosponsor. He was a good friend to Senator Lautenberg.

I say to Senator MANCHIN, one of the issues we have been talking about is the question of whether this bill is ready to go, but please, it is open for your comment and discussion. Please proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a bill that is long past due—long past due—and one that, in part, honors our dear colleague and my dear friend Frank Lautenberg. Anybody who served with Frank knew he served with compassion, and he had a passion with that compassion that was unbeatable.

This is one of those pieces of legislation he had compassion for and the passion to get it done, and I think we can all agree the current Toxic Substances Control Act, which we know as TSCA, is inadequate and the law is long past due to be reformed. The Toxic Substances Control Act has not been improved in more than 30 years.

I couldn't believe that when Frank explained to me the history of this piece of legislation. How this all came about and how I became involved is that in 2013 I started talking to Senator VITTER. He was working it diligently, and he told me that Frank had always been on the frontline and championed this thing. So I went to Frank to get his input, and he said: JOE, the time has come. We have to do something. We have to move the ball forward. It is not going to be a perfect bill. I understand that. And to be honest, I have never seen a perfect bill. So we worked on it, but Frank was willing to move it forward.

Here are the facts. In the 30 years that we have been talking about doing nothing but talking about it, 80,000 chemicals have been registered in the United States—80,000 new chemicals have been registered—which many of us use every day. We use these unknowingly. Only 200 have undergone EPA testing—only 200 out of 80,000. So Frank thought, very pragmatically, if we can just move the ball, can we do 20,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 or 50,000 of them? That is all we were trying to do, and he knew this.

There is not one person here who can question Senator Lautenberg's dedication to not only reforming the law but also protecting the environment and the health and safety of every American. This thing got a little bit nasty, to the point where Frank, really sincere about moving this forward, knew he had to take some steps. After 30 years, I can tell you Frank Lautenberg knew exactly what he was doing. He knew exactly that he had to make some adjustments to move the ball forward, and that is what we are here for. Frank wanted to do that.

So we had a long talk about that, and Frank said: Joe, try to move it if you can. So we all got together, our staffs got together, and things started to happen. Then Senator UDALL became very much involved, and I appreciate that he was on the committee. He championed it from there. He and Senator VITTER are sitting on that committee and really making things happen.

Reforming TSCA would establish much needed regulatory certainty for the chemical industry, which directly and indirectly employs about 40,000 West Virginians and over 800,000 people nationwide. When Senator Lautenberg met with Senator VITTER, he toughened many of the most important provisions in the law, and Senator UDALL has taken up that effort and further strengthened the bill.

The bill we have before us includes increased States' rights under preemption. That was our hangup for a long time. They worked through this, and I commend both of them for working through preemption and making sure that the States that have been out front and doing things are not going to be harmed by this. That was never the intention.

It ensures that doctors, first responders, and government health and environmental officials would have greater access to confidential business information to guarantee that those potentially exposed to harmful chemicals could receive the best possible treatment.

Most importantly, it contains a safety standard that, unlike current law, is based solely on human health and the environment and includes no cost-benefit analysis.

Now let me get personal here. In my State we had Freedom Industry leak a chemical called MCHM, used in the coal cleaning process in West Virginia. We had no idea what effect this chemical had on humans. We had one plant, one intake on the Elk River that supplied about 300,000 homes with water. The whole valley was affected—everybody. Don't drink it, don't bathe in it, don't wash. We didn't know what effect it would have so all precautions were taken. It shut down a whole industry. It shut down the whole community—the whole city, if you will.

In July of last year, I pushed the NIH and CDC to conduct further studies into the potential impacts of crude MCHM. We didn't know. We had to push them, and we had to get everybody onboard to tell us as quickly as they could what effect it has on our humans and on our children. Does it have any long-lasting effects?

The NIH's National Toxicology Program concluded their study into crude MCHM and indicated that no long-term health effects should be expected for residents who were impacted. That was great news, but it came long after a lot of harm was done.

While I am thrilled with the findings, we shouldn't have to wait more than 1 year to get safety information on the chemicals in question. This bill that we are working on right now would require the EPA to systematically review

all chemicals in commerce for the first time ever. While this will be a long process, it is far superior to the current system that allows the chemicals we use every day to go untested for health impacts on all of us.

Some of my colleagues have argued that the bill could be better. I assure you it could be better. Every bill that we ever pass here could be better. But you have to start somewhere. Frank Lautenberg knew that. After 30 years, he said: Listen, enough is enough. If Frank Lautenberg had been able and we could have gotten this done 2, 3 years later, my community, my State—300,000 residents out of 1.8 million—wouldn't have been affected for 1 year with the uncertainty of what effect it is going to have on them.

I do know that before I decide to vote for a bill, I ask myself three things. Will this improve the quality of life of my constituents? Is it better than the status quo? And have we worked as hard as we can to preserve our core beliefs? For me, the Frank Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act is a yes on all three. It is a win-win for all of us. Senator Lautenberg was an extremely smart legislator who knew it was time to move past partisan politics and craft a bill that would finally protect all Americans. This bill does that. It does it in grand fashion.

I think Senator VITTER summed it up. We have a little bit of a jousting going on, if you will. I understand it. I sympathize with Senator BURR and Senator AYOTTE in wanting to get a piece of legislation that most of us—I think all of us—support. It may not be the right fit for it right now, and this bill should go as clean. As much work and as much time as has elapsed, this bill should go clean. I truly believe that.

We are committed with our energy bill coming up, as we are with the LWG—the land-water grant—and we are going to be there. We are going to fight for that. But it should be done in a different format than what this piece of legislation is being done in and given how important this piece of legislation is—the Frank Lautenberg legislation, which he worked so hard on and dedicated his life to. I want to make sure that we support this in the fashion that it should be. It is bipartisan. There are not too many things here that are bipartisan. This is one moment that we should seize and move forward for all of our constituents.

With that, I say to Senator UDALL, I commend you for the job you have done and the work you have put into this, and I know that Frank would be proud of you.

Mr. UDALL. I say to Senator MANCHIN, I want to thank you too because I know you have labored hard on this, and you helped the original cosponsors get together and talk with each other and help them find common ground. With Senator VITTER here, we both believe we are going to have a couple of meetings now to try to move forward with the bill, as you have talked about, and meet with leadership and iron out the differences. But this thing is ready to go.

Mr. MANCHIN. If I may, I ask the Senator, the preemption was the last thing hanging, right?

Mr. UDALL. Yes.

Mr. MANCHIN. You have worked through that. All of our States that had concerns about that know they will not be usurped by preemption, that we will commence and you have to reduce your standards.

Mr. UDALL. The key here is that States are going to be able to participate much more. When we started with the original bill, we worked more towards having States participate.

I know that Senator DAINES has been very generous to us and shown us great courtesy. We have run over our time. I am going to yield the floor, Senator MANCHIN, unless you have something else.

Mr. MANCHIN. I would like to recognize Mrs. Lautenberg here to observe this historic moment.

We are so happy to have you here, Bonnie. I know that Frank would be proud of you, having fought the good fight that he fought forever.

There is our good friend right there.

Mr. UDALL. Earlier, before the Senator got here, this is what I showed everybody, which is a picture of Frank and his grandchildren. You know well how he always talked about his grandchildren—

Mr. MANCHIN. God bless.

Mr. UDALL. And how we were supposed to legislate with grandchildren in mind.

I wish to thank Senator DAINES for his courtesies. The Senator can count on me and Senator MANCHIN to work with him on the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Senator MANCHIN is from West Virginia, but I am from the West, like he is. I think we all believe that should move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, Montana has a rich legacy of service to our country. From maintaining our Nation's peace-through-strength strategy at Montana's Malmstrom Air Force Base, where we oversee one-third of our Nation's intercontinental ballistic missiles, to our Army and Air National Guard members' work to support our communities in times of emergency and respond to calls for deployment overseas, Montana is playing a critical role in meeting our Nation's security and military needs. Montanans know firsthand the importance of supporting our men and women in uniform.

The National Defense Authorization Act is critical to ensuring servicemembers have the funding and support they need to fulfill their missions. The NDAA prioritizes the needs of our servicemembers, while protecting the important role that Montana holds in our national defense. The passage of this legislation is critical to carrying out our missions in an increasingly dangerous world.

In fact, earlier this year former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee. He described the perilous state of our global security: ''The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.''

The threats we face from Syria, Russia, China, and ISIS are too serious for our troops to lack the resources they need to protect and defend our Nation from foreign threats. Yet the leader of our troops, our Commander in Chief, has threatened to veto the bipartisan NDAA, which would fund our military priorities at the levels he requested. This is the same foreign policy agenda that has become the hallmark of President Obama's now famous ''lead from behind'' strategy.

Even former Democratic President Jimmy Carter agrees. In fact, earlier this summer, President Carter was asked whether he thought President Obama's foreign policy was a success or failure on the world stage. Here is what President Carter replied: ''I can't think of many nations in the world where we have a better relationship now than we did when he took over.''

President Carter then continued: ''I would say that the United States' influence and prestige and respect in the world is probably lower now than it was 6 or 7 years ago.''

This weekend the Washington Post's editorial board criticized President Obama for holding our troops ransom for his domestic policy agenda. That editorial said this:

> American Presidents rarely veto national defense authorization bills, since they are, well, vital to national security. . . . Refusing to sign this bill would make history, but not in a good way.

It is a mistake for President Obama to use our troops for leverage. Our troops deserve better. The NDAA seeks to provide our troops with the support they deserve. It fully authorizes spending on defense programs at the President's budget request level of $612 billion for fiscal year 2016. It authorizes $75 million for the Southern Border Security Initiative to help address challenges facing the U.S.-Mexican border. It supports servicemembers beyond their years of sacrifice to our Nation by extending retirement benefits to the vast majority of servicemembers left out of the current system. It includes a provision that mirrors my legislation, which I introduced, called the Securing Military Personnel Response Firearm Initiative Act, or SEMPER FI Act, which empowers a member of the Armed Forces to carry appropriate firearms, including personal firearms, at DOD installations, reserve centers, and recruiting centers.

Additionally, this bill provides much-needed support for Montana's military missions. There is $19.7 million for the Tactical Response Force Alert Facility

at Malmstrom Air Force Base. There is $4.26 million for an energy conservation project at Malmstrom. It authorizes funding for Avionics Modernization Program Increments 1 and 2 to ensure that our C–130s can stay in the air. It authorizes funding for C–130 engine modifications. It expresses the sense of Congress that the nuclear triad plays a critical role in ensuring our national security and that it is the policy of the United States to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace the triad and to operate and modernize or replace a capability to forward-deploy nuclear weapons and dual-capable fighter bomber aircraft.

The heroes of our Nation serve our country selflessly day in and day out, and they don't deserve partisan politics. It is unfortunate that critical appropriations for our military and veterans were blocked in recent weeks. Today's vote shows there is overwhelming bipartisan support to fund our troops. Given this, it is senseless that partisan politics continue to block funding for our troops.

I urge our Democratic Senators to put politics aside. Let's do what is right. Join me in supporting the Department of Defense appropriations bill. Our heroes deserve our utmost respect and the security to carry out their missions without threats—without threats from our Commander in Chief. Congress has a constitutional duty to provide for the funding of our troops. This body needs to uphold that responsibility. Let's do what is right. Let's pass the National Defense Authorization Act.

I yield back my time.

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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY AND EPA REGULATIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last Friday the Obama administration released the latest numbers on unemployment and jobs, and once again, the numbers were grim. Experts predicted that our economy would create 200,000 new jobs in September. Instead, they fell woefully short. There were only 140,000 jobs, so they were about 60,000 jobs short. That is a big miss. It is nowhere near as many jobs as America's families need now.

Here is how Investor's Business Daily put it in a headline on Monday, October 5, ''Private Hiring Pace Is Worst In 3 Years; Labor Force Shrinks.'' Wages have gone almost nowhere for 6 years. They actually declined in September. We have had 74 straight months with wage growth below 2 and a ½ percent. Before the recession, we routinely had 3 percent growth month after month, but President Obama seems to be satisfied with this limping progress. Over the weekend, he bragged about how many jobs have been created while he has been President.

Is missing expectations good enough for President Obama? It is not good enough for me. It is not good enough to get the economic growth that we need in this country and that we should have coming out of a recession.

One of the very big reasons for this slow growth is due to all of the regulations that this administration has piled onto the backs of American families. Since 2009, this administration has come out with more than 2,500 new regulations. According to the American Action Forum, the total cost of all of these new regulations—this new red tape—is about $680 billion. That is more than $2,100 for every man, woman, and child in America right now.

According to the World Bank, the United States is 46th in the world in terms of how easy it is to start a business. Is 46th in the world good enough? Maybe it is good enough for President Obama, but I don't think it is good enough for the American people. All of these regulations make it very tough for someone to start a business right now. It is also tough for existing businesses to create new jobs.

Last week, the energy company Royal Dutch Shell announced that it was going to suspend drilling for oil off the coast of Alaska. They said one of the reasons was ''the challenging and unpredictable federal regulatory environment in offshore Alaska.'' Too much regulation is making it too difficult to produce the American energy and American jobs that we need.

Unelected, unaccountable Washington bureaucrats have been having a field day at the expense of our economy. As the Obama administration runs down, it is in a race to get even more rules on the books.

Just last week the administration announced three big new regulations. On Tuesday, the EPA finalized a rule on oil refineries. It is going to require refineries to install new equipment and spend more money on something other than creating jobs and paying higher wages to their workers. It is estimated that the rule could cost up to $1 billion and provide very little in the way of health benefits.

On Wednesday, the EPA finalized more limits on coal, gas, and nuclear powerplants. Just like Tuesday's rule, this one will cost another one-half billion dollars a year. The rule sets the unacceptable amounts of some emissions at zero.

Finally, on Thursday the EPA released a new limit on ozone in the air. The limit was 75 parts per billion, and they cut it to 70 parts per billion. This is a tiny change—we are talking about parts per billion—but that tiny change is going to cost more than $2 billion a year once the rule is in full effect. Huge chunks of the country are going to have to adjust to meet the new standard, and the benefit is minuscule.

Farms and small manufacturing companies will have to buy new equipment or change the way they do things. States and cities will have to change how they do local transportation projects. All of that adds up to lost jobs and even less economic growth than we have had in the past 6 years. These are huge effects, all to chase another few tiny parts per billion of ozone. Five parts per billion is the equivalent of 5 seconds over 32 years. That is how small it is, but the costs are enormous.

Over the course of three days last week, three new regulations have been added. They will cost our economy billions of dollars at a time when the private-hiring pace is at its worst in 3 years and the labor force shrinks.

We all agree that reasonable regulations make good sense. In the 1960s and 1970s, regulations helped to clean up pollution in our air, land, and water, but now Washington bureaucrats are chasing after smaller and smaller trace amounts of chemicals no matter what the cost, how high the cost, or how insignificant the benefits.

The EPA issued one rule that I found hard to believe. I thought it was a misprint, but it is not. They issued one rule that would cost $9.6 billion per year to administer.

What are the benefits? Only $4 million. I thought they had misspelled and misplaced the ''b'' and the ''m,'' but, no. It will cost $9.6 billion and will produce only $4 million in direct benefits. That is as much as $2,400 in costs for every $1 in benefits. How can they do this? I am talking about direct benefits.

The EPA tried to say: Well, there are all sorts of what they called ancillary benefits. Who gets to decide how much these are worth? Apparently the Obama administration says that it does. It is no surprise that this administration cooks up an imaginary number for those theoretical benefits—not direct benefits, but their ''ancillary'' benefits, and they say it is big enough to balance the very real costs that American families feel.

It is all a way to justify these ridiculous rules that destroy jobs, restrict freedom, and do very little good for Americans. It is Washington and this administration run amok.

Is the Obama administration trying to make sure our economy continues to limp along as it has for the past 6½ years? Is that what they want?

In 1972, the Clean Water Act was meant to protect navigable waters. It was reasonable. We want to protect our navigable waters. Today the administration has a new water rule called waters of the United States. It is going to give Washington bureaucrats control over everything from irrigation ditches to small natural ponds in someone's backyard. This is unreasonable. Where does it end? Bipartisan majorities in the Congress already say it needs to end now.

I have introduced a bill that would direct the Obama administration to

come up with a new rule on waters of the United States—one that protects traditional navigable water from pollution, which we must do, but it also protects farmers, ranchers, and private landowners. We can do both.

This legislation has 46 cosponsors, Democrats and Republicans. We are telling the Obama administration that enough is enough.

Republicans are also ready to take on some of these other outrageous rules such as the extreme new restrictions on powerplants. That is what Congress is going to be doing to stop the insanity of these out-of-control regulations and out-of-control regulators. We need to cut through the redtape.

Americans want to get back to work. They want to get our economy going again. Congress needs to help them do it because this administration certainly is not. The Obama administration basically needs to get out of the way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak this afternoon on a very important vote that we took today to move forward on the Defense authorization bill. I thought I would start by backing up a little bit.

Last week we had the opportunity to vote on and talk about funding for our veterans and our troops. In addition to the Defense authorization bill that we voted on today to proceed to that, the votes we took last week were very important. They were very important to the country and certainly very important to my State—the great State of Alaska—which has a huge military presence, but also to our huge veteran population. We have probably the highest number of veterans per capita than any State in the Union.

I am honored to have a good friend of mine, Representative Bob Herron, the majority whip in the Alaska House. He is in the Gallery today. He is also a marine. So he represents not only Alaska in our State Government but Alaska as a veteran, as a fellow marine.

The American people want the Senate to be working again. We all know the country has huge challenges. I wish to speak about some national foreign policy challenges. We have a huge debt: $8 trillion. I think we are close to $19 trillion. We got downgraded in terms of our credit rating for the first time in American history. We can't grow the economy. We have huge challenges.

For years the Senate was not working. It was not moving forward. Some would have called it dysfunctional. No regular order, no amendments, no budget, no appropriations bills; a locked down U.S. Senate not doing its work. I think the American people wanted us to do work. So last fall they said it is time for a change. We need to get to work. We need to start tackling our challenges.

So we are changing that. We are working hard to do things the American people sent us to Washington to do. We passed a budget. It hasn't happened in years. We passed appropriations bills through regular order, Democrats and Republicans, bringing amendments to the floor of the Senate, voting again. One of the things we have been doing—and it happened today—is we are prioritizing where they want us to prioritize. Our national defense, which is probably the most important role we have in this body—our troops, our veterans.

So we are making progress, but progress is halting. It is never a straight line. For some reason—and we saw it over the last couple of weeks—a lot of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle didn't want to fund the government, particularly in terms of these critical issues of our troops, including our national defense and taking care of our veterans—and again we saw that over the last couple of weeks.

Two critical appropriations bills moved to the Senate floor. There was the Defense appropriations bill, which again passed out of the Appropriations Committee by huge bipartisan numbers: 27 to 3. There was huge bipartisan support for that bill. Then we had the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, which passed out of committee 21 to 9. It had huge bipartisan support. Why? Because the American people want us to focus on these critical issues: national defense, our troops, taking care of our veterans. So we are moving forward.

The budget, appropriations bills that we voted on that haven't been voted on for years—bipartisan, prioritizing what the American people want. But then these appropriations bills, which provide funding for our vets, funding for our troops, came to the floor, and progress stopped. I still don't understand why. When asked by constituents: Why did the other side vote to move these bills out of committee in such a bipartisan way, but then when they got to the floor, they stopped, they filibustered, no spending for our troops or for our vets, I don't know the answer. I have asked. My constituents are asking. Directions from the White House? Who knows. But I do think it is clear to me, I think it is clear to most Americans, and I even think it is clear to all of the Members of this body that when those bills were filibustered over the last 2 weeks, that our troops and our veterans were shortchanged because we are voting to defund them. That is what the filibuster did; it defunded our troops and our veterans.

So I have to admit that when we were getting ready to vote today, I feared a repeat performance on probably one of the most important bills we are going to take up all year—the National Defense Authorization Act. It authorizes spending, pay raises, sets out our military strategy, retirement reform. It is so important to our country. Once again, I wish to commend Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED, the two leaders of the Armed Services Committee who did such a good job moving that bill forward. Once again, it started with such great bipartisan promise. It moved out of committee 22 to 4, very bipartisan. Then it came to the Senate floor for a vote a few months ago, the NDAA, the Defense authorization bill; 71 Senators, incredibly bipartisan, moved forward and voted for that bill. Then it went to a conference with the House where it was improved. It all seemed to be on track to bring this bill back to the floor of the Senate and to vote on moving forward on the conference report.

What happened? That is great bipartisan progress. We are changing things. We are making things happen. The President of the United States has since said he is going to veto the bill. He is going to veto the bill—veto the National Defense Authorization Act.

Once again—and I am not sure, taking orders from the White House or not—the minority leader came to the floor and told the American people this morning he would work with the President to sustain that veto, to sustain the veto of our Defense bill. What a disappointment. We have this huge bipartisan progress. When given the clear choice between standing with our troops and our veterans or the President, who says he is going to veto this bill for reasons I still don't understand, the minority leader is choosing the President.

I am honored to sit on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate as well as the Veterans' Affairs Committee. As I said in remarks last week on the Senate floor, these are two of the most bipartisan committees we have. It is clear to me that every member—Democratic, Republican—of these committees cares about our troops, respects our troops, cares deeply about our national security. I believe every Member of this body does. Once again, we saw that today. We saw that today. There was no filibuster. Seventy-three Senators voted to move forward on the Defense appropriations bill. It was 71 before and today it was 73—an important bipartisan victory for our national defense, for our veterans, for our troops, but a Presidential veto still hangs out there. The President's veto threat still is like a cloud hanging over this very important vote today.

I mentioned at the outset that this is very important for my State, the great State of Alaska. This is important for the national security of our Nation, and this is important for all of us. It is important to me. As a veteran and a marine in the Reserves, I know this is a critically important issue. If he is going to veto this bill, I don't know how the Commander in Chief will explain to the American people and our

troops why he is doing this. There have been only four times in the last 53 years that the NDAA has been vetoed.

Providing the common defense of this Nation, the national defense, is probably our most important duty. And that duty increases when you look around the world and see the threats that are emerging in different parts of the world—the Middle East, Ukraine, the Asian Pacific, the Arctic.

Mr. President, to govern is to choose. To govern is to prioritize. The President's administration spent years negotiating a nuclear deal with Iran, and this body spent weeks debating the merits of the President's Iran deal. That deal and what we debated then needs to be put in the context of the President's veto threat to the Defense authorization bill.

Let me give a few examples.

The President's Iran deal will give billions—tens of billions—in the lifting of sanctions to Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, but the President threatens to veto a bill that will fund our military.

The President's Iran deal lifts sanctions on Iranian military members such as General Soleimani, who literally is responsible for the maiming and killing of thousands of American troops, but the President's veto—his threatened veto—would stop payment of bonuses and improved military retirement benefits to our troops and veterans.

The President's Iran deal gives access to the Iranians by lifting sanctions on conventional weapons, ballistic missiles, and advanced nuclear centrifuges, but the President threatens to veto in this bill advanced weapons systems for the United States.

The President's Iran deal gives the opportunity for terrorist groups supported by Iran such as Hezbollah and Hamas to have further funding for their terrorist activities, but the President threatens to veto a bill that provides additional funding and resources and capability for our troops to defeat ISIS.

To govern is to choose. To govern is to prioritize. As we move forward on the substance of the national defense authorization bill, we are choosing and prioritizing our troops and our national defense, and that is why this vote was so positive this morning. I hope we can have at least 73 Senators, who voted to move forward today, vote to pass the NDAA and put it on the President's desk for his signature. But if the President chooses to veto this critical piece of legislation, which has enormous bipartisan support, at this moment in time when our country faces serious international threats, I hope that my colleagues—the 73 Senators who voted to move forward on this critical piece of legislation—will also stand strong and vote to override the veto of the President, which is exactly what our troops and the American people would want us to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, what we saw in Roseburg last week was a repeat of the evil we have seen in countless places across the country, causing tens of thousands of deaths in towns and cities and suburbs and rural areas across this country.

Evil visited Roseburg. We saw the worst of human character in those moments of mass killing. We saw also the best in human character in the response from the firemen, police, and emergency responders who risked their lives and saved lives.

When the sound of gunshots rang out that morning, my own recollection was triggered of a morning just a few years earlier when I stood with the parents and loved ones on that day of the mass slaughter in Sandy Hook in Newtown.

My thoughts and prayers are with the people of Roseburg, with the victims and their loved ones. I know that nothing said here—certainly nothing I can say—will help mend those wounds and ease the grief and pain of those loved ones for the great lives lost and the many left behind.

I am frustrated and angry coming here today because the places of those mass killings have become shorthand for a deep disease, an epidemic of violence in America today—Virginia Tech, Columbine, Charleston, Sandy Hook, Newtown, and now Roseburg. They are shorthand for mass slaughters which have occurred at the rate of about one a week while President Obama has been in office. There have been 142 school shootings since Newtown alone. There are 30,000 deaths per year in America, the greatest, strongest country in the history of the world.

The mass killings are not even the source of the largest numbers. They are individual deaths, such as that of Javier Martinez, a young man from New Haven with an enormously bright and promising future. When I visited his school after he was killed by a gun because he was in the wrong place at the wrong time, his classmates asked me to talk about gun violence—not as an abstract notion but as a real threat to them and their community.

It is a phenomenon that faces every community every day, everywhere, and everyone. All of us are touched by it if we think about it, if we put aside the denial that all too often affects us, a denial that causes people to minimize the threat. We all are victims or we know victims or we know of the tragic consequences of real stories in our community as a result of gun violence.

The deaths in Roseburg are tragic, but no less tragic was Javier Martinez' death, nor are the gun deaths that occur in situations that involve domestic violence, gangs, fights between individuals, accidents, and suicides—a major source of death by gun violence—and countless other circumstances where people who are dangerous or who lack the mental health or the maturity to responsibly use guns nonetheless have access to them and use them for deadly purposes.

Let's be very clear. The Second Amendment is a guarantee under our Constitution to law-abiding citizens that they can use guns for lawful purposes, whether recreational or hunting, that they can possess as many as they please, and the vast majority of them support measures that will keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people.

Keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people is the reason we have advanced commonsense, sensible measures to stop gun violence, and the failure to adopt them has made Congress complicit—in effect an aider and abettor to those deaths—because Congress has enabled the continuation of death and destruction that has become a fact of life in America, a disgraceful and shameful emblem of Congress's failure to act. There is a point when inaction causes culpability, when it becomes, in effect, aiding and abetting and complicity. Congress in some ways might just as well be standing at the elbows of those shooters, whether in Charleston or Roseburg or Sandy Hook or elsewhere.

Regret and grief are appropriate, but they are no solution. They are no excuse for inaction. Inaction is reprehensible when it comes to gun violence—an epidemic and disease spreading in this country just as surely as a contagion or infection. The inaction of this body speaks louder than words.

My simple reaction is, enough—enough of inaction. The time for action is now on universal background checks, a ban on illegal trafficking and straw purchases, a prohibition on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines, as well as mental health initiatives and school safety measures. This kind of comprehensive package of reforms has been proposed. This body failed to adopt it, but that is no excuse for inaction now.

There is no one measure, no single solution, no panacea, no simple fix to this problem, but we must begin because laws have consequences. I refuse to adopt the defeatist or denial approach of many of our colleagues who say the laws simply will not work, cannot do anything, will not solve the problem.

We are here because we believe laws can improve the lives of ordinary Americans, no less so when it comes to gun violence or any other problem we face. In fact, we ought to approach this issue of gun violence with the same urgency and immediacy that America would in attempting to solve any public health crisis because surely we face a public health crisis and emergency in gun violence.

When there is a spread of a contagious disease, whether it is flu, tuberculosis, or Ebola, we track the source, hospitalize the victims, take remedial action, admit them to treatment, and take preventive measures to prevent that kind of disease from recurring. When there is a spread of food

poisoning, we don't throw up our arms and say there is nothing laws can do. In fact, law enforcement and health authorities track down the packages that are contaminated and provide relief for the people who suffer from that kind of occurrence and take preventive measures to stop it from recurring by imposing sanitary conditions and rules and regulations on the food producer.

Infections, contagion, and spread of disease can be deadly and crippling; they can threaten fear and harm and cause panic. Gun violence is exactly the same. It is equally insidious and pernicious, and its impact is greater than any of those single epidemics. The spread of stolen guns—guns that are stolen or illegally purchased—is much like a disease in America today, and the ones who will testify to that fact are our law enforcement authorities who see it firsthand and are on our side in urging responsible, commonsense measures and reform.

When this Nation faced, in effect, an epidemic of car deaths and injuries, we didn't stop everyone from driving, but we did put in place reasonable safeguards—seatbelt laws, drunk driving measures, and speed limits—and we enforced them. They were resisted at the time. Drunk driving measures caused outrage among some civil libertarians, but now they are part of our everyday expectations about how life will work in America, and they have drastically reduced auto fatalities and injuries. The recognition of the damage and destruction that has been caused by automobiles means that we educate and we take commonsense, responsible measures.

Much of the knowledge that led to those commonsense, sensible measures came from research—yes, knowledge. It was fact-based, evidence-driven research done by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Like many of my colleagues, I am dismayed by the fact that similar, incredibly valuable public health data about gun control from this world-class institution is unavailable to us because of the restrictive, politically motivated budget riders forbidding it. It is unconscionable that Congress's response to this problem is denial, shutting out research and responsible, fact-based evidence involving the provision of information.

This country knows how to respond to a public health crisis. We are America. We face the challenges; we don't deny or disparage the truth tellers.

After the Stockton schoolyard shooting in California where 34 children were shot and 5 killed, President George H.W. Bush issued an Executive order in 1989 banning the import of semiautomatic assault rifles. There were repeated circumventions of that order. Part of the response was, in 1994, a measure authored by Senator FEINSTEIN—our great colleague—banning the manufacture and transfer of assault weapons and high-capacity magazines. That measure expired, but it shows how we can act and how we can face challenges.

Ronald Reagan was almost killed by an assassin's bullet—a would-be assassin's bullet—in 1981. Ten years after the event, he wrote in the New York Times that if the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act reduced gun deaths by as little as 10 percent, it would be ''well worth making it the law of the land because there would be a lot fewer families facing anniversaries such as the Bradys and the Reagan's faced every March 30th.'' That bill, the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, became law in 1993 with his support 12 years after that near assassination.

Both Stockton and the Reagan near assassination show that these measures are possible. It may look like a marathon. It is never a sprint. It is not only possible, it is obligatory.

I look forward to a number of my colleagues and myself—and I note that a partner in this effort has been my colleague Senator MURPHY, who will follow me shortly—I look forward to all of us coming together and spearheading and championing again a set of reforms that will help make America safer and better. The time for action is truly now. This public health emergency cannot go unaddressed. The gap in our current laws can be remedied.

I have already offered the Lori Jackson Violence Survivor Protection Act, a bill named for a brave Connecticut mother of two children who was estranged from her husband, fled her home for her life, obtained a temporary restraining order for her and her children's protection, and then was gunned down by her estranged husband because the temporary protective order did not require him to surrender his weapon—a gap in the law that must be remedied. That bill would do so.

This bill is modest. My bill would close this loophole requiring protective orders, whether temporary or permanent, to require the surrendering of weapons. Women who are victims of domestic violence are at the greatest risk. Women who are victims of this insidious peril are most in danger when they first leave or try to leave. That is when the temporary order is, in effect, most necessary, the danger at its greatest but the law at its weakest in stopping gun violence.

We are on the right side of history. We are on the right side of law enforcement. We are on the right side of public opinion. The overwhelming majority of Americans clearly favor these kinds of measures and the overwhelming majority of gun owners too. If history is on our side, we must be on the right side of this issue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to keep faith with the victims of Newtown and Sandy Hook, to demonstrate that our grief and regret is more than just words, that it will lead to action. The time for action is now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, let me thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for being such a great partner. He and I have traveled a very long journey together since September of 2012 when we both stood together at the firehouse in Sandy Hook, CT. We have become evangelical in our belief that this mass slaughter has to stop. On Friday we all stopped for a moment and we sent our sympathies to those who were killed in Portland: Lucero Alcaraz, Treven Taylor Anspach, Rebecka Ann Carnes, Quinn Glen Cooper, Kim Dietz, Lucas Eibel, Jason Dale Johnson, Lawrence Levine—he was the assistant professor there—and Sarena Dawn Moore.

Mr. President, 274 days this year and 294 mass shootings. We are averaging one mass shooting—multiple people being shot at one particular moment—more mass shootings than we have days in the year.

Of course, for us, this shooting and the information that came out in the aftermath of it was particularly chilling because we have seen this young man before. The young man, Christopher Harper-Mercer, was isolated, withdrawn, and obsessed with guns. His family had many of them. He had rebuffed attempts at socialization by his family. He had grievances that he mainly shared with himself. He eventually turned those grievances on nine people who died and about an equal number who were injured.

We know that story because we saw it play out in Connecticut as well—a mentally ill individual, a young man who became isolated from his friends, his community, and his family, who had a rather large store of weapons, and who then took out his frustration and his outrage on 20 little kids at Sandy Hook Elementary.

But I guess to me what is definitional about this scourge of mass violence is not necessarily what happened on Friday but what happened the day after, on Saturday. On Saturday there were likely another 80 people killed by guns all across the country. That is about the number we run every single day. Every day there are a handful of exceptional stories, stories that make your heart turn, that make your gut cringe.

On Saturday there was an 11-year-old boy who confronted his 8-year-old neighbor in Tennessee over the fact that she would not let him play with her pet bunny. When she protested and said she did not want him to play with it, he marched back into his house, got a shotgun, walked back over to her, and shot her with a shotgun. How on Earth did an 11-year-old boy get that quick access to a shotgun? How on Earth have we gotten into a moment in which a dispute over whether you can hold a little pet bunny turns into a murder?

What I can tell you is that I guarantee that scene does not play out in other countries in this world, that 11-year-old boys don't shoot 8-year-old girls with shotguns in Sweden or Japan or in Great Britain. We know that because what is happening here in the

United States is exceptional. This rate of 80 people being lost to guns every day, this normalization of mass shootings, is exclusive to the United States. We have a gun homicide rate in the United States that is not twice the average of other OEDC countries, it is not 5 times, it is not 10 times, it is 20 times the average of our first-world competitor nations. We have to ask ourselves, what is different about the United States? What is different about life here, the way in which we resolve disputes, from all of these other nations that have gun violence, gun death rates that are 20 times lower than the United States?

Let's be honest about one thing. It is not that the United States has higher rates of mental illness than other countries. It is not that our mental health delivery system spends less than other countries. There is no more mental illness in the United States than there is in any other industrialized country. Some studies will tell you that we spend more on mental illness treatment and behavioral health treatment than any other country. Yet gun deaths are 20 times what they are in other countries. It is not because we lack for protection. Our malls and our churches and our movie theatres are not any less protected or less secure than those in other countries. We invest in law enforcement at a same or greater rate than all of these other nations. What is different? What is different here in this country? What is different is that we are awash in guns. We are awash in illegal guns. We celebrate weapons that are designed exclusively to kill other people, and we collect them and show them off for sport, military-style assault weapons, cartridges, drums of ammunition that hold 100 rounds, whose utility is only associated with ending life. That is what is different. That is what is different about the United States.

I will admit that the solution is comprehensive because I will be the last person to tell you that fixing our mental health system will not have a beneficial effect on the rates of gun violence. Adam Lanza and Christopher Harper-Mercer were deeply troubled individuals who were ill-served by a behavioral health system that was far too opaque and complex for them. Law enforcement needs more help on the streets of New Haven and New York and Chicago and Los Angeles. All those things will help. But what distinguishes America from the other parts of the world that have much lower rates on gun violence is not investment in law enforcement and is not our rate of mental illness. So we have to have this conversation about our laws that allow for this flow of high-powered guns and illegal guns onto the street.

Senator BLUMENTHAL and I are going to join together tomorrow to introduce what we think is a modest measure to ensure that no guns get sold to people who cannot pass a background check. Walmart does it today. They say: We won't sell you a gun unless you can pass a background check. But unfortunately many other retailers take advantage of a loophole that allows for 72 hours to pass without a background check, which then allows them to sell a gun. We just think there should be a simple premise. If you can't pass a background check, you shouldn't be able to get a gun—getting a green light to walk out of a store with a weapon that can kill people.

But that is just one brick in the wall. There are a series of other measures that enjoy 90 percent support in this country, whether it be making sure people who are subject to spousal restraining orders cannot buy a gun during the period of time in which they are under a restraining order or just expanding background checks to gun shows and Internet sales or just giving more resources to the background check system so they can make sure they upload the proper records. Mental health is part of the solution. It is not a substitute for the reform of our gun laws, but it is part of a solution as well.

I am proud to join with Senator CASSIDY to introduce the primary comprehensive mental health reform legislation on the floor of the Senate. It has 10 cosponsors at this moment: five Republicans and five Democrats. We think you should fix the mental health system because it is broken, full stop, but we also understand it will have a downward effect on gun violence.

I wish to close by echoing the sentiments of Senator BLUMENTHAL. We are going to introduce our legislation tomorrow, and we are hopeful it will be taken up by this body.

What we really worry about is that this silence from Congress has become complicit. I know that sounds like a very hard thing to say—that sounds very hyperbolic—but let me walk you through why I have come to believe that the failure to act in the wake of these mass shootings has made us complicit in them. I think these young men—and it is not all young men, but it is mostly young men—these young men whose minds are becoming unhinged and are contemplating mass violence, they take cues from the total, complete, absolute silence from Congress in the face of mass shooting, after a mass shooting. If the Nation's top elected leaders, the people charged with deciding what matters in this Nation, don't even try to stop the mass carnage, then these would-be shooters reasonably conclude that we must be OK with it because if a society doesn't condone settling a grievance with a gun, wouldn't the people in charge of it at least try to stop it.

But we don't try—and that is what is most offensive. That is what truly turns my stomach. We just lived through a summer in which 4,000 people died on the streets of this Nation, and this body is sending a loud, clear signal that we don't care—we don't care. Nine more people died on Friday—another mass slaughter—and we are back to normal this week.

We are going to debate the Toxic Substances Control Act this week. I don't deny that is probably a very important piece of legislation, but we are acting as if there isn't an epidemic of preventable murder happening in this Nation and that it is getting worse.

Somebody wrote last week that the gun control debate ended the day after Sandy Hook because that was the day America decided it was OK to murder 20 first graders. I know that is not the message my colleagues are intending to send, and we appreciate all of the sincere notes of sympathy that have been sent over the course of the last 2 years, 3 years, to Newtown and those that went out on Friday to Oregon, but words are beginning to become meaningless. The tweets aren't helping. I would argue they are becoming a cover for cowardice.

It is not a coincidence that America has a gun violence rate that is 20 times that of any other competitor nation. We are doing something wrong here and the whole reason we draw our paychecks is to make wrong things right. If we cannot do something—a background check law, a mental health bill, more resources for law enforcement—if we cannot do anything to try to stop this soul-crushing, life-extinguishing violence, then we might as well go home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague Senator MURPHY regarding the responsibility—our responsibility—to deal with the issue of gun violence in our country.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. President, I wish to turn to another subject. I wish to talk about the Land and Water Conservation Fund or the LWCF as it is commonly known.

Last week, at the end of the fiscal year, the LWCF authorization expired. The LWCF is one of the Federal Government's best tools for supporting conservation, and we need to act quickly to renew the law. As cities grow, suburbs swell, and our natural world shrinks, the need for more opportunities for outdoor recreation and education grows.

The LWCF helps expand those opportunities: opportunities for our veterans, our children, and our families. For example, we have heard from veterans who shared the therapeutic value of our public lands.

When Matthew Zedwick served in Iraq, he was comforted by memories of hiking and fishing on public lands in his Oregon hometown. Since coming home to Oregon, he has found that visiting many of the trails, lakes, and streams that are protected by the LWCF helped him heal.

Also, this year, for the first time our Nation's fourth graders have free access to all of our national parks. Why fourth graders? Because fourth graders are able to understand their surrounding environments in more concrete ways. Through these kinds of experiences in our national parks, these fourth graders will, we hope, grow into having a lifelong appreciation of our environment.

Finally, millions of families looking for a weekend getaway flock to our parks, refuges, and wildlife reserves, areas that are afforded protection thanks to the LWCF.

Despite being chronically underfunded, over the past 50 years the LWCF protected and conserved land in every single State. Rather than relying on taxpayers, money for the fund comes from oil and gas development on the Outer Continental Shelf. Unfortunately, without renewing the LWCF, conservation efforts across the country are at risk, including in Hawaii.

Hawaii's environment is unique. I am sure my colleagues are aware of our beautiful beaches, lush greenery, and spectacular geography. For all its beauty, Hawaii's environment is also fragile. One-third of our native forest birds are endangered, and we are home to almost half of the Nation's threatened and endangered plants, making us in Hawaii the endangered species capital of the world. Our coasts and beaches are being threatened as we speak by sea level rise. Our corals are expected to suffer the worst bleaching event in history this year—this coming on the heels of a major bleaching event that happened just last year. All of these phenomena impact our economy and way of life. We know what is at stake if we do not act today to protect our lands for tomorrow.

That is why my State put together a collaborative landscape proposal to receive LWCF money. This proposal is entitled ''Island Forests at Risk,'' an appropriate title as we are seeing firsthand how the future of our forests is indeed at risk. The Obama administration recognized the importance of this proposal to conserving Hawaii's unique ecosystems. Thanks to this recognition, a number of the island forests at risk land acquisitions are in line to receive LWCF funding in the next fiscal year. Under the plan, almost 5,000 acres will be added to Hawaii's volcano national parks, Hawaii's most popular national park that in 2014 alone attracted almost 1.7 million visitors.

Funds will also help add almost 7,000 acres to help allow Hakalau National Wildlife Refuge, a land acquisition that has been the top priority for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Region since 2011. These critical land acquisitions have a pricetag of almost $15 million, and these acquisitions will only be made possible by the financial assistance provided by the LWCF.

Hawaii is not the only State that is set to receive money from the Land and Water Conservation Fund next year. Over the past few days, my colleagues from across the aisle have come to the floor to talk about the importance of the LWCF in their own States. They have talked about the lands in their States and the experiences they have had in the outdoors with their families.

We all recognize the opportunities that LWCF investments provide for our people, our economies, and future generations. We know oil and gas drilling is accelerating climate change. We know climate change is threatening our native birds, our coasts, and our coral. Why not reauthorize a fund that takes money from activities that threaten our climate and environment and invests it into conservation efforts? It seems like a no-brainer to me.

Earlier this year, I joined Ranking Member CANTWELL and my fellow Democratic colleagues on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee in introducing legislation that would permanently reauthorize LWCF—permanently so that it will not end.

I urge my colleagues to join us in finding a bipartisan path forward to permanently reauthorize the commonsense fund that protects the environment and affords outdoor recreation and education opportunities in every single State. We owe it to the people who elected us, and we owe it to our children and our future generations.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELLING USED CARS ON THE RECALL LIST

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, would the Chair like to buy a used car from a used car dealer that was on the recall list because it had a defective Takata airbag in the steering wheel; so that if you had a fender-bender and it suddenly exploded, it might send shrapnel into your face and into your jugular in your neck. The answer is obviously, no; that you would not want to buy such a used car. Well, to the credit of a major used car dealer, as well as new car dealer, AutoNation, headquartered in Florida but with hundreds and hundreds of dealerships all over the country, they have set as company policy that they will not sell a used car on the recall list for defective products until that recall problem has been corrected.

All dealers do this with regard to new cars because it is the law. In fact, in the highway bill we passed a couple of months ago we put in an additional provision, which if you are a rental car company such as Avis, National, and so forth, you cannot rent to a customer if it has a recall on that vehicle until the recall item is fixed. That just makes common sense. You certainly wouldn't want to put a defective product out there for the consuming public.

So then why is the National Association of Automobile Dealers fighting us as we try to extend the law for new cars to used cars when it comes to the sale of a used car with a defective item? It defies common sense.

This is what it is: What is the economic interest versus what is the safety interest—the economic interest of the used car salesman versus the safety interest of the consuming public that would buy that used car? I hope the national association will reconsider. This is an argument that cannot stand on all fours that they are making—that they comply with the sale of new cars but they don't want to comply with the sale of used cars.

What we ought to be looking out for in light of all of these revelations of all of the defective automobiles—look what happened with General Motors and the ignition. Look what has happened to Toyota and Honda with the Takata airbags. By the way, in airbags we are talking some 20 million recalls worldwide. It is huge. If we are going to protect the consuming public, we ought to make sure that recall items are taken care of before those vehicles are sold.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. 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. FLAKE. Mr. President, I wish to highlight a few items that are in the NDAA conference report authorization that we are considering this week. In April of this year, my office came across a $115,000 marketing contract with the New York Jets and some other teams. But the contract with the New York Jets showed that the weekly hometown hero tribute was actually paid for by the taxpayers. A resulting investigation found that other taxpayer-funded tributes were not just with the Jets or with the NFL but extended to other sports leagues, as well as the NCAA. We don't need this kind of paid-for patriotism.

I wish to note that many in the NFL, many teams, and others of our sports teams and other leagues do this out of the goodness of their heart. It is what it looks like. But in many instances, these salutes to the troops have been paid for by the taxpayer. That needs to end. That is why I joined Senator MCCAIN and Senator BLUMENTHAL in adding an amendment to the NDAA that will bring an end to these taxpayer-funded salutes to the troops.

This amendment also encourages sports organizations that have accepted these funds to consider making a contribution to a charity that supports

members of the military or veterans or their families. In addition, the NDAA conference report also prohibits the DOD from spending 25 percent of its sports-related marketing budget until they can show that the money that they are spending in this regard actually contributes towards their marketing goals or towards their recruitment goals.

These results have to be reported to both the House and the Senate. That is a good thing. I want to thank the Pentagon, especially Undersecretary of Defense Brad Carson and his staff, for working with my office and others as we continue to investigate the scope of these taxpayer-funded tributes.

Another item I want to mention in this NDAA bill is that 22-year-old Marine Corps Cpl Jacob Hug of Phoenix was serving as part of the U.S. humanitarian mission to Nepal in response to the earthquakes in that country. In May, Hug was one of six marines and two Nepalese soldiers who were killed when their helicopter crashed during a mission to deliver food and aid to the victims in the earthquakes there. Because Jacob died during a humanitarian mission, Jim and Andrea Hug, his parents, were informed that the DOD was not authorized to pay for their flight to Dover Air Force Base to be on hand when their son's remains returned to the United States.

Currently, the military is only authorized to pay for next-of-kin travel expenses if the servicemember is killed in action. That is not right. The Hugs did get to travel to Dover because many in the Arizona delegation worked with DOD to make sure the costs were eventually paid for by DOD.

I worked with Senator MCCAIN to amend the NDAA to ensure that no other family has to go through this—that if a family of a servicemember serving on an overseas humanitarian mission is killed, the additional hardship is not faced by their family. This amendment help pays for the next of kin to travel to meet the remains of deceased relatives if they are killed in humanitarian operations.

I hope we can approve this NDAA in the coming days and we can send it to the President. I hope that the President will sign it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Americans across the board recognize the growing threat of global climate change. Last week was a big week on the conservative and corporate sides. New polling revealed strong support among conservatives for smart policies to stem carbon pollution. Coalitions of leading corporate voices—6 major banks and 10 major food and beverage companies—called on us to join them in backing strong climate action.

I come to the floor today, now for the 114th time, to join with them—with scientists and lay people, with military commanders and faith leaders, with environmentalists and capitalists, with Democrats and Republicans, all saying it is time to wake up to this crisis.

Yes, I said ''and Republicans.'' Outside this Chamber, Republicans are calling for action on climate. The poll out last week, conducted by three leading Republican pollsters, showed a majority of Republican voters, including 54 percent of conservative Republicans, agreeing that the climate is changing and that human activity contributes to the changes we are all seeing.

They want solutions from us. The same proportion of conservative Republicans—54 percent—would favor a carbon pollution fee on electric utilities, provided the revenue would then be rebated to consumers. As we know, a carbon fee is a market-based solution, very much in line with conservative principles. I recently introduced a bill that I hope both Republicans and Democrats can embrace. It would establish an economy-wide carbon fee on carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions and then return 100 percent of the money to the American people.

It would work. A recent analysis said it would reduce U.S. carbon dioxide emissions by nearly 50 percent by 2030. The revenue would offset annual payroll taxes for every working person by $500, with a similar benefit to veterans and Social Security recipients. It would reduce the corporate income tax rate from 35 percent to 29 percent. It would return the remaining funds to States to be used locally, for transition costs, efficiency investments or whatever the States prefer.

With this bill, I extend to conservatives what my very conservative friend, former Republican Congressman Bob Inglis, has called not just an olive branch but an olive limb. Whether you want tax reform, a proper free market for energy or even to address climate change, please, let's get to work.

To state the obvious, Congress has been ruled by the lobbyists and political enforcers for the fossil fuel industry. The fossil fuel industry, with political threats and very big money and lots of phony front groups, has made the Republican Party in Congress its political wing. But outside this Chamber, where conservatives don't need fossil fuel industry money, there is considerable conservative support for a carbon fee, from leading right-of-center economists, conservative think tanks, and former Republican officials.

President Nixon's Treasury Secretary, George Shultz; President Reagan's economic adviser, Art Laffer; President George W. Bush's Treasury Secretary, Hank Paulson; and Bush Council of Economic Advisers Chair, Greg Mankiw, have all advocated for some form of a carbon fee as the efficient way to correct a market failure—the market failure where we all have to pick up the costs of carbon pollution for the fossil fuel industry. No wonder they spend so much money around here. That market failure is a sweet deal for the fossil fuel fellas, but it is not good free market economics.

In a 2013 New York Times op-ed, former Republican EPA Administrators Bill Ruckelshaus, Christine Todd Whitman, Lee Thomas, and William Reilly wrote: ''A market-based approach, like a carbon tax, would be the best path to reducing greenhouse-gas emissions.''

Republicans in Congress are being squeezed. On one side they see unequivocal scientific consensus, compelling economic theory, and mounting public opinion—all pointing toward the need for strong action on climate. On the other side, they see rich and powerful polluters who fund their politics and who make heavy-handed threats against any Republicans who might dare to cross them. That is why it was such glad news when a group of 11 House Republicans, led by Congressman CHRIS GIBSON of New York, introduced a House resolution committing to address climate change by promoting ingenuity, innovation, and exceptionalism.

That is not a bill yet. We have a ways to go still. But it is another sign that the ''denier castle'' is crumbling. First, climate change was a hoax. Then, OK, maybe it is not a hoax, but it is natural variation. Then, OK, maybe it is real and humans do cause some of it. But, look, it paused. Then, OK, maybe it didn't pause. But we really can't do anything about it. And then, OK, we can do something about climate change, but please stop asking me about it because I am not a scientist. And now this: A resolution by sitting Republican House Members that we need to take climate action. It has been quite a journey.

The escape of 11 Republicans from the dark, crumbling ramparts of denier castle gives dawning hope to Americans that bipartisan action on climate change is becoming possible, even in Congress.

Last Thursday, Congressman GIBSON and I joined together, bicameral and bipartisan, to hear from major food and beverage companies how climate change affects their industry, supply chains, and bottom line. It marked—as far as I can recall—the first time in years that a sitting Democrat and a sitting Republican Member of Congress joined in a public event on climate change. I hope that is another sign that things in this building have begun to shift.

For these big companies, climate change is not a partisan issue. It is not even a political issue. It is business. It is their reality. ''Climate really matters to our business,'' Kim Nelson of General Mills told us. ''We fundamentally rely on Mother Nature.'' The choices we make to protect or forsake our climate, she said, will be ''important to the long-term viability of our company and our industry.''

Paul Bakus of Nestle agreed, impressing on us that this is not a hypothetical. Climate change ''is impacting our business today,'' he said. His company, Nestle, cans pumpkins under the Libby's brand. They have seen pumpkin yields crash in the United States. ''We have never seen growing and harvesting conditions like this in the Midwest,'' said Mr. Bakus.

Chief sustainability officer for Mars, Barry Parkin, was more blunt: ''We are on a path to a dangerous place.''

These companies are reducing carbon emissions and demanding sustainable supply chains. Mars, for example, recently invested in a 211-megawatt wind power farm in Texas to offset all of the electricity used by its U.S. operations. Unilever, in addition to shifting away from fossil fuels toward renewables and biofuel energy, is also fighting deforestation associated with farming.

Message No. 1 from these businesses was: This is important.

Message No. 2 was: They can't do it alone. They need us in government to pay attention. ''Business, government, civil society, and individuals all have a part to play,'' said General Mills. ''We need governments to be involved,'' said Unilever.

Specifically, the companies want a strong global climate deal at the Paris conference this December. They released a joint letter pledging to accelerate their own climate efforts and urging governments to do their part as well. They even took out full-page ads in the Washington Post. Here it is.

They had the full text of their letter and the signatures of the 10 CEOs printed in the Financial Times on the very day of our event.

The heads of Mars, General Mills, Nestle USA, Unilever, Kellogg Company, New Belgium Brewing Company, Ben & Jerry's, Cliff Bar, Stonyfield Farm, and Danone Dairy North America had the following statement in the letter:

Climate change is bad for farmers and agriculture. Drought, flooding, and hotter growing conditions threaten the world's food supply and contribute to food insecurity.

They also pledged:

We will: Use our voices to advocate for governments to set clear, achievable, measurable and enforceable science-based targets for carbon emissions reductions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the heads of these 10 major food and beverage companies asking world leaders and the Congress to act on climate change be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Accelerating Change]

THIS COULD BE A TURNING POINT

DEAR U.S. AND GLOBAL LEADERS: When you convene in Paris later this year for climate negotiations, you will have an opportunity to take action that could significantly change our world for the better.

As heads of some of the world's largest food companies, we have come together today to call out that opportunity.

Climate change is bad for farmers and for agriculture. Drought, flooding and hotter growing conditions threaten the world's food supply and contribute to food insecurity.

By 2050. it is estimated that the world's population will exceed nine billion, with two-thirds of all people living in urban areas. This increase in population and urbanization will require more water, energy and food, all of which are compromised by warming temperatures.

The challenge presented by climate change will require all of government, civil society and business—to do more with less. For companies like ours, that means producing more food on less land using fewer natural resources. If we don't take action now, we risk not only today's livelihoods, but also those of future generations.

We want the women and men who work to grow the food on our tables to have enough to eat themselves, and to be able to provide properly for their families.

We want the farms where crops are grown to be as productive and resilient as possible, while building the communities and protecting the water supplies around them.

We want to see only the most energy-efficient modes of transport shipping products and ingredients around the world.

We want the facilities where we make our products to be powered by renewable energy, with nothing going to waste. As corporate leaders, we have been working hard toward these ends. but we can and must do more.

Today, we are making three commitments—to each other, to you as our political leaders, and to the world.

We will:

Re-energize our companies' continued efforts to ensure that our supply chain becomes more sustainable, based on our own specific targets;

Talk transparently about our efforts and share our best practices so that other companies and other industries are encouraged to join us in this critically important work;

Use our voices to advocate for governments to set clear, achievable, measurable and enforceable science-based targets for carbon emissions reductions.

THAT'S WHERE YOU COME IN

Now is the time to meaningfully address the reality of climate change. We are asking you to embrace the opportunity presented to you in Paris, and to come back with a sound agreement, properly financed, that can affect real change.

We are ready to meet the climate challenges that face our businesses. Please join us in meeting the climate challenges that face the world.

Signed.

Grant Reid, President & CEO, Mars Incorporated; Paul Polman, Chief Executive, Unilever; Jostein Solheim, CEO, Ben & Jerry's; Kendall J. Powell, Chairman of the Board & CEO, General Mills, Inc.; Mariano Lozano, President & CEO, Dannon & Regional VP, Danone Dairy North America; John Bryant, Chief Executive Officer, Kellogg Company; Kevin Cleary, CEO, Clif Bar; Paul Grinwood, Chairman & CEO, Nestle, USA; Esteve Torrens, President & CEO, Stonyfield Farm, Inc.; Kimberly Jordan, Cofounder & CEO, New Belgium Brewing Company.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. We heard a similar appeal from America's largest financial powerhouses last week. Bank of America, Citi, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Morgan Stanley, and Wells Fargo released a strong call for governments to come together on a climate agreement.

Here is what they wrote:

Policy frameworks that recognize the costs of carbon are among the many important instruments needed to provide greater market certainty, accelerate investment, drive innovation in low carbon energy, and create jobs. . . . While we may compete in the marketplace, we are aligned on the importance of policies to address the climate challenge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that their statement also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN SUPPORT OF PROSPERITY AND GROWTH: FINANCIAL SECTOR STATEMENT ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Scientific research finds that an increasing concentration of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere is warming the planet, posing significant risks to the prosperity and growth of the global economy. As major financial institutions, working with clients and customers around the globe, we have the business opportunity to build a more sustainable, low-carbon economy and the ability to help manage and mitigate these climate-related risks.

Our institutions are committing significant resources toward financing climate solutions. These actions alone, however, are not sufficient to meet global climate challenges. Expanded deployment of capital is critical, and clear, stable and long-term policy frameworks are needed to accelerate and further scale investments.

We call for leadership and cooperation among governments for commitments leading to a strong global climate agreement. Policy frameworks that recognize the costs of carbon are among many important instruments needed to provide greater market certainty, accelerate investment, drive innovation in low carbon energy, and create jobs. Over the next 15 years, an estimated $90 trillion will need to be invested in urban infrastructure and energy. The right policy frameworks can help unlock the incremental public and private capital needed to ensure this infrastructure is sustainable and resilient.

While we may compete in the marketplace, we are aligned on the importance of policies to address the climate challenge. In partnership with our clients and customers, we will provide the financing required for value creation and the vision necessary for a strong and prosperous economy for generations to come.

Bank of America, Citi, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Morgan Stanley, Wells Fargo.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. These are serious people running big, successful companies. They don't take climate change lightly, they don't scoff and neither should we. They are asking that elected officials find the courage to address climate change. Majorities of voters of both parties and of Independents are also asking elected representatives to find the courage to address climate change. That brings us back to that squeeze I talked about.

If you are not willing to address carbon pollution and the climate change and ocean acidification it is causing, I ask my colleagues who are on the ballot in 2016: What are you going to say? What are you going to say to your voters? Are you going to say it is a hoax? Great. Good luck with that.

Are you going to say: OK. It is real, it is important, these companies are all right, but as far as fixing it, well, we have nothing—because right now that is what they have, nothing.

Maybe they should just beg: Please don't ask me about climate change because the big fossil fuel polluters are paying my party's bills and making mean threats to me. Those are not a great set of options.

At some point soon, I tell my friends: Your party's leaders are going to have to go to the fossil fuel billionaires and say: Enough. Enough. Let my people go. We held out for you as long as we could, but now you have to let my people go, and it has to be soon.

As one executive told Congressman GIBSON and me quite directly, ''The window of opportunity to act on climate change is closing.''

It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

THE FILIBUSTER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to comment on an extraordinary about-face that we have seen from many of my colleagues across the aisle with respect to the filibuster. When I say ''across the aisle,'' I mean an about-face on the part of Democrats who see the filibuster differently now than they did over the last 4 or 5 years. But now, like Paul on the road to Damascus, they have seen the light and have now embraced the filibuster wholeheartedly, and like many converts, they are very active in their faith.

Naturally, this has caused frustration for many Americans who wonder why we cannot address the pressing issues we were elected to address, and there are a lot of frustrated Members of the Senate as well. I am one of those frustrated Members. When we have an opportunity for the Senate to function as James Madison said it should function, I don't understand why we cannot have it function that way. Not surprisingly, the recent series of filibusters on legislation of enormous consequences for our Nation has resulted in new calls for changes to the Senate rules.

First, I would like to take stock of where we are right now. It was just last year that the previous majority leader was abusing the cloture motion to shut down debate and amendments on virtually every single bill, even before the debate had begun, all while blocking any amendments. Any Senator who routinely votes for cloture motions under those circumstances is obviously abdicating his or her responsibility to the people who elected that Senator to offer and debate any number of different ideas. That is what the Senate is all about.

Nevertheless, when those of us who were then in the minority voted against abdicating our responsibilities as Senators, we had a parade of Democratic Senators come to the floor and accuse us of that most dastardly deed, at least according to them, the filibuster. They repeatedly claimed that strict rule by the majority faction was the principle by which the Senate ought to operate with little or no input from the minority party; in other words, have it operate just like the House of Representatives.

We now have a majority—a Republican majority—that has tried to restore the Senate to function as a deliberative body, as it used to and as it was intended to by the Framers of the Constitution. For instance, last year the previous majority leader didn't bring a single, individual appropriations bill to the floor of the Senate for consideration and vote. By putting off appropriations until the end of the fiscal year, that leader calculated that the threat of being blamed for a government shutdown would force Republicans to accept a massive omnibus bill containing policies that would otherwise be rejected.

This year things are different. The Senate appropriators have done their work and reported out each separate appropriations bill—can you imagine, all 12 of those appropriations bills—and most of them on a bipartisan basis. Then, when the majority leader has attempted to bring them to the floor, Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, has been met with a Democratic filibuster of the motion even to proceed to the bill.

What is the justification of that on the part of today's minority? The majority leader Senator MCCONNELL is not blocking amendments. In fact, he is even inviting amendments. So if there is something that the minority wishes to change or add to a bill, they can do it simply by participating in the process and offering amendments. After all, isn't that what the Senate is all about? We have to pass appropriations bills or the government will shut down, so why can't we even bring appropriations bills up for consideration?

Well, the answer is quite obvious: The Democratic leadership is up to those old games they used to keep the Senate from debating appropriations bills that they did over the last 5 years. By blocking appropriations bills and threatening to blame us for the shutdown, they hope and believe they can bully us into busting open the spending caps that a majority in both the House and Senate agreed to in the budget resolution earlier this year. So much, then, for majority rule, which the Democrats claim was such a deeply held principle, as they expressed it only last year and years before that.

They justify filibustering the appropriations bills because President Obama has threatened to veto them unless he gets more spending. That doesn't make any sense.

The first appropriations bill they filibustered was the Defense appropriations bill—not because that bill didn't provide enough funding but because they want to hold it hostage to extract additional spending in other areas. Now they are holding hostage the bill that funds the Department of Veterans Affairs. So they are holding hostage funding for our men and women in combat and our veterans who have served our Nation in order to protect the President from having to follow through on his threat to veto these bills.

I understand that the President might not want to have to defend vetoing funding for our troops and veterans as a bargaining chip to extract additional spending from the Congress, but protecting the President from having to follow through with his threat is not a very good reason for a filibuster.

A similar thing happened with the filibuster of legislation to disprove the Iran deal. A bipartisan majority in both the House and the Senate was in favor of legislation to block President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran. Because the deal was set to go into effect unless Congress acted, the Democrats cannot claim their filibuster was needed for additional deliberation. It was a blatant attempt to run out the clock so the President would not have to use his veto pen.

So clearly it is not as though Democrats have now grudgingly accepted the utility of the filibuster only in extraordinary circumstances; they have now embraced it so completely that they used it simply to prevent embarrassing the President.

In light of this, it is understandable that many in my political party and even in the grassroots are questioning whether we ought to get rid of the filibuster on legislation. This is an expression of the frustration by a lot of conservatives that I hear from in the grassroots of Iowa, and they hear it in the other body as well.

The argument goes kind of like this: After all, the Democrats unilaterally abolished the filibuster on nominations, contrary to Senate rules. Well, they will have to live with that come 2017 when the Republican President is inaugurated, as I hope. But just as I think they will live to regret that move, I think those of us on my side of the aisle would ultimately regret the loss of the Senate as a deliberative body if we were to change the cloture rule for legislation. What would the Democrats do with unchecked power? We don't have to guess. The Democrats briefly had the 60 votes needed to overcome any filibuster, and they promptly ran the unpopular health care law down the throats of an unwilling American public. They dismissed legitimate criticism from Republicans and skepticism from citizens of America. They promised that Americans would like it once it had passed and when we found out what is in it. Well, Americans now know what is in the health care law, and the law hasn't become any more popular.

So does that mean we have to just accept that ObamaCare and other aspects of ''the fundamental transformation of America'' the President promised are here to stay? Of course not. But we must not be shortsighted. I think a lot of the people who are conservatives, such as the grassroots of America, who are frustrated, as a lot of

us in this body are frustrated, would be shortsighted if they consider changing how the Senate operates.

Keep in mind that the American left was greatly influenced by the progressive movement in the early 20th century which held that history is continually progressing toward a future of more governmental control over people's lives—for the people's benefit, of course. Now, most of us don't buy that—those who hold to the principle of limited government—but there are a lot of people today who are buying it. We hear it in the Presidential campaigns, particularly of the other political party.

This led the progressives of the early 20th century to reject the Declaration of Independence and focus on individual liberty and to oppose our Constitution's system of checks and balances designed to protect that liberty because it made it harder for the government to act. That comes from the philosophy that government always knows best. It also means that those on the left played the long game, sometimes biding their time, sometimes accepting incremental progress toward their goals, and other times making radical changes when they see an opening.

Those of us who are animated by the principle of individual liberty recognize that liberty is the exception in human history, and threats to liberty must be fought constantly or we risk losing liberty and freedom. As such, we are impatient to correct every loss of liberty right away, as we should be. However, in doing so, we must be very careful not to break down those very safeguards that are in place to prevent government encroachment on individual liberty. If we are not careful, then short-term gains could lead to even greater loss of liberty in the future.

The President's former Chief of Staff was famous for saying something like this, and hopefully I am quoting him accurately: ''You never let a serious crisis go to waste, and what I mean by that, it's an opportunity to do things you think you could not do before.''

In other words, we have seen a concerted effort to take advantage of momentary passions and temporary majorities to enact longstanding policy goals of more governmental intervention in the economy and intervention in the lives of Americans. Preventing such a power play is precisely the role the Senate was designed to play. Just listen to this passage from Federalist No. 62: ''The necessity of a senate is not less indicated by the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions, and to be seduced by factious leaders into intemperate and pernicious resolutions.''

Of course, that was written by James Madison, who is rightly called the father of the Constitution. Madison prepared extensively for the Constitutional Convention by studying ancient republics and ancient and contemporary political philosophers. He came to the convention with what was called the Virginia plan, which the convention used as a starting point for what became the U.S. Constitution. Madison also took extensive notes throughout the Constitutional Convention.

In other words, I think that when he speaks about the intent behind the structure of the U.S. Constitution, he ought to know better than anybody, and that is particularly as he writes about the function of the Senate in our Constitution system.

It is true that Madison did not speak to the filibuster itself, and the Constitution leaves the rules of the House and Senate up to each Chamber, but you cannot read the Federalist papers without a clear understanding that our system of government was intended to allow only measures that have broad and enduring support to actually get into law. The Constitution was not designed to allow whatever faction happens to be in power to have a free hand to do whatever it wishes.

As Madison said in Federalist No. 10, ''Measures are too often decided not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority.''

Where that minority is protected is in the U.S. Senate—the only place in our political system. In fact, in arguing for the necessity of the Senate in Federalist Paper No. 63, Madison is quite critical of pure majoritarian democracies in ancient times and attributes their failure to the lack of something we call the U.S. Senate.

That said, I understand why some of my Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives are frustrated with the fact that many of the things they pass become stalled here in the Senate. I say to them that a lot of us on this side of the aisle share that frustration. So I and we need to make sure those obstructing are held accountable. But anyone who would change the Senate rules to give the majority leader the power to ram any bill through the Senate on a party-line vote should then ask whether they can trust that this power will be used fairly by future majority leaders. Remember that the previous majority leader tried to shut the minority out of the legislative process at almost every stage. The Senate was routinely presented with bills often written behind closed doors in the majority leader's office and told that there would be only an up-or-down vote with no amendments.

Moreover, what would conservatives gain by abolishing the filibuster? I want people to think about what might happen if the filibuster is abolished. In the short term, we would have the emotional satisfaction of seeing President Obama use his veto pen, but that is about it. In the long run, you can bet that modern-day progressives will use those tools to impose all sorts of policies to expand the scope of government that would otherwise not make it through our constitutional system.

If you want to know what some of those ''intemperate and pernicious resolutions'' that Madison warned us about might be, we need only look to the past. I will list a whole bunch of things that could be the law of the land today.

Had the Senate operated on a purely majoritarian basis in the past, our country would be in much worse shape than it is now. For instance, if you think ObamaCare is bad, we would have had a single-payer, totally government-run health care system if it weren't for the 60-vote requirement. We would have had the disastrous cap-and-trade bill in 2008 with its crony giveaways, making special interests rich while destroying jobs for hard-working Americans. The list of items that would have passed the Senate goes on and on—the 2007 immigration amnesty bill; the DISCLOSE Act to intimidate private groups who engage in political speech that was brought up in 2010; the abolition of secret ballot elections for unions in 2007; the prohibition on businesses replacing striking employees that was brought up in 1992; a bill to encourage public safety employees to unionize in 2010; the 1992 Clinton crime bill; drug price negotiations in Medicare Part D that amount to Federal price controls in 2007; an amendment to the Constitution to cancel First Amendment protections for speech around election time in 2014; stripping religious liberty protections from Christian business owners who object to paying for drugs that can cause an abortion in 2014; President Obama's second big-spending stimulus proposal in 2011; the so-called Buffett tax would have been passed several times by now; the tax increase to pay local government employee salaries in 2011; and who knows how many other tax increases they would have passed if they knew they could get away with it. Of course, we heard a few weeks ago a speech by Senator ALEXANDER, who has argued that one of the first things the Democratic leadership would do is follow the orders of union bosses and outlaw the many right-to-work laws we have in the United States, forcing associations against the will of some people.

This Senator knows well what it is like in the majority and what it is like being in the minority in the Senate, and I know things look very different from each perspective. I would ask my conservative colleagues who are frustrated that the current majority is not able to work its will to consider the example of history and look to the future.

It is also interesting to observe the behavior of the many Democrats who had never experienced a minority before who have now gained a new perspective on the filibuster and the power of the minority and the protection of the minority by supporting the filibuster every chance they get—and it

didn't take long. On the third vote in the Senate this year—after the change of control, that is—most of the Democrats, including the loudest critics of the filibuster, voted against cloture on a motion to proceed, which until that point they claimed to be an egregious and inappropriate abuse of Senate rules. I know there are some Senate Democrats who still say they are opposed to the filibuster even in principle, although apparently not in practice. It is no good saying ''Stop me before I filibuster again.'' If you think it is wrong, don't do it. It is as simple as that.

When Senator WYDEN and I began to work on ending the practice of secret holds, we pledged to disclose any hold that we placed on a bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and we did that for years before finally getting the rules changed so that every Member had to do that.

The Senate Democrats have shown through their actions that they now fully support the Senate filibuster. I guarantee that the next time Republicans are in the minority, we, too, will see the necessity of this traditional protection against what Madison referred to as ''the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority.''

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the year 1789, the U.S. Senate, in a chamber not far from here, approved the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. The Second Amendment reads: ''A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.'' The Second Amendment to the Constitution is an amendment which has been uttered, debated, and litigated over the entire history of the United States. Whatever the true intent of our Founding Fathers in writing that language, that brief sentence, I wonder if they could even imagine what we are dealing with today in the name of the right of people to keep and bear arms because every day, on average, in America, 297 people are shot—every day—and 89 of them die every day in America.

Last Saturday I was with my wife in Chicago having a cup of coffee and reading over the papers, listening to National Public Radio. They reported the Roseburg, OR, shooting at the community college, and they cited a statistic that I was not aware of: That shooting at the community college that killed nine innocent people was the 45th school shooting in America this year. There have been 45 shootings in schools. There were many other mass shootings in different places, but now even schools, even students, even schoolchildren are not safe from the rampage of guns.

I am honored to represent the city of Chicago. It is a great city. I do my best to help it in every way I can. But I also have to be very candid and honest with you. So far, there have been 2,300 shootings in the city of Chicago this year. Where are all these guns coming from?

Yesterday morning I went to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms in Chicago and sat down with the new special agent in charge and asked him the question: Where are all these guns coming from? Why do we have more guns per capita in Chicago than in New York? Why is it that so many of these teenagers, kids, moms, and dads are armed to the teeth? Where are all these guns coming from?

He said: Senator, the No. 1 source of guns in the State of Illinois—crime guns that we have taken in the commission of crime and can trace—the No. 1 source is Illinois.

We have a phenomenon where people go into a federally licensed arms dealer and purchase guns and use them in crime. But the bigger problem is they send in someone without a criminal record who can pass a background check and who buys guns and turns them over to drug gang thugs and criminals on the street. They call it straw purchasing. So the No. 1 source of guns is trading guns within the State of Illinois and these traffickers, these straw purchasers who purchase a gun not for their own use but to turn it over to a criminal or sell it to a criminal. That is the No. 1 source.

What is the No. 2 State that supplies guns to the State of Illinois? It is Indiana, which adjoins Illinois to the east—specifically, Lake County, IN, in the northwestern section of that State.

Why do we get so many guns from Indiana into Illinois that are used in the commission of crime? Because of gun shows. Gun shows occur on the weekends, and people literally show up in Indiana, show some State identification, and without any background check walk out with a gun—not just a gun but many times fill their trunks with guns and ammunition and drive across the border into Chicago, Cook County, and go to the west side of town or down south in Englewood. They pull up in an alley or maybe even on the curbside and have an open market, selling these guns picked up at gun shows. The people who purchase these never went through a background check. Nine times out of 10, unless they are buying from a gun show from a Federal dealer, it is just an arms-length transaction—however many guns you want to buy; no questions asked. Many of these people would be disqualified if they went to a Federal gun dealer. They have a history of committing felonies and other acts that disqualify them.

The fact is that today that is the No. 2 source of crime guns—Indiana.

What is the No. 3 source of crime guns in the city of Chicago? Mississippi. Mississippi. Why? Because their gun show requirements are even more lax than in the Midwest. It is an ongoing commerce of running those guns up the interstate and selling them in the city of Chicago.

So what is happening? There is a dramatic increase in homicides across America. We are awash in guns. Sadly, many of them are in the hands of people who buy them to kill innocent people. There has been a spike in homicides this year—not just in Chicago but in Milwaukee, St. Louis, Houston, Baltimore, New Orleans, and many other cities. The plain reality is that we are now awash in guns in America, and it is far too easy for convicted criminals, felons, and unstable people to get their hands on a gun and to use it.

When guns are everywhere and when it is easy for dangerous people to get them, it puts everyone at risk. Can you imagine for a second that any of those students heading into that community college in Oregon that morning had even an idea they would face a gunman and some would die? The heartbreaking stories—one I remember hearing from a minister who talked about his daughter, who survived because she appeared to be a bloody corpse. The gunman stepped over her. The father could hardly contain his emotions when he talked about dropping that girl off at school and living with the possibility that she would have died there and that would have been his last memory of his daughter. Is that what America has come to? Is that what we are?

Pretty much anywhere you go now, you have it in the back of your mind that someone could have a gun, someone could start shooting. Do we want to live this way in America?

If you talk to the gun lobby and the special interest groups that manufacture guns and want to sell more and more, they will say the solution is to arm more good guys with guns so they can shoot the bad guys. That is a solution they like because it sells more guns, but why wouldn't we try in the first place to keep guns out of the hands of bad guys?

The Supreme Court has said there is no constitutional problem in the provision that I read with keeping guns away from felons, domestic violence abusers, the mentally unstable, and other dangerous people. The Supreme Court across the street said that is completely consistent with the Second Amendment. Why don't we do it? If our country did a better job of preventing bad guys from getting guns, there are a lot of innocent people who would still be here today.

I held a hearing in my Constitution subcommittee a couple years ago about gun violence. We talked about the need for better laws to stop illegal straw purchases and gun trafficking.

One of our witnesses, a young woman who has become my friend, was Sandra Wortham of Chicago. Her brother Thomas was a Chicago police officer. He had served two tours of duty in Iraq. He was a great guy. He was gunned down in front of his parents' home on the South Side of Chicago. He was murdered by gang members with a

straw-purchased gun. He was an extraordinary police officer. When he was shot, he had a gun on him. He shot back at the armed gunmen who were trying to rob him, and so did his father, who was standing nearby, also a retired police sergeant. But Officer Wortham was killed. He died in front of his parents' house on May 19, 2010. I attended his funeral.

Thomas Wortham's sister Sandra spoke at that hearing. It was powerful. This is what she said:

> My brother carried a gun. My father carried a gun. But the fact that my brother and father were armed that night did not prevent my brother from being killed. We need to do more to keep guns out of the wrong hands in the first place. I don't think that makes us anti-gun; I think it makes us pro-decent, law abiding people.

Sandra Wortham is right. I hope my colleagues will hear her words.

Some say it is impossible to stop bad guys from getting guns; they are just going to get them. It is true that there are a lot of loopholes in the law to get them today, like the gun show loophole and the Internet loopholes in the background check system. I don't question the possibility that those loopholes are there. It is also true that the gun lobby is working hard every day to further weaken the laws on the books and to strike them down in court. But we can stop the gun lobby from gutting the laws on the books, and we can close those loopholes if lawmakers just have the courage and political will.

Our goal should be to keep guns out of the hands of bad guys, not to take them away from people who use them in a responsible and legal way. I grew up in downstate Illinois. Owning shotguns and rifles is just part of life. Taking your son or in some cases even your daughter out hunting is normal. It is what people do. I have been out duck hunting in Stuttgart, AR, with my former colleague, Mark Pryor. We had a good time. Everybody there knew that a gun was a dangerous weapon that had to be handled carefully. We filed the necessary permits and licenses to be out there hunting on that day and followed a long list of requirements that limited our right to go shooting ducks, migrating ducks in that area. We did it because it was the law and law-abiding people pay attention to the law.

But what are we going to do now to respect those law-abiding people but still get serious about stopping these guns that end up in the hands of felons and mentally unstable people? Are we going to shrug our shoulders? Are Members of Congress going to put out the standard press release after a mass shooting? Or are we going to rise to this challenge on this occasion and do something? What a breakthrough it would be if we could save these innocent lives.

I cannot imagine that classroom in that community college in Oregon where that crazy gunman, loaded and armed, went up to each of those students and asked if they were Christians. If they said yes, he told them: You are on your way to Heaven, and then he shot them dead. I cannot imagine that moment. I certainly cannot imagine if in that classroom was someone I loved, someone I knew, someone I cared about, and they were the victim of that kind of mental instability.

So are we going to shrug our shoulders, remember the victims in our thoughts and prayers and do nothing? Is that what it has come to? We are better than that. We can easily pass laws to protect domestic violence victims by keeping the guns out of the hands of their abusers. All it takes is will. We could easily hold gun dealers accountable for guns that they purposefully misplace into the hands of criminals. All it takes is the will. We can easily adopt technology to stop criminals from stealing guns and stop kids from using them accidentally. All it takes is will. We can easily create a better background check system and pass better laws to stop straw purchasing and illegal gun trafficking. All it takes is will. We can stop the gun lobby from gutting the laws on the books, and we can close these loopholes if lawmakers just have the courage and the political will.

As President Obama said, our thoughts and prayers are not enough. Stopping this violence requires courage and political will. I hope the Congress can rise to this challenge. I am not giving up. I have seen too many lives cut short, too many families and communities devastated by this violence. I am going to do all I can to bring down the number of shootings in America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, imagine a successful and popular program that saves our special natural places, such as parks, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and forests. Imagine further that this is accomplished not with tax dollars, but with royalties paid by companies that extract oil or minerals from our public lands. What is not to love about a program like that? Now imagine that some in Congress want to kill or weaken that program. In fact, its charter just expired on October 1.

For 50 years, a bipartisan commitment has promoted the preservation of our national parks, forests, and refuges and the vistas that are so iconic in our national identity. But today we find ourselves yet again in the midst of a made-in-Washington crisis that devalues this history of shared commitment, replacing it with the misplaced ire of those who do not understand its profound, community-driven impact on the land and on our economy.

On September 30, the authorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, LWCF, America's most successful conservation and recreation program, was allowed to expire. Founded on the principle of balancing the depletion of certain natural resources by conserving other resources, the fund uses revenues from royalties of offshore oil and gas extraction to support the conservation of our land and water, a symmetry that conservation advocates have praised. More to the point, the fund is supported at no cost to taxpayers. Similarly, congressional inaction allowed the Historic Preservation Fund—also a budget-neutral program with longstanding bipartisan support—to lapse. Together, these twin programs represent key commitments to protecting our Nation's historic resources and lands for future generations.

For 50 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has supported the creation of parks and refuges, but it has also filled in plots of land at risk of loss through development in our national parks to create a seamless park system that is easier and more cost-effective to manage. It has provided resources to local communities to achieve otherwise cost-prohibitive conservation projects in small towns. It supports community playgrounds and maintains trails, while fostering and protecting our innate appreciation of the world around us, and it accomplishes all of this while being a boon to local economies.

In Vermont more than $123 million in LWCF grants have supported hundreds projects over the last five decades, and the benefits can be seen across every county in the Green Mountain State. These grants back an economy of outdoor recreation supporting 35,000 jobs, generating $187 million in state tax revenue and $2.5 billion in retail sales in Vermont alone, according to the Outdoor Industry Association. On top of this, an estimated 545,000 people hunt, fish, and enjoy the wildlife of the Green Mountain State every year—a stunning number that nearly matches our State's entire population.

In addition to local recreation projects, the LWCF in Vermont has supported the creation of our State's only national park, the Marsh Billings Rockefeller National Historical Park. It has helped to add 100,000 acres to the

Green Mountain National Forest, to establish the Conte National Wildlife Refuge, and to forever preserve large swaths of the Appalachian and Long Trails. These are treasures today, preserved for future generations.

Across the country, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been valued as America's premier conservation program—an outgrowth of what has been called ''America's Best Idea,'' the creation of our National Park System. It has drawn strong bipartisan support for half a century, even as the political atmosphere has become more divisive. I recently led a bipartisan coalition of 53 Senators representing every corner of the Nation in asking for a short-term extension of the LWCF and a commitment to work to permanently authorize and fund the program. We sent a similar letter calling on Majority Leader MCCONNELL and Minority Leader REID to support permanent funding for the program, which was followed by a similar bipartisan letter from members of the House to Speaker BOEHNER.

But despite this strong bipartisan and bicameral support, there are those who seek to throw this longstanding, commonsense program out the window, shutting down one of the few reliable sources that fund conservation work across the country, a truly devastating bid that threatens our land and water and our local economies. It makes no sense.

Several times last week, opponents of the widely popular LWCF objected to extending its authorization, claiming that the fund was used to purchase privately held land from landowners. But that is precisely what the fund is intended to support: the purchase of land from willing sellers interested in seeing land protected rather than developed. Often these land deals include land exchanges, thus ensuring that the Nation's most sensitive lands are not developed, while ensuring that other working lands remain privately owned.

Too often we see these deals evaporate because the funding is not there. This is why we need to ensure the fund is permanently authorized and fully funded. These projects should not slip away, as we have seen in Vermont and other parts of the country, because of a fundamental misunderstanding of how the fund operates and how it is supported.

We have watched conservation funding wither across the country while developments encroach our precious national parks and while the real threat of climate change draws closer and closer. Now is not the time to break a commitment to conserve our natural resources, our heritage, and the legacy we will hand to our children and grandchildren. We must value and protect our heritage by renewing the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

CONFIRMATION OF DALE DROZD

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the confirmation of Dale Drozd to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California.

Judge Drozd earned his bachelor's degree magna cum laude from San Diego State University in 1977 and his law degree from UCLA in 1980, where he was inducted into the Order of the Coif.

He began his legal career as a law clerk for a district judge in the same judicial district where he now serves.

Following his clerkship, Judge Drozd worked as a criminal and civil litigator in Federal and State courts at the trial and appellate levels for 14 years.

Then, in 1997, Judge Drozd was appointed to serve as a magistrate judge in the Eastern District of California.

In 2011, he became the chief magistrate judge in that court.

Over his 18-year career as a magistrate judge, he has presided over thousands of cases.

He is well regarded in the legal community and among those who appear before him on a daily basis. The ABA has rated Judge Drozd ''well qualified,'' its highest rating.

Five different U.S. attorneys who served under both Republican and Democratic administrations over more than 20 years have endorsed his nomination.

Those former U.S. attorneys include David F. Levi, who later served on the district court and is now dean of Duke law school, as well as George O'Connell, Charles Stevens, Paul Seave, and McGregor Scott.

Their letter states: ''[w]e have all known Judge Drozd for many years and are also aware of his judicial reputation in the community. He is an effective, productive, fair, and balanced jurist who is widely respected in this district.''

Their letter further recognized Judge Drozd as ''an outstanding magistrate judge,'' and went on to state that ''he will be equally effective as a district judge.''

The president of the Sacramento chapter of the Federal Bar Association wrote to the Judiciary Committee in support of this nomination.

That letter notes that, although it is not typical for the Federal Bar Association ''to endorse a particular candidate or nomination,'' Judge Drozd's nomination is ''uniquely easy to support.''

The letter further stated that Judge Drozd ''is widely respected in our district and commands a high level of respect from attorneys who appear before him.''

I would also add a point from the U.S. attorneys' letter about the crushing caseload in this district.

Their letter states: ''[o]ur district has an extremely heavy case load and has been operating with a vacant judgeship for two and a half years. It is vitally important to the fair administration of justice that the long-vacant judicial vacancy in our Fresno district be promptly filled.''

This is a point that bears repeating: the caseload in the Eastern District of California is extraordinarily large, and has been for many years.

This district covers Sacramento and California's Central Valley, including Fresno and Bakersfield—it covers 55 percent of California's land area.

The district has only six judgeships for a population of nearly 8 million people, and it has almost two times as many people per judgeship as the average U.S. district court.

Over the last 6 years, the court has had nearly three times as many pending cases per judgeship—more than 1400—than the national average, 569.

These numbers translate into lengthy times for cases to be resolved. Over the last several years, it has taken between 38 and 51 months for civil cases to get to trial—well above the national average of 26 months.

Criminal cases now take over 20 months to be resolved currently, almost three times the national average of 7.4 months.

The point is this: the Eastern District of California is in serious need of additional judges. I have worked for many years to create those positions, and I believe very strongly that they are needed.

I am pleased that the Senate took the step of voting on this nomination.

Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IDAHO HOMETOWN HERO MEDAL

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to honor the 2015 Idaho Hometown Hero Medalists in the fifth year of the presentation of this recognition.

The Idaho Hometown Hero Medal celebrates those working for the betterment of our communities. Drs. Fahim and Naeem Rahim established the recognition to honor individuals who embody the spirit of philanthropy while showing remarkable commitment in both their personal and professional lives. I congratulate the 2015 award recipients and commend the Rahim brothers, the award's committee members, the cosponsors, volunteers, and other organizations supporting this honor for partnering to highlight good works.

Ten exceptional Idahoans from communities across our great State are 2015 Hometown Hero Medal recipients. Marianna Budnikova, of Boise, started two nonprofits to help girls take part in technology and pursue careers in computer sciences. Carrie French, of Caldwell, is being awarded posthumously for her dedicated, courageous service to our Nation. She enlisted in the U.S. Army at the age of 19 and died serving bravely in the Iraq war. Tiara Lusk, an ex-policewoman from Sugar City, started two initiatives to help women who are victims of domestic abuse and started a training program to help women enlist in the police force.

Sylvia Medina, a successful businesswoman from Idaho Falls, works to economically empower women and encourage the Latina community to participate in politics. John Rauker, an anti-drug campaign advocate, rescues at-risk children and opened drug rehab centers in Twin Falls and Pocatello for teens. Maria Sanchez, from American Falls, is an Idaho State University student who has excelled playing soccer for the university and is training to play for the Mexican national women's soccer team in the World Cup. Donna Scroggins, of Ririe, has dedicated many years to service. She is a World War II veteran who also served as a Peace Corp volunteer and nursed those in need in Ecuador and Afton, WY.

Judge Norman Randy Smith, of Pocatello, has served with distinction on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and is significantly involved with education and empowering students. Carmen Stanger, of Boise and Pocatello, channeled the loss of her daughter to bullying to leading antibullying efforts and working to empower teens and prevent similar tragedies in other families. Pastor Jacqualine Thomas, of Pocatello, grew the church she started from a congregation of 3 to more than 200. As an African-American woman pastor, she is actively involved in helping people in the community and providing a safe haven for those who are struggling.

Thank you to all the Hometown Hero Award recipients for the good works you inspire in others through your commitment to hard work, self-improvement, and community service. Congratulations on receiving this deserved recognition.●

TRIBUTE TO THE FITE FAMILY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Aaron and Tami Fite of Platte, SD. I selected the Fites to receive the 2015 Angels in Adoption Award presented by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption. I chose this couple for the way they have opened their hearts and homes to their children Cody and Cate through adoption and the way they have helped inspire their community to better understand adoption and children with all types of abilities.

Though they initially intended to adopt a child from abroad, God changed their hearts and brought Cody into their lives. During the first 3 years of his life, Cody had a variety of complex medical needs, but thanks to Aaron and Tami's love and support, today he is a healthy and vibrant 11-year-old who competes in basketball, track, and softball at the Special Olympics.

Two years after adopting Cody, Aaron and Tami welcomed a baby girl, Cate, into their home through adoption. Cate has a condition she developed in the womb that prevents her from being able to walk or talk on her own. Despite these challenges, she has mastered using a Mustang walker to walk and using an Eyegaze communication tool that allows her to talk to others using her eyes. Cate captivates others with her beautiful smile and gentle spirit.

Not long after adopting Cate, Tami unexpectedly became pregnant. Chloe was born in 2010, and another daughter, Clare, was born in 2012.

I am inspired by the Fites' faith in the Lord and their desire to spread the word about life. I am pleased they were able to travel to Washington, D.C., to help advocate for their message that opening homes to children through adoption can help spread the word that every life is valuable.

The Angels in Adoption award recognizes individuals, couples, and organizations that have made extraordinary contributions on behalf of children in need of a family. Awardees from all 50 states, plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, come together in Washington, D.C., each year to participate in events that celebrate their heroic actions and enable them to use their personal experience to effect change on a national level.

Aaron and Tami's exemplary actions demonstrate the positive impact adopting a child can have on a family and a community, and the Fites are more than deserving of this award. I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Aaron and Tami and their family, and I wish them the best of luck in the future.●

RECOGNIZING LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, too often our days are filled with news of worldwide violence and hardship. It is during these times that it is especially important to recognize those communities that find ways daily to celebrate life, family, and culture. Today, I would like to recognize Lafayette, LA, a city that goes above and beyond to distinguish itself as a cultural crossroads and one of the happiest places to live in America.

According to a 2014 report by the Wall Street Journal's MarketWatch, the top five happiest cities in America are all located in Louisiana, with Lafayette taking the top spot. For anyone who has ever visited this jewel of south Louisiana, the recognition will come as no surprise. Lafayette is located in the heart of Louisiana's Cajun and Creole country—an area known for its upbeat music, flavorful foods, and for letting the good times roll.

Each and every day, Lafayette's rich, unique history and culture can be seen throughout the streets of the city and the personalities of its residents. Entertaining, educational events are scattered throughout the calendar year, ensuring guests from around the world are shown a slice of the Lafayette way of life. Festivals such as the Festivals Acadiens et Creoles, held every October, provide an opportunity to experience the one-of-a-kind food, music, and traditions that the Lafayette region has to offer. Another annual Lafayette festival, the Festival International de Louisiane, attracts folks from across the State and the region in celebrating the intriguing history and culture shared between Louisiana and the Francophone world.

Lafayette is truly like no other place in the world; just ask any of its residents. With renowned food, music, and festivals, it is no wonder the population of this southern paradise always has a reason to smile. Congratulations again to Lafayette, LA, on the recognition of being the happiest place to live; and I wish you many more successful, happy years building and growing south Louisiana.●

RECOGNIZING LAFAYETTE MUSIC COMPANY

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, American musicians play a large role in the cultural development of our Nation's history, and much of that success is due to the local small businesses responsible for providing the equipment and instruction musicians need. This week's Small Business of the Week has an expert staff that is dedicated to serving all kinds of musicians. Congratulations to Lafayette Music Company of Lafayette, LA, for being selected Small Business of the Week.

The Lafayette Music Company is a 60-year-old family-owned business that has continuously provided musicians in their community with excellent equipment and instruction. Built in 1955 by Mr. William C. ''Bill'' Peyton, the Lafayette Music Company initially focused on the sale of pianos and organs. When Mr. Raymond J. Goodrich joined the sales team in 1967, he expanded the company's focus to include servicing additional instruments, including the brass family. Under Mr. Goodrich's management, the Lafayette Music Company developed a band department, catering to schools in the Acadiana region of south Louisiana. Mr. Goodrich's affable approach to securing a local consumer base offered a unique and personalized level of assistance that was unrivaled in the area. After working as a salesman and sales manager for 6 years and part owner for 3 years, Mr. Goodrich purchased a majority of the company's shares to become the primary owner.

Today, Mr. Goodrich and his wife, Karen, provide beginner, intermediate, and expert musicians with a diverse product selection. The Lafayette Music Company offers a wide array of the latest guitars, drums, band instruments, accessories, pianos, church organs, and more, as well as an in-house repair department that has been in service for more than 80 years. Additionally, the Lafayette Music Company boasts an astonishing customer service record that has ranked them in the top 100 largest music products retailers by The Music Trades magazine for 3 consecutive years.

Mr. Goodrich and his wife, Karen, provide entrepreneurs across the Nation with an inspiring example of how pursuing a business plan with unrelenting vigor and creativity is the key to success. Centered in an area of the country with world-renowned music and an incomparable heritage, the Goodrich family has secured the business of a community of musicians with specific needs. Congratulations again to Small Business of the Week, Acadiana's own Lafayette Music Company.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT AMENDING THE AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC—PM 28

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95–216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Supplementary Agreement Amending the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Czech Republic (the ''Supplementary Agreement''). The Supplementary Agreement, signed at Prague on September 23, 2013, is intended to modify a certain provision of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Czech Republic, with Administrative Arrangement, signed at Prague on September 7, 2007, and entered into force January 1, 2009 (the ''U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement'').

The U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement as amended by the Supplementary Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements already in force with most European Union countries, Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, and the Republic of Korea. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the lost benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Supplementary Agreement amends the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement to account for a new Czech domestic health insurance law, which was enacted subsequent to the signing of the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement in 2007. By including the health insurance law within the scope of the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement, this amendment will exempt U.S. citizen workers and multinational companies from contributing to the Czech health insurance system, when such workers otherwise meet all of the ordinary criteria for such an exemption.

The U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement, as amended, will continue to contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and other provisions that I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233, pursuant to section 233(c)(4) of the Social Security Act.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Supplementary Agreement and its estimated cost effect. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration have recommended the Supplementary Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the Supplementary Agreement to the U.S.-Czech Social Security Agreement and related documents.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 6, 2015*.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:54 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2835. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection officers.

At 5:55 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1151), as amended by section 1601 of Public Law 111–68, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 202(a) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146), the Democratic Leader appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Care: Ms. Charlene Taylor of Elk Grove, California.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2129. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, Energy and Water Development, and Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

S. 2130. A bill making appropriations for Department of Defense, energy and water development, Department of Homeland Security, military construction, Department of Veterans Affairs, and Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

S. 2131. A bill making appropriations for Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies and Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

S. 2132. A bill making appropriations for financial services and general government, Department of the Interior, environment, and Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2146. A bill to hold sanctuary jurisdictions accountable for defying Federal law, to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed, and to provide liability protection for State and local law enforcement who cooperate with Federal law enforcement and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Michael Herman Michaud, of Maine, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2136. A bill to establish the Regional SBIR State Collaborative Initiative Pilot Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BURR, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2137. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide a period for the relocation of spouses and dependents of certain members of the Armed Forces undergoing a permanent change of station in order to ease

and facilitate the relocation of military families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2138. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the review and acceptance of subcontracting plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2139. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for the procurement of covered contracts; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2140. A bill to establish criminal penalties for failing to inform and warn of serious dangers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2141. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to health information technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2142. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2143. A bill to provide for the authority for the successors and assigns of the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company to maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Rio Grande City, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 2144. A bill to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2145. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2146. A bill to hold sanctuary jurisdictions accountable for defying Federal law, to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed, and to provide liability protection for State and local law enforcement who cooperate with Federal law enforcement and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 278. A resolution welcoming the President of the Republic of Korea on her official visit to the United States and celebrating the United States-Republic of Korea relationship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. Res. 279. A resolution honoring the Red Land Little League Team of Lewisberry, Pennsylvania, for the performance of the Team in the 2015 Little League World Series; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. Con. Res. 22. A concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the White House Fellows program; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 89

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 89, a bill to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 255

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 334

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 334, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 395

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 395, a bill to implement a demonstration project under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to examine the costs and benefits of providing payments for comprehensive coordinated health care services provided by purpose-built, continuing care retirement communities to Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 480

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 480, a bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 399O of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) 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. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor 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. 800

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 901, a bill 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, and for other purposes.

S. 1424

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1424, a bill to prohibit the sale or distribution of cosmetics containing synthetic plastic microbeads.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to provide for increased Federal oversight of prescription opioid treatment and assistance to States in reducing opioid abuse, diversion, and deaths.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1455, a bill to provide access to medication-assisted therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 1550

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1550, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program

and project management in certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1559

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1559, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 1789

At the request of Mr. RISCH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1789, a bill to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

S. 1860

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1860, a bill to protect and promote international religious freedom.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1883, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1896

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1896, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to ensure that employees are not misclassified as non-employees, and for other purposes.

S. 1996

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1996, a bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 2021

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2021, a bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes.

S. 2116

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2116, a bill to improve certain programs of the Small Business Administration to better assist small business customers in accessing broadband technology, and for other purposes.

S. 2120

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2120, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to support veterans in contact with the criminal justice system by discouraging unnecessary criminalization of mental illness and other nonviolent crimes, and for other purposes.

S. 2126

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 2126, a bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2143. A bill to provide for the authority for the successors and assigns of the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company to maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Rio Grande City, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2143

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

SECTION 1. STARR-CAMARGO BRIDGE.

Public Law 87–532 (76 Stat. 153) is amended—

(1) in the first section, in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by inserting ", and its successors and assigns," after "State of Texas";

(B) by inserting "consisting of not more than 14 lanes" after "approaches thereto"; and

(C) by striking "and for a period of sixty-six years from the date of completion of such bridge,";

(2) in section 2, by inserting "and its successors and assigns," after "companies";

(3) by redesignating sections 3, 4, and 5 as sections 4, 5, and 6, respectively;

(4) by inserting after section 2 the following:

"SEC. 3. RIGHTS OF STARR-CAMARGO BRIDGE COMPANY AND SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Starr-Camargo Bridge Company and its successors and assigns shall have the rights and privileges granted to the B and P Bridge Company and its successors and assigns under section 2 of the Act of May 1, 1928 (45 Stat. 471, chapter 466).

"(b) REQUIREMENT.—In exercising the rights and privileges granted under subsection (a), the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company and its successors and assigns shall act in accordance with—

"(1) just compensation requirements;

"(2) public proceeding requirements; and

"(3) any other requirements applicable to the exercise of the rights referred to in subsection (a) under the laws of the State of Texas."; and

(5) in section 4 (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) by inserting "and its successors and assigns," after "such company";

(B) by striking "or" after "public agency,";

(C) by inserting "or to a corporation," after "international bridge authority or commission,"; and

(D) by striking "authority, or commission" each place it appears and inserting "authority, commission, or corporation".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 278—WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA ON HER OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES AND CELEBRATING THE UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA RELATIONSHIP, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 278

Whereas the Government and people of the United States and the Republic of Korea share a comprehensive alliance, a dynamic partnership, and a personal friendship rooted in the common values of freedom, democracy, and a free market economy;

Whereas the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea is a

linchpin of regional stability in Asia, including against the threats posed by the regime in Pyongyang;

Whereas cooperation between our nations spans across the security, diplomatic, economic, energy, and cultural spheres;

Whereas the relationship between the people of the United States and the Republic of Korea stretches back to Korea's Chosun Dynasty, when the United States and Korea established diplomatic relations under the 1882 Treaty of Peace, Amity, Commerce, and Navigation;

Whereas the United States-Republic of Korea alliance was forged in blood, with casualties of the United States during the Korean War of 54,246 dead (of whom 33,739 were battle deaths) and more than 103,284 wounded, and casualties of the Republic of Korea of over 50,000 soldiers dead and over 10,000 wounded;

Whereas the Korean War Veterans Recognition Act (Public Law 111–41) was enacted on July 27, 2009, and President Barack Obama issued a proclamation to designate the date as the National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day and called upon Americans to display flags at half-staff in memory of the Korean War veterans;

Whereas the Republic of Korea has stood shoulder-to-shoulder alongside the United States in all 4 major engagements the United States has faced since World War II—the Vietnam War, the Persian Gulf War, in Afghanistan, and in Iraq;

Whereas, since the 1953 Mutual Defense Treaty, to which the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification on January 26, 1954, United States military personnel have maintained a continuous presence on the Korean Peninsula, and currently there are approximately 28,500 United States troops stationed in the Republic of Korea;

Whereas, in January 2014, the United States and the Republic of Korea successfully concluded negotiations for a new five-year Special Measures Agreement (SMA), establishing the framework for Republic of Korea contributions to offset the costs associated with the stationing of United States Forces Korea (USFK) on the Korean Peninsula;

Whereas, the Governments and people of the United States and the Republic of Korea share a deep commitment to addressing the continued suffering of the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea due to the human rights abuses and repression of the regime in Pyongyang;

Whereas, on March 15, 2012, the United States-Republic of Korea Free Trade Agreement entered into force, which both sides have committed to fully implement, and the Republic of Korea is the United States sixth-largest trade partner, with United States goods and exports to Korea reaching a record level of $44,500,000,000 in 2014, up over 7 percent compared to 2013;

Whereas, on May 7, 2013, the United States and the Republic of Korea signed a Joint Declaration in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Alliance Between the Republic of Korea and the United States;

Whereas, on May 8, 2013, Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, the President of the Republic of Korea, addressed a Joint Session of Congress;

Whereas the United States Government notes the address delivered by President Park Geun-hye in Dresden, Germany, on March 28, 2014, and recognizes her efforts to promote peace, stability, and cooperation in Northeast Asia;

Whereas the United States Government appreciates the Government of the Republic of Korea's leadership and the critical role of the United States–Republic of Korea alliance in defusing tensions along the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) in August and September of 2015, that were provoked by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

Whereas there are deep cultural and personal ties between the peoples of the United States and the Republic of Korea, as exemplified by the large flow of visitors and exchanges each year between the 2 countries, including Korean students studying in United States colleges and universities;

Whereas Korean-Americans have made invaluable contributions to our Nation's security, prosperity, and diversity;

Whereas, from October 14–16, 2015, President Park Geun-hye will visit Washington for a second official visit to the United States since her election as President; and

Whereas the United States Government looks forward to continuing to deepen our enduring partnership with the Republic of Korea on security, economic, cultural issues, as well as embracing new opportunities for cooperation on emerging regional and global challenges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, the President of the Republic of Korea, on her official visit to the United States;

(2) reaffirms the importance of the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea, as enshrined in the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1953, that is vital to peace and security in Northeast Asia, and welcomes opportunities to strengthen security ties, including on space, cyber, and missile defense; and

(3) encourages the United States Government and the Government of the Republic of Korea to continue to broaden and deepen the alliance by enhancing cooperation in the security, economic, scientific, health, education, and cultural spheres.

SENATE RESOLUTION 279—HONORING THE RED LAND LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM OF LEWISBERRY, PENNSYLVANIA, FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE TEAM IN THE 2015 LITTLE LEAGUE WORLD SERIES

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 279

Whereas on Saturday, August 29, 2015, the Red Land Little League Team won the United States championship at the Little League Baseball World Series, defeating a versatile and dynamic team from Pearland, Texas, with a walk-off hit in the bottom of the sixth inning to win 3-2;

Whereas on Sunday, August 30, 2015, the Red Land Little League Team competed against the Kitasuna Little League Team from Tokyo, Japan, in the 69th Annual Little League World Series championship and set the record for the most runs scored in the first inning with 10 runs;

Whereas the Red Land Little League Team is the first York County team to win a national Little League championship and the first team from Pennsylvania to win the national Little League championship since 1990;

Whereas the Red Land Little League Team is comprised of: Camden Walter, Braden Kolmansberger, Dylan Rodenhaber, Adam Cramer, Jaden Henline, Chayton Krauss, Kaden Peifer, Cole Wagner, Zack Sooy, Jake Cubbler, Jarrett Wisman, Bailey Wirt, and Ethan Phillips;

Whereas the Red Land Little League Team is managed by Tom Peifer and coached by J.K. Kolmansberger and Bret Wagner, among others; and

Whereas the Red Land Little League Team has brought tremendous excitement, pride, and honor to the city of Lewisberry, the county of York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors the Red Land Little League Team and its loyal fans, affectionately known as the ''Red Sea'', on the performance of the Team at the 69th Little League World Series championship;

(2) recognizes and commends the hard work, dedication, determination, and commitment to excellence of the members, parents, families, coaches, and managers of the Red Land Little League Team; and

(3) recognizes and commends the people of Lewisberry, Pennsylvania and the surrounding area for their outstanding loyalty, support, and countless hours of volunteerism for the Red Land Little League Team throughout the season.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM

Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. REED) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 22

Whereas, in 1964, John W. Gardner presented the idea of selecting a handful of outstanding men and women to come to Washington, DC to participate as White House Fellows and learn the workings of the highest levels of the Government, learn about leadership as they observed the officials of the United States in action, and meet with these officials and other leaders of society;

Whereas John W. Gardner believed that serving as Fellows would strengthen the abilities and desires of the Fellows to contribute to their communities, their professions, and their country;

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson established the President's Commission on White House Fellowships through Executive Order 11183 (October 3, 1964) to create a program that would select between 11 and 19 outstanding young people of the United States every year and bring them to Washington, DC for ''first hand, high-level experience in the workings of the Federal Government, to establish an era when the young men and women of America and their government belonged to each other—belonged to each other in fact and in spirit'';

Whereas the White House Fellows program has steadfastly remained a nonpartisan program that has served and been supported by 9 Presidents exceptionally well;

Whereas the 725 White House Fellows who have served have established a legacy of leadership in every aspect of our society, including—

(1) appointments as Cabinet officers, ambassadors, special envoys, United States Attorneys, deputy and assistant secretaries of departments, and senior White House staff;

(2) election to the House of Representatives, the Senate, and State and local government;

(3) appointments to the Federal, State, and local judiciary;

(4) leadership in many of the largest corporations and law firms in the United States; and

(5) service as presidents of colleges and universities, deans of the most distinguished graduate schools in the United States, officials in nonprofit organizations, leaders in

national journalism and the working press, senior leaders in every branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, and distinguished scholars and historians;

Whereas the legacy of leadership of the White House Fellows program is a national resource that has served the United States in major challenges, including—

(1) organizing resettlement operations following the Vietnam War;

(2) assisting with the national response to terrorist attacks;

(3) managing the aftermath of natural disasters, such as Hurricanes Katrina and Rita;

(4) providing support to earthquake victims in Haiti and Nepal;

(5) serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Iraq and Afghanistan; and

(6) reforming and innovating in national and international securities and capital markets;

Whereas the post-Fellowship years of the 725 White House Fellows are characterized by a demonstrable lifetime commitment to public service through continuing personal and professional renewal and association, creating a White House Fellows Community of Mutual Support for leadership at every level of government and in every element of life in the United States; and

Whereas September 1, 2015, marked the 50th anniversary of the first class of White House Fellows to serve the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the 50th anniversary of the White House Fellows program and commends the White House Fellows for their continuing lifetime commitment to public service;

(2) acknowledges the legacy of leadership provided by White House Fellows over the years in their local communities, the United States, and the world; and

(3) expresses appreciation and support for the continuing leadership of White House Fellows in all aspects of the national life of the United States in the years ahead.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2708. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of the ratification of the 13th Amendment; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SA 2709. Mr. DAINES (for Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

SA 2710. Mr. DAINES (for Mr. SASSE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2708. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 21, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of the ratification of the 13th Amendment; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; as follows:

On page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike ''July 8'' and insert ''December 8''.

SA 2709. Mr. DAINES (for Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, add the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO THE TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (Public Law 109–424; 33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF PURPOSES OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 3202) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''research,'' after ''warnings,'';

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) to enhance and modernize the existing United States Tsunami Warning System to increase the accuracy of forecasts and warnings, to ensure full coverage of tsunami threats to the United States with a network of detection assets, and to reduce false alarms;'';

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) to improve and develop standards and guidelines for mapping, modeling, and assessment efforts to improve tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;'';

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (8), respectively;

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

''(4) to improve research efforts related to improving tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;'';

(6) in paragraph (5), as redesignated—

(A) by striking ''and increase'' and inserting '', increase, and develop uniform standards and guidelines for''; and

(B) by inserting '', including the warning signs of locally generated tsunami'' after ''approaching'';

(7) in paragraph (6), as redesignated, by striking '', including the Indian Ocean; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (6), as redesignated, the following:

''(7) to foster resilient communities in the face of tsunami and other similar coastal hazards; and''.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI FORECASTING AND WARNING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(a)) is amended by striking ''Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico region'' and inserting ''Atlantic Ocean region, including the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico''.

(b) COMPONENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''established'' and inserting ''supported or maintained'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) to the degree practicable, maintain not less than 80 percent of the Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis buoy array at operational capacity to optimize data reliability;''.

(5) by amending paragraph (5), as redesignated by paragraph (3), to read as follows:

''(5) provide tsunami forecasting capability based on models and measurements, including tsunami inundation models and maps for use in increasing the preparedness of communities and safeguarding port and harbor operations, that incorporate inputs, including—

''(A) the United States and global ocean and coastal observing system;

''(B) the global Earth observing system;

''(C) the global seismic network;

''(D) the Advanced National Seismic system;

''(E) tsunami model validation using historical and paleotsunami data;

''(F) digital elevation models and bathymetry;

''(G) newly developing tsunami detection methodologies using satellites and airborne remote sensing; and

''(H) any other data the Administrator determines is necessary;'';

(6) by amending paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (3), to read as follows:

''(7) include a cooperative effort among the Administration, the United States Geological Survey, and the National Science Foundation under which the Director of the United States Geological Survey and the Director of the National Science Foundation shall—

''(A) provide rapid and reliable seismic information to the Administrator from international and domestic seismic networks; and

''(B) support seismic stations installed before the date of the enactment of the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015 to supplement coverage in areas of sparse instrumentation;'';

(7) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting '', including graphical warning products,'' after ''warnings'';

(B) by inserting '', territories,'' after ''States''; and

(C) by inserting ''and Wireless Emergency Alerts'' after ''Hazards Program''; and

(8) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''provide and'' before ''allow''; and

(B) by inserting ''and commercial and Federal undersea communications cables'' after ''observing technologies''.

(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—Subsection (c) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The program under this section shall operate a tsunami warning system that—

''(1) is capable of forecasting tsunami, including forecasting tsunami arrival time and inundation estimates, anywhere in the Pacific and Arctic Ocean regions and providing adequate warnings;

''(2) is capable of forecasting and providing adequate warnings, including tsunami arrival time and inundation models where applicable, in areas of the Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico, that are determined—

''(A) to be geologically active, or to have significant potential for geological activity; and

''(B) to pose significant risks of tsunami for States along the coastal areas of the Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, or Gulf of Mexico; and

''(3) supports other international tsunami forecasting and warning efforts.''.

(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—Subsection (d) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall support or maintain centers to support the tsunami warning system required by subsection (c). The Centers shall include—

''(A) the National Tsunami Warning Center, located in Alaska, which is primarily responsible for Alaska and the continental United States;

''(B) the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, located in Hawaii, which is primarily responsible for Hawaii, the Caribbean, and other areas of the Pacific not covered by the National Center; and

''(C) any additional forecast and warning centers determined by the National Weather Service to be necessary.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) Continuously monitoring data from seismological, deep ocean, coastal sea level, and tidal monitoring stations and other data sources as may be developed and deployed.

''(B) Evaluating earthquakes, landslides, and volcanic eruptions that have the potential to generate tsunami.

''(C) Evaluating deep ocean buoy data and tidal monitoring stations for indications of tsunami resulting from earthquakes and other sources.

''(D) To the extent practicable, utilizing a range of models, including ensemble models, to predict tsunami, including arrival times, flooding estimates, coastal and harbor currents, and duration.

''(E) Using data from the Integrated Ocean Observing System of the Administration in coordination with regional associations to calculate new inundation estimates and periodically update existing inundation estimates.

''(F) Disseminating forecasts and tsunami warning bulletins to Federal, State, tribal, and local government officials and the public.

''(G) Coordinating with the tsunami hazard mitigation program conducted under section 5 to ensure ongoing sharing of information between forecasters and emergency management officials.

''(H) In coordination with the Coast Guard, evaluating and recommending procedures for ports and harbors at risk of tsunami inundation, including review of readiness, response, and communication strategies, and data sharing policies.

''(I) Making data gathered under this Act and post-warning analyses conducted by the National Weather Service or other relevant Administration offices available to the public.

''(J) Integrating and modernizing the program operated under this section with advances in tsunami science to improve performance without compromising service.

''(3) FAIL-SAFE WARNING CAPABILITY.—The tsunami warning centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1) shall maintain a fail-safe warning capability and perform back-up duties for each other.

''(4) COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.—The Administrator shall coordinate with the forecast offices of the National Weather Service, the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1), and such program offices of the Administration as the Administrator or the coordinating committee, as established in section 5(d), consider appropriate to ensure that regional and local forecast offices—

''(A) have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings for the communities they serve;

''(B) leverage connections with local emergency management officials for optimally disseminating tsunami warnings and forecasts; and

''(C) implement mass communication tools in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015 used by the National Weather Service on such date and newer mass communication technologies as they are developed as a part of the Weather-Ready Nation program of the Administration, or otherwise, for the purpose of timely and effective delivery of tsunami warnings.

''(5) UNIFORM OPERATING PROCEDURES.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) develop uniform operational procedures for the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1), including the use of software applications, checklists, decision support tools, and tsunami warning products that have been standardized across the program supported under this section;

''(B) ensure that processes and products of the warning system operated under subsection (c)—

''(i) reflect industry best practices when practicable;

''(ii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with internationally recognized standards for information technology; and

''(iii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with other warning products and practices of the National Weather Service;

''(C) ensure that future adjustments to operational protocols, processes, and warning products—

''(i) are made consistently across the warning system operated under subsection (c); and

''(ii) are applied in a uniform manner across such warning system;

''(D) establish a systematic method for information technology product development to improve long-term technology planning efforts; and

''(E) disseminate guidelines and metrics for evaluating and improving tsunami forecast models.

''(6) AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—The Administrator, through the National Weather Service, shall ensure that resources are available to fulfill the obligations of this Act. This includes ensuring supercomputing resources are available to run, as rapidly as possible, such computer models as are needed for purposes of the tsunami warning system operated under subsection (c).''.

(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—Subsection (e) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

''(1) develop requirements for the equipment used to forecast tsunami, including—

''(A) provisions for multipurpose detection platforms;

''(B) reliability and performance metrics; and

''(C) to the maximum extent practicable, requirements for the integration of equipment with other United States and global ocean and coastal observation systems, the global Earth observing system of systems, the global seismic networks, and the Advanced National Seismic System;

''(2) develop and execute a plan for the transfer of technology from ongoing research conducted as part of the program supported or maintained under section 6 into the program under this section; and

''(3) ensure that the Administration's operational tsunami detection equipment is properly maintained.''.

(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—Subsection (f) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—When deploying and maintaining tsunami detection technologies under the program under this section, the Administrator shall—

''(1) identify which assets of other Federal agencies are necessary to support such program; and

''(2) work with each agency identified under paragraph (1)—

''(A) to acquire the agency's assistance; and

''(B) to prioritize the necessary assets in support of the tsunami forecast and warning program.''.

(g) UNNECESSARY PROVISIONS.—Section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203) is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);

(2) by striking subsections (i) through (k); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(h) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.—Subsection (g) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(g)), as redesignated by subsection (g)(3), is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking ''30'' and inserting ''90'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(3) in the matter before subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator'';

(4) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the occurrence of a significant tsunami warning.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CONTENTS.—In a case in which notice is submitted under paragraph (1) within 90 days of a significant tsunami warning described in subparagraph (C) of such paragraph, such notice shall include, as appropriate, brief information and analysis of—

''(A) the accuracy of the tsunami model used;

''(B) the specific deep ocean or other monitoring equipment that detected the incident, as well as the deep ocean or other monitoring equipment that did not detect the incident due to malfunction or other reasons;

''(C) the effectiveness of the warning communication, including the dissemination of warnings with State, territory, local, and tribal partners in the affected area under the jurisdiction of the National Weather Service; and

''(D) such other findings as the Administrator considers appropriate.''.

SEC. 5. MODIFICATION OF NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 (33 U.S.C. 3204) is amended by striking subsections (a) through (d) and inserting the following:

''(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the heads of such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, shall conduct a community-based tsunami hazard mitigation program to improve tsunami preparedness and resiliency of at-risk areas in the United States and the territories of the United States.

''(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Program conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

''(1) Technical and financial assistance to coastal States, territories, tribes, and local governments to develop and implement activities under this section.

''(2) Integration of tsunami preparedness and mitigation programs into ongoing State-based hazard warning, resilience planning, and risk management activities, including predisaster planning, emergency response, evacuation planning, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development and redevelopment planning programs in affected areas.

''(3) Activities to promote the adoption of tsunami resilience, preparedness, warning, and mitigation measures by Federal, State, territorial, tribal, and local governments and nongovernmental entities, including educational and risk communication programs to discourage development in high-risk areas.

''(4) Activities to support the development of regional tsunami hazard and risk assessments. Such regional risk assessments may include the following:

''(A) The sources, sizes, and other relevant historical data of tsunami in the region, including paleotsunami data.

''(B) Inundation models and maps of critical infrastructure and socioeconomic vulnerability in areas subject to tsunami inundation.

''(C) Maps of evacuation areas and evacuation routes, including, when appropriate, traffic studies that evaluate the viability of evacuation routes.

''(D) Evaluations of the size of populations that will require evacuation, including populations with special evacuation needs.

''(E) Evaluations and technical assistance for vertical evacuation structure planning for communities where models indicate limited or no ability for timely evacuation, especially in areas at risk of near shore generated tsunami.

''(F) Evaluation of at-risk ports and harbors.

''(G) Evaluation of the effect of tsunami currents on the foundations of closely-spaced, coastal high-rise structures.

''(5) Activities to promote preparedness in at-risk ports and harbors, including the following:

''(A) Evaluation and recommendation of procedures for ports and harbors in the event of a distant or near-field tsunami.

''(B) A review of readiness, response, and communication strategies to ensure coordination and data sharing with the Coast Guard.

''(6) Activities to support the development of community-based outreach and education programs to ensure community readiness and resilience, including the following:

''(A) The development, implementation, and assessment of technical training and public education programs, including education programs that address unique characteristics of distant and near-field tsunami.

''(B) The development of decision support tools.

''(C) The incorporation of social science research into community readiness and resilience efforts.

''(D) The development of evidence-based education guidelines.

''(7) Dissemination of guidelines and standards for community planning, education, and training products, programs, and tools, including—

''(A) standards for—

''(i) mapping products;

''(ii) inundation models; and

''(iii) effective emergency exercises; and

''(B) recommended guidance for at-risk port and harbor tsunami warning, evacuation, and response procedures in coordination with the Coast Guard.

''(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In addition to activities conducted under subsection (b), the program conducted under subsection (a) may include the following:

''(1) Multidisciplinary vulnerability assessment research, education, and training to help integrate risk management and resilience objectives with community development planning and policies.

''(2) Risk management training for local officials and community organizations to enhance understanding and preparedness.

''(3) Interagency, Federal, State, tribal, and territorial intergovernmental tsunami response exercise planning and implementation in high risk areas.

''(4) Development of practical applications for existing or emerging technologies, such as modeling, remote sensing, geospatial technology, engineering, and observing systems, including the integration of tsunami sensors into Federal and commercial submarine telecommunication cables if practicable.

''(5) Risk management, risk assessment, and resilience data and information services, including—

''(A) access to data and products derived from observing and detection systems; and

''(B) development and maintenance of new integrated data products to support risk management, risk assessment, and resilience programs.

''(6) Risk notification systems that coordinate with and build upon existing systems and actively engage decisionmakers, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments and agencies, business communities, nongovernmental organizations, and the media.

''(d) COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall maintain a coordinating committee to assist the Administrator in the conduct of the program required by subsection (a).

''(2) COMPOSITION.—The coordinating committee shall be composed of members as follows:

''(A) Representatives from each of the States and territories most at risk from tsunami, including Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas Islands.

''(B) Such other members as the Administrator considers appropriate to represent Federal, State, tribal, territorial, and local governments.

''(3) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Administrator may approve the formation of subcommittees to address specific program components or regional issues.

''(4) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The coordinating committee shall—

''(A) provide feedback on how funds should be prioritized to carry out the program required by subsection (a);

''(B) ensure that areas described in section 4(c) in the United States and its territories have the opportunity to participate in the program;

''(C) provide recommendations to the Administrator on how to improve and continuously advance the TsunamiReady program of the National Weather Service, particularly on ways to make communities more tsunami resilient through the use of inundation maps and models and other hazard mitigation practices;

''(D) ensure that all components of the program required by subsection (a) are integrated with ongoing State based hazard warning, risk management, and resilience activities, including—

''(i) integrating activities with emergency response plans, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development programs in affected areas; and

''(ii) integrating information to assist in tsunami evacuation route planning.

''(5) EXEMPTION FROM FACA.—The provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the committee established and maintained under paragraph (1).

''(e) NO PREEMPTION WITH RESPECT TO DESIGNATION OF AT-RISK AREAS.—The establishment of national standards for inundation models under this section shall not prevent States, territories, tribes, and local governments from designating additional areas as being at risk based on knowledge of local conditions.

''(f) NO NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed as establishing new regulatory authority for any Federal agency.''.

(b) REPORT ON ACCREDITATION OF TSUNAMIREADY PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on which authorities and activities would be needed to have the TsunamiReady program of the National Weather Service accredited by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 6 (33 U.S.C. 3205) is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking ''The Administrator shall'' and all that follows through ''establish or maintain'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with such other Federal agencies, State, tribal, and territorial governments, and academic institutions as the Administrator considers appropriate, the coordinating committee under section 5(d), and the panel under section 8(a), support or maintain'';

(2) in subsection (a), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking ''and assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling. Such research program shall—'' and inserting the following: ''assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling, and standards development.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The research program supported or maintained under subsection (a) shall—''; and

(3) in subsection (b), as designated by paragraph (2)—

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

''(1) consider other appropriate and cost effective solutions to mitigate the impact of tsunami, including the improvement of near-field and distant tsunami detection and forecasting capabilities, which may include use of a new generation of the Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis array,

integration of tsunami sensors into commercial and Federal telecommunications cables, and other real-time tsunami monitoring systems and supercomputer capacity of the Administration to develop a rapid tsunami forecast for all United States coastlines;'';

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''include'' and inserting ''conduct''; and

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5);

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

''(4) develop the technical basis for validation of tsunami maps, numerical tsunami models, digital elevation models, and forecasts; and''; and

(E) in paragraph (5), as redesignated by subparagraph (C), by striking ''to the scientific community'' and inserting ''to the public and the scientific community''.

SEC. 7. GLOBAL TSUNAMI WARNING AND MITIGATION NETWORK.

Section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The Administrator shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and in consultation with such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, provide technical assistance, operational support, and training to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Meteorological Organization of the United Nations, and such other international entities as the Administrator considers appropriate, as part of the international efforts to develop a fully functional global tsunami forecast and warning system comprised of regional tsunami warning networks.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''shall'' each place it appears and inserting ''may''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''establishing'' and inserting ''supporting''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''establish'' and inserting ''support''; and

(ii) by striking ''establishing'' and inserting ''supporting''.

SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8 (33 U.S.C. 3207) as section 9; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) the following:

''SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

''(a) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator shall designate an existing working group within the Science Advisory Board of the Administration to manage the Tsunami Science and Technology Advisory Panel to provide advice to the Administrator on matters regarding tsunami science, technology, and regional preparedness.

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) COMPOSITION.—The Panel shall be composed of no fewer than 7 members selected by the Administrator from among individuals from academia or State agencies who have academic or practical expertise in physical sciences, social sciences, information technology, coastal resilience, emergency management, or such other disciplines as the Administrator considers appropriate.

''(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—No member of the Panel may be a Federal employee.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Panel shall—

''(1) review the activities of the Administration, and other Federal activities as appropriate, relating to tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation; and

''(2) submit to the Administrator and such others as the Administrator considers appropriate—

''(A) the findings of the working group with respect to the most recent review conducted under paragraph (1); and

''(B) such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the working group considers appropriate to improve Federal tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation.

''(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the findings and recommendations received by the Administrator under subsection (c)(2).''.

SEC. 9. REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed description of the progress made in implementing sections 4(d)(6), 5(b)(6), and 6(b)(4) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act.

(B) A description of the ways that tsunami warnings and warning products issued by the Tsunami Forecasting and Warning Program established under section 4 of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203) can be standardized and streamlined with warnings and warning products for hurricanes, coastal storms, and other coastal flooding events.

(b) REPORT ON NATIONAL EFFORTS THAT SUPPORT RAPID RESPONSE FOLLOWING NEAR-SHORE TSUNAMI EVENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly, in coordination with the Director of the United States Geological Survey, Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Administrator considers appropriate, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the national efforts in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act that support and facilitate rapid emergency response following a domestic near-shore tsunami event to better understand domestic effects of earthquake derived tsunami on people, infrastructure, and communities in the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of scientific or other measurements collected on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to quickly identify and quantify lost or degraded infrastructure or terrestrial formations.

(B) A description of scientific or other measurements that would be necessary to collect to quickly identify and quantify lost or degraded infrastructure or terrestrial formations.

(C) Identification and evaluation of Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and military first responder and search and rescue operation centers, bases, and other facilities as well as other critical response assets and infrastructure, including search and rescue aircraft, located within near-shore and distant tsunami inundation areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) An evaluation of near-shore tsunami response plans in areas described in subparagraph (C) in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and how those response plans would be affected by the loss of search and rescue and first responder infrastructure described in such subparagraph.

(E) A description of redevelopment plans and reports in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act for communities in areas that are at high-risk for near-shore tsunami, as well identification of States or communities that do not have redevelopment plans.

(F) Recommendations to enhance near-shore tsunami preparedness and response plans, including recommended responder exercises, predisaster planning, and mitigation needs.

(G) Such other data and analysis information as the Administrator and the Secretary of Homeland Security consider appropriate.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 of the Act, as redesignated by section 8(a)(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) $27,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, of which—

''(A) not less than 27 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year shall be for activities conducted at the State level under the tsunami hazard mitigation program under section 5; and

''(B) not less than 8 percent of the amount appropriated shall be for the tsunami research program under section 6.''.

SEC. 11. OUTREACH RESPONSIBILITIES.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with State and local emergency managers, shall develop and carry out formal outreach activities to improve tsunami education and awareness and foster the development of resilient communities. Outreach activities may include—

(1) the development of outreach plans to ensure the close integration of tsunami warning centers supported or maintained under section 4(d) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)) with local Weather Forecast Offices of the National Weather Service and emergency managers;

(2) working with appropriate local Weather Forecast Offices to ensure they have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings to the communities they serve; and

(3) evaluating the effectiveness of warnings and of coordination with local Weather Forecast Offices after significant tsunami events.

SEC. 12. MODIFICATION OF COASTAL OCEAN PROGRAM.

Section 201(c) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization

Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567; 106 Stat. 4280) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Of the sums'' and indenting appropriately; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REGIONAL COASTAL RISK MANAGEMENT COALITIONS.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration may form regional coastal risk management coalitions comprised of representatives of Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, community groups, academic institutions, and nongovernmental groups to advance the goals of this section for communities facing common coastal hazards and risks. Such coalitions may enter into an agreement with an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a nonprofit foundation in order to accept gifts and donations to support the goals of this subsection.''.

SEC. 13. REPEAL OF DUPLICATE PROVISIONS OF LAW.

(a) REPEAL.—The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–479) is amended by striking title VIII (relating to tsunami warning and education).

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal, or affect in any way, Public Law 109–424.

SA 2710. Mr. DAINES (for Mr. SASSE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3116, to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. REPORT ON DATA SECURITY PROCEDURES OF THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a review of the data security procedures of the Bureau of the Census, including such procedures that have been implemented since the data breaches of systems of the Office of Personnel Management were announced in 2015.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on the review required by subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) identify all information systems of the Bureau of the Census that contain sensitive information;

(B) described any actions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce or the Director of the Bureau of the Census to secure sensitive information that have been implemented since the data breaches of systems of the Office of Personnel Management were announced in 2015;

(C) identify any known data breaches of information systems of the Bureau of the Census that contain sensitive information; and

(D) identify whether the Bureau of the Census stores any information that, if combined with other such information, would comprise classified information.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 6, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 6, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD–366 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 October 6, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The U.S. Role and Strategy in the Middle East: Yemen and the Countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on October 6, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled '' Stealing the American Dream of Business Ownership: The NLRB's Joint Employer Decision.''

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 October 6, 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 October 6, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, AGENCY ACTION, FEDERAL RIGHTS, AND FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights, and Federal Courts, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on October 6, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Opportunity Denied: How Overregulation Harms Minorities.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Gifford J. Wong, who is an American Association for the Advancement of Science fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2015

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 237, H.R. 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 34) to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO THE TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (Public Law 109–424; 33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF PURPOSES OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 3202) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''research,'' after ''warnings,'';

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) to enhance and modernize the existing United States Tsunami Warning System to increase the accuracy of forecasts and warnings, to ensure full coverage of tsunami threats to the United States with a network of detection assets, and to reduce false alarms;'';

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) to improve and develop standards and guidelines for mapping, modeling, and assessment efforts to improve tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;'';

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (8), respectively;

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

''(4) to improve research efforts related to improving tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;'';

(6) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''and increase'' and inserting '', increase, and develop uniform standards and guidelines for''; and

(B) by inserting '', including the warning signs of locally generated tsunami'' after ''approaching'';

(7) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking '', including the Indian Ocean; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (6), as so redesignated, the following:

''(7) to foster resilient communities in the face of tsunami and other similar coastal hazards; and''.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI FORECASTING AND WARNING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203) is amended by striking ''Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico region'' and inserting ''Atlantic Ocean region, including the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico''.

(b) COMPONENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section 4 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''established'' and inserting ''supported or maintained'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) to the degree practicable, maintain not less than 80 percent of the Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis buoy array at operational capacity to optimize data reliability;''.

(5) by amending paragraph (5), as redesignated by paragraph (3), to read as follows:

''(5) provide tsunami forecasting capability based on models and measurements, including tsunami inundation models and maps for use in increasing the preparedness of communities and safeguarding port and harbor operations, that incorporate inputs, including—

''(A) the United States and global ocean and coastal observing system;

''(B) the global Earth observing system;

''(C) the global seismic network;

''(D) the Advanced National Seismic system;

''(E) tsunami model validation using historical and paleotsunami data;

''(F) digital elevation models and bathymetry; and

''(G) newly developing tsunami detection methodologies using satellites and airborne remote sensing;'';

(6) by inserting after paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (3), the following:

''(8) include a cooperative effort among the Administration, the United States Geological Survey, and the National Science Foundation under which the Director of the United States Geological Survey and the Director of the National Science Foundation shall—

''(A) provide rapid and reliable seismic information to the Administrator from international and domestic seismic networks; and

''(B) support seismic stations installed before the date of the enactment of the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015 to supplement coverage in areas of sparse instrumentation;''.

(7) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting '', including graphical warning products,'' after ''warnings'';

(B) by inserting '', territories,'' after ''States''; and

(C) by inserting ''and Wireless Emergency Alerts'' after ''Hazards Program''; and

(8) in paragraph (10), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''provide and'' before ''allow''; and

(B) by inserting ''and commercial and Federal undersea communications cables'' after ''observing technologies''.

(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—Subsection (c) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

''(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The program under this section shall operate a tsunami warning system that—

''(1) is capable of forecasting tsunami, including forecasting tsunami arrival time and inundation estimates, anywhere in the Pacific and Arctic Ocean regions and providing adequate warnings;

''(2) is capable of forecasting and providing adequate warnings, including tsunami arrival time and inundation models where applicable, in areas of the Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico, that are determined—

''(A) to be geologically active, or to have significant potential for geological activity; and

''(B) to pose significant risks of tsunami for States along the coastal areas of the Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, or Gulf of Mexico; and

''(3) supports other international tsunami forecasting and warning efforts.''.

(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—Subsection (d) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

''(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall support or maintain centers to support the tsunami warning system required by subsection (c). The Centers shall include—

''(A) the National Tsunami Warning Center, located in Alaska, which is primarily responsible for Alaska and the continental United States;

''(B) the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, located in Hawaii, which is primarily responsible for Hawaii, the Caribbean, and other areas of the Pacific not covered by the National Center; and

''(C) any additional forecast and warning centers determined by the National Weather Service to be necessary.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) Continuously monitoring data from seismological, deep ocean, coastal sea level, and tidal monitoring stations and other data sources as may be developed and deployed.

''(B) Evaluating earthquakes, landslides, and volcanic eruptions that have the potential to generate tsunami.

''(C) Evaluating deep ocean buoy data and tidal monitoring stations for indications of tsunami resulting from earthquakes and other sources.

''(D) To the extent practicable, utilizing a range of models, including ensemble models, to predict tsunami, including arrival times, flooding estimates, coastal and harbor currents, and duration.

''(E) Using data from the Integrated Ocean Observing System of the Administration in coordination with regional associations to calculate new inundation estimates and periodically update existing inundation estimates.

''(F) Ensuring supercomputing resources of the National Centers for Environmental Prediction are available to run, as rapidly as possible, such computer models as are needed for purposes of the tsunami warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c).

''(G) Disseminating forecasts and tsunami warning bulletins to Federal, State, tribal, and local government officials and the public.

''(H) Coordinating with the tsunami hazard mitigation program conducted under section 5 to ensure ongoing sharing of information between forecasters and emergency management officials.

''(I) Evaluating and recommending procedures for ports and harbors at risk of tsunami inundation, including review of readiness, response, and communication strategies to ensure coordination and data sharing with the Coast Guard.

''(J) Making data gathered under this Act and post-warning analyses conducted by the National Weather Service or other relevant Administration offices available to the public.

''(K) Integrating and modernizing the program operated under this section with advances in tsunami science to improve performance without compromising service.

''(3) FAIL-SAFE WARNING CAPABILITY.—The tsunami warning centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall maintain a fail-safe warning capability and perform back-up duties for each other.

''(4) COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.—The Administrator shall coordinate with the forecast offices of the National Weather Service, the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1), and such program offices of the Administration as the Administrator or the coordinating committee consider appropriate to ensure that regional and local forecast offices—

''(A) have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings for the communities they serve;

''(B) leverage connections with local emergency management officials for optimally disseminating tsunami warnings and forecasts; and

''(C) implement mass communication tools in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015 used by the National Weather Service on such date and newer mass communication technologies as they are developed as a part of the Weather-Ready Nation program of the Administration, or otherwise, for the purpose of timely and effective delivery of tsunami warnings.

''(5) UNIFORM OPERATING PROCEDURES.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) develop uniform operational procedures for the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1), including the use of software applications, checklists, decision support tools, and tsunami warning products that have been standardized across the program supported under this section;

''(B) ensure that processes and products of the warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c)—

''(i) reflect industry best practices when practicable;

''(ii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with internationally recognized standards for information technology; and

''(iii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with other warning products and practices of the National Weather Service;

''(C) ensure that future adjustments to operational protocols, processes, and warning products—

''(i) are made consistently across the warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c); and

''(ii) are applied in a uniform manner across such warning system;

''(D) establish a systematic method for information technology product development to improve long-term technology planning efforts; and

''(E) disseminate guidelines and metrics for evaluating and improving tsunami forecast models.

''(6) AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—The Administrator, through the National Weather Service, shall ensure that resources are available to fulfill the obligations of this Act. This includes ensuring supercomputing resources are available to run such computer models as are needed for purposes of the tsunami warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c).''.

(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—Subsection (e) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

''(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

''(1) develop requirements for the equipment used to forecast tsunami, including—

''(A) provisions for multipurpose detection platforms;

''(B) reliability and performance metrics; and

''(C) to the maximum extent practicable, requirements for the integration of equipment with other United States and global ocean and coastal observation systems, the global Earth observing system of systems, the global seismic networks, and the Advanced National Seismic System;

''(2) develop and execute a plan for the transfer of technology from ongoing research conducted as part of the program supported or

maintained under section 6 into the program under this section; and

''(3) ensure that the Administration's operational tsunami detection equipment is properly maintained.''.

(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—Subsection (f) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

''(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—When deploying and maintaining tsunami detection technologies under the program under this section, the Administrator shall—

''(1) identify which assets of other Federal agencies are necessary to support such program; and

''(2) work with each agency identified under paragraph (1)—

''(A) to acquire the agency's assistance; and

''(B) to prioritize the necessary assets.''.

(g) UNNECESSARY PROVISIONS.—Such section 4 is further amended—

(1) by striking subsections (g) and (i) through (k); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(h) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.—Subsection (g) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (g)(2), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(2) in the matter before subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator'';

(3) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the occurrence of a significant tsunami warning.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CONTENTS.—In a case in which notice is submitted under paragraph (1) within 90 days of a significant tsunami warning described in subparagraph (C) of such paragraph, such notice shall include brief information and analysis of—

''(A) the accuracy of the tsunami model used;

''(B) the specific deep ocean or other monitoring equipment that detected the incident, as well as the deep ocean or other monitoring equipment that did not detect the incident due to malfunction or otherwise;

''(C) the effectiveness of the warning communication procedures including the integration of warnings with State, territory, local, and tribal partners in the affected area under the jurisdiction of the National Weather Service; and

''(D) such other findings as the Administrator considers appropriate.''.

SEC. 5. MODIFICATION OF NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 (33 U.S.C. 3204) is amended by striking subsections (a) through (d) and inserting the following:

''(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the heads of such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, conduct a community-based tsunami hazard mitigation program to improve tsunami preparedness and resiliency of at-risk areas in the United States and the territories of the United States.

''(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Program conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include the following:

''(1) Technical and financial assistance to coastal States, territories, tribes, and local governments to develop and implement activities under this section.

''(2) Integration of tsunami preparedness and mitigation programs into ongoing State-based hazard warning, resilience planning, and risk management activities, including predisaster planning, emergency response, evacuation planning, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development and redevelopment planning programs in affected areas.

''(3) Activities to promote the adoption of tsunami resilience, preparedness, warning, and mitigation measures by Federal, State, territorial, tribal, and local governments and nongovernmental entities, including educational and risk communication programs to discourage development in high-risk areas.

''(4) Activities to support the development of regional tsunami hazard and risk assessments. Such regional risk assessments may include the following:

''(A) The sources, sizes, and other relevant historical data of tsunami in the region, including paleotsunami data.

''(B) Inundation models and maps of critical infrastructure and socioeconomic vulnerability in areas subject to tsunami inundation.

''(C) Maps of evacuation areas and evacuation routes, including, when appropriate, traffic studies that evaluate the viability of evacuation routes.

''(D) Evaluations of the size of populations that will require evacuation, including populations with special evacuation needs.

''(E) Evaluations and technical assistance for vertical evacuation structure planning for communities where models indicate limited or no ability for timely evacuation, especially in areas at risk of near shore generated tsunami.

''(F) Evaluation of at-risk ports and harbors.

''(G) Evaluation of the effect of tsunami currents on the foundations of closely-spaced, coastal high-rise structures.

''(5) Activities to promote preparedness in at-risk ports and harbors, including the following:

''(A) Evaluation and recommendation of procedures for ports and harbors in the event of a distant or near-field tsunami.

''(B) A review of readiness, response, and communication strategies to ensure coordination and data sharing with the Coast Guard.

''(6) Activities to support the development of community-based outreach and education programs to ensure community readiness and resilience, including the following:

''(A) The development, implementation, and assessment of technical training and public education programs, including education programs that address unique characteristics of distant and near-field tsunami.

''(B) The development of decision support tools.

''(C) The incorporation of social science research into community readiness and resilience efforts.

''(D) The development of evidence-based education guidelines.

''(7) Dissemination of guidelines and standards for community planning, education, and training products, programs, and tools, including—

''(A) standards for—

''(i) mapping products;

''(ii) inundation models; and

''(iii) effective emergency exercises; and

''(B) recommended guidance for at-risk port and harbor tsunami warning, evacuation, and response procedures in coordination with the Coast Guard.

''(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In addition to activities conducted under subsection (b), the program conducted pursuant to subsection (a) may include the following:

''(1) Multidisciplinary vulnerability assessment research, education, and training to help integrate risk management and resilience objectives with community development planning and policies.

''(2) Risk management training for local officials and community organizations to enhance understanding and preparedness.

''(3) Interagency, Federal, State, tribal, and territorial intergovernmental tsunami response exercise planning and implementation in high risk areas.

''(4) Development of practical applications for existing or emerging technologies, such as modeling, remote sensing, geospatial technology, engineering, and observing systems, including the integration of tsunami sensors into Federal and commercial submarine telecommunication cables if practicable.

''(5) Risk management, risk assessment, and resilience data and information services, including—

''(A) access to data and products derived from observing and detection systems; and

''(B) development and maintenance of new integrated data products to support risk management, risk assessment, and resilience programs.

''(6) Risk notification systems that coordinate with and build upon existing systems and actively engage decisionmakers, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments and agencies, business communities, nongovernmental organizations, and the media.

''(7) Formation of regional coastal risk management coalitions of Federal, State, local and tribal governments, community groups, academic institutions, and non-governmental groups to advance the goals of this section for communities facing common coastal hazards and risks. Such coalitions may enter into an agreement with an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a nonprofit foundation in order to accept gifts and donations to support of the goals of this section.

''(d) COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall maintain a coordinating committee to assist the Administrator in the conduct of the program required by subsection (a).

''(2) COMPOSITION.—The coordinating committee shall be composed of members as follows:

''(A) Representatives of States and territories most at risk from tsunami, including Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam and American Samoa.

''(B) Such other members as the Administrator considers appropriate to represent Federal, State, tribal, territorial, and local governments.

''(3) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Administrator may approve the formation of subcommittees to address specific program components or regional issues.

''(4) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The coordinating committee shall—

''(A) provide feedback on how funds should be prioritized to carry out the program required by subsection (a);

''(B) ensure that areas described in section 4(c) in the United States and its territories have the opportunity to participate in the program;

''(C) provide recommendations to the Administrator on how to improve and continuously advance the TsunamiReady program of the National Weather Service, particularly on ways to make communities more tsunami resilient through the use of inundation maps and models and other hazard mitigation practices;

''(D) ensure that all components of the program required by subsection (a) are integrated with ongoing State based hazard warning, risk management, and resilience activities, including—

''(i) integrating activities with emergency response plans, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development programs in affected areas; and

''(ii) integrating information to assist in tsunami evacuation route planning.

''(5) EXEMPTION FROM FACA TERMINATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 14) shall not apply to the committee established and maintained pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(e) NO PREEMPTION WITH RESPECT TO DESIGNATION OF AT-RISK AREAS.—The establishment of national standards for inundation models under this section shall not prevent States, territories, tribes, and local governments from designating additional areas as being at risk based on knowledge of local conditions.

''(f) NO NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed as establishing new regulatory authority for any Federal agency.''.

(b) REPORT ON ACCREDITATION OF TSUNAMIREADY PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on which authorities and activities would be needed to have the TsunamiReady program of the National Weather Service accredited by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 6 (33 U.S.C. 3205) is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking ''The Administrator shall'' and all that follows through ''establish or maintain'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with such other Federal agencies, State, tribal, and territorial governments, and academic institutions as the Administrator considers appropriate, the coordinating committee under section 5(d), and the panel under section 8(a), support or maintain'';

(2) in subsection (a), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking ''and assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling. Such research program shall—'' and inserting the following: ''assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling, and standards development.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The research program supported or maintained pursuant to subsection (a) shall—''; and

(3) in subsection (b), as designated by paragraph (2)—

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

''(1) consider other appropriate and cost effective research to mitigate the impact of tsunami, including the improvement of near-field and distant tsunami detection and forecasting capabilities, which may include use of a new generation of the Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis array, integration of tsunami sensors into commercial and Federal telecommunications cables, and other real-time tsunami monitoring systems and supercomputer capacity of the Administration to develop a rapid tsunami forecast for all United States coastlines;'';

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''include'' and inserting ''conduct''; and

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5);

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

''(4) develop the technical basis for validation of tsunami maps, numerical tsunami models, digital elevation models, and forecasts; and''; and

(E) in paragraph (5), as redesignated by subparagraph (C), by striking ''to the scientific community'' and inserting ''to the public''.

SEC. 7. GLOBAL TSUNAMI WARNING AND MITIGATION NETWORK.

Section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The Administrator shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and in consultation with such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, provide technical assistance and training to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Meteorological Organization of the United Nations, and such other international entities as the Administrator considers appropriate, as part of the international efforts to develop a fully functional global tsunami forecast and warning system comprised of regional tsunami warning networks.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''may''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''establishing'' and inserting ''supporting''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''establish'' and inserting ''support''; and

(ii) by striking ''establishing'' and inserting ''supporting''.

SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8 (33 U.S.C. 3207) as section 9; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) the following:

''SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

''(a) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator shall designate an existing working group within the Science Advisory Board of the Administration to serve as the Tsunami Science and Technology Advisory Panel to provide advice to the Administrator on matters regarding tsunami science, technology, and regional preparedness.

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) COMPOSITION.—The working group designated under subsection (a) shall be composed of no fewer than 7 members selected by the Administrator from among individuals from academia or State agencies who have academic or practical expertise in physical sciences, social sciences, information technology, coastal resilience, emergency management, or such other disciplines as the Administrator considers appropriate.

''(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—No member of the working group designated pursuant to subsection (a) may be a Federal employee.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the working group designated under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) review the activities of the Administration, and other Federal activities as appropriate, relating to tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation; and

''(2) submit to the Administrator and such others as the Administrator considers appropriate—

''(A) the findings of the working group with respect to the most recent review conducted pursuant to paragraph (1); and

''(B) such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the working group considers appropriate to improve Federal tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation.

''(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the findings and recommendations received by the Administrator under subsection (c)(2).''.

SEC. 9. REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed description of the progress made in implementing sections 4(d)(6), 5(b)(6), and 6(b)(4) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act.

(B) A description of the ways that tsunami warnings and warning products issued by the Tsunami Forecasting and Warning Program established under section 4 of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203) can be standardized and streamlined with warnings and warning products for hurricanes, coastal storms, and other coastal flooding events.

(b) REPORT ON NATIONAL EFFORTS THAT SUPPORT RAPID RESPONSE FOLLOWING NEAR-SHORE TSUNAMI EVENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly, in coordination with the Director of the United States Geological Survey, Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Administrator considers appropriate, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the national efforts in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act that support and facilitate rapid emergency response following a domestic near-shore tsunami event to better understand domestic effects of earthquake derived tsunami on people, infrastructure, and communities in the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of scientific or other measurements collected on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to quickly identify and quantify lost or degraded infrastructure or terrestrial formations.

(B) A description of scientific or other measurements that would be necessary to collect to quickly identify and quantify lost or degraded infrastructure or terrestrial formations.

(C) Identification and evaluation of Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and military first responder and search and rescue operation centers, bases, and other facilities as well as other critical response assets and infrastructure, including search and rescue aircraft, located within near-shore and distant tsunami inundation areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) An evaluation of near-shore tsunami response plans in areas described in subparagraph (C) in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and how those response plans would be affected by the loss of search and rescue and first responder infrastructure described in such subparagraph.

(E) A description of redevelopment plans and reports in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act for communities in areas that are at high-risk for near-shore tsunami, as well identification of States or communities that do not have redevelopment plans.

(F) Recommendations to enhance near-shore tsunami preparedness and response plans, including recommended responder exercises, predisaster planning, and mitigation needs.

(G) Such other data and analysis information as the Administrator and the Secretary of Homeland Security consider appropriate.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 of the Act, as redesignated by section 8(a)(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) $27,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, of which—

''(A) not less than 27 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year shall be for activities conducted at the State level under the tsunami hazard mitigation program under section 5; and

''(B) not less than 8 percent of the amount appropriated shall be for the tsunami research program under section 6.''.

SEC. 11. OUTREACH RESPONSIBILITIES.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with State and local emergency managers, shall develop and carry out formal outreach activities to improve tsunami education and awareness and foster the development of resilient communities. Outreach activities may include—

(1) the development of outreach plans to ensure the close integration of tsunami warning centers supported or maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)) with local Weather Forecast Offices of the National Weather Service and emergency managers;

(2) working with appropriate local Weather Forecast Offices to ensure they have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings to the communities they serve; and

(3) evaluating the effectiveness of warnings and of coordination with local Weather Forecast Offices after significant tsunami events.

SEC. 12. REPEAL OF DUPLICATE PROVISIONS OF LAW.

(a) REPEAL.—The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–479) is amended by striking title VIII (relating to tsunami warning and education).

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal, or affect in any way, Public Law 109–424.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Thune amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2709) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 34), as amended, was passed.

QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3116 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. 3116) to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sasse amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, 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 amendment (No. 2710) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To protect privacy for the American public)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. REPORT ON DATA SECURITY PROCEDURES OF THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a review of the data security procedures of the Bureau of the Census, including such procedures that have been implemented since the data breaches of systems of the Office of Personnel Management were announced in 2015.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on the review required by subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) identify all information systems of the Bureau of the Census that contain sensitive information;

(B) described any actions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce or the Director of the Bureau of the Census to secure sensitive information that have been implemented since the data breaches of systems of the Office of Personnel Management were announced in 2015;

(C) identify any known data breaches of information systems of the Bureau of the Census that contain sensitive information; and

(D) identify whether the Bureau of the Census stores any information that, if combined with other such information, would comprise classified information.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 3116), as amended, was passed.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 22.

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. 22) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the White House Fellows program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DAINES. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

HONORING THE RED LAND LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM OF LEWISBERRY, PENNSYLVANIA, IN THE 2015 LITTLE LEAGUE WORLD SERIES

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 279, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 279) honoring the Red Land Little League Team of Lewisberry, Pennsylvania, for the performance of the Team in the 2015 Little League World Series.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DAINES. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 279) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS FOR 150 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 272.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 272) congratulating the University of Kansas for 150 years of outstanding service to the State of Kansas, the United States, and the world.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DAINES. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 272) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 30, 2015, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2146

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2146) to hold sanctuary jurisdictions accountable for defying Federal law, to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed, and to provide liability protection for State and local law enforcement who cooperate with Federal law enforcement and for other purposes.

Mr. DAINES. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2015

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 7; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, with the time until 1 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that the time from 1 p.m. until 1:30 p.m. be controlled by the Democratic manager or his designee, and that the time from 1:30 p.m. to 2 p.m. be controlled by the chairman or his designee; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735 be deemed expired at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DAINES. 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.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:01 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 7, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 2015

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I take issue with the irresponsible manner in which this authorization approaches funding of our National Defense. This bill uses the Overseas Contingency Operations fund to avoid congressionally mandated budget caps for fiscal year 2016—an approach that fails to provide the appropriate budget and funding structure that enables the Department of Defense to operate in the most effective and efficient manner over both the short-term and long-term planning horizons. This is Congress' most important role. We need to do this right.

In addition, this Conference Report prevents the responsible transfer of detainees from Guantanamo Bay and continues the existence of a detention facility which serves as propaganda for extremists and undermines our moral standing in the world. Many of the detainees who remain were cleared for transfer nearly six years ago by the Guantanamo Review Task Force—an interagency effort that included the Departments of Defense, Justice, State, and Homeland Security, as well as the Director of National Intelligence. The transfer restrictions interfere with the administration's executive role in responsibly closing this facility, wasting valuable resources, and making us less safe. This facility needs to be closed.

H.R. 1735 fails to heed the expert advice and request of numerous senior leaders in the Department of Defense, Department of the Air Force, and Department of the Army, who all repeatedly testified regarding the problem of sustaining excess facilities. I understand that many of my colleagues are concerned about potentially losing a military base in their district; however, we should not force the Defense Department to hold onto excess infrastructure and assets that are of diminishing military value. The best way to address this problem is to authorize a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and ensure our military bases are operating in the smartest, most efficient and effective manner. This bill prevents that from happening.

I recognize that passing the NDAA is described as a tradition, but tradition is an inadequate reason to support legislation that undermines the ability of our Defense leaders to properly manage the largest portion of our federal budget—the portion responsible for National Security—and effectively undermines the health and safety of the women and men who carry out that mission.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 1735—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

SYDNEY HUGHES TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sydney Hughes of Meeker, Colorado. She was recently awarded a National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association student athlete scholarship for her excellence on and off the field.

The National Athletic Administrators Association awards scholarships to high school students based on their academic achievement and athletic accomplishments. Ms. Hughes was selected to the second team All-state girls' basketball team for the 2014–2015 season and was the only player from the Third Congressional District of Colorado to hold such honor in division 2A girls' basketball. She was also selected to the Western Slope Grand Mesa All-Conference teams in volleyball and track and field, all while maintaining a 4.2 Grade Point Average throughout her high school career.

Excellence in academics and athletics provides a wealth of life-long advantages, not least because they instill qualities of discipline, perseverance, and teamwork that are hallmarks of future success. Ms. Hughes embodies all of these qualities and knows that her resiliency and dedication in high school athletics and academics will continue through college and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent inspiring high school students like Ms. Hughes and I wish her nothing but the best as she continues through life's challenges. She is a terrific role model for her peers and represents the best that the Third District has to offer.

CELEBRATING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ITALIAN PRISONERS OF WAR ASSIGNED TO LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT, CHAMBERSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of World War II's Italian Service Units, in particular, the 321st Quartermaster Battalion once assigned to Letterkenny Army Depot near Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

During the summer of 1943, fierce fighting took place across North Africa and Sicily between Allied Forces and the Axis Powers. The U.S. and its allies captured approximately 275,000 prisoners of war and sent nearly 1,250 Italian soldiers to the Letterkenny Army Depot in Pennsylvania. A few months later, an armistice was signed with Italy and the one-time foes transformed into Italian Service Units culminating as the 321st Quartermaster Battalion.

With sworn allegiance to the United States, they spent the next seventeen months ordering, stocking and shipping critical military items to our men and women serving in the Pacific and European Theaters of war. The rugged labor and staunch commitment of the 321st Quartermaster Battalion were integral to the Allies' eventual defeat of the Axis Powers. Additionally, the men once held prisoner now helped to construct the depot itself, including a chapel and bell tower resplendent in Tuscan style.

As we mark the 70th Anniversary of the end of World War II, we also celebrate the repatriation of these distinctive soldiers and honor their contributions to both our home front and efforts abroad. They will forever remain entwined in our history and in our hearts.

METROPOLITAN STATE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Metropolitan State University of Denver, or MSU Denver, on its 50th anniversary. The extraordinary faculty and staff at MSU Denver have had an incredible impact on the lives of students in my district and on the Denver community as a whole.

Since its founding in 1965, MSU Denver has been known as a gateway to opportunity. The University opens its doors to students from all walks of life and provides rigorous academic coursework relevant to the Colorado economy. The University formed out of an idea for a new, different type of college, dedicated to supporting hard-working, scrappy students who might not otherwise have an opportunity to attend an institution of higher education. As a sign of its future success, MSU Denver enrolled double the number of students than anticipated when it first opened its doors on October 1, 1965.

Today, MSU Denver is Colorado's urban land-grant university, offering individualized, relevant bachelor's and select master's degrees to more undergraduate Coloradans than any other four-year university in the state. It has served as a leader in diverse enrollment among Colorado's four-year universities with 35 percent students of color and 32 percent first-generation students this year. The University has been a leader in educating students to think critically, solve problems, address community concerns, and meet Colorado's

workforce needs. Most of the school's 85,000 alumni have stayed within our state and continue to contribute to the economic and cultural vitality of Colorado.

I am not the only one that has recognized the value of the education MSU Denver provides to its students. Recently, the Military Times named MSU Denver the best college in the state for veterans. Further, MSU Denver strives to keep tuition affordable while providing a quality education. It has consistently been recognized in numerous rankings and articles for its affordability, its return on investment, and its incredible value in education. We are truly fortunate to have such a valuable resource in the First Congressional District.

For the last five decades, Metropolitan State University of Denver has transformed the lives of countless students, served as a courageous leader in higher education, and boldly advanced the well-being of communities throughout the State of Colorado. I congratulate each and every member of the MSU Denver community on this 50th anniversary. I wish MSU Denver continued success and growth for many years to come.

HONORING TERRY BOSTON, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF PJM INTERCONNECTION, LLC

HON. RYAN A. COSTELLO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Terry Boston, President and CEO of PJM Interconnection, LLC headquartered in Audubon, Pennsylvania.

Since 2008, Terry Boston has attentively served his role as the CEO by leading his team—600 of which are located in my district—and oversees the largest power grid in North America. As a result of his leadership, 51 million residents across 14 states, and many in PA–06, have access to reliable, affordable, and high quality electricity.

Mr. Boston and his team truly keep the lights on for millions, and for that we are grateful.

Mr. Boston has served a notable career as the President of the Association of Edison Illuminating Companies, Inc., immediate past president of the GO 15, past chair of the North American Transmission Forum, and the Executive Vice President of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Further, Terry recently was elected to the National Academy of Engineering, one of the highest professional honors for an engineer.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Boston on his distinguished career and wish him well in his retirement.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PAUL DEVROUAX

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Paul S. Devrouax, New Orleans native and leading architect in Washington, DC. Mr. Devrouax passed away on March 22, 2010, at the age of 67.

Mr. Devrouax was born in New Orleans, Louisiana in 1942. He studied architecture at Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana where he graduated in 1966. Mr. Devrouax was drafted into the United States Army and was promoted to Sergeant in the 6th Armored Cavalry Regiment. He first came to Washington, DC after his unit was deployed in the wake of riots after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.

In the decades that followed, Mr. Devrouax returned to the nation's capital and helped rebuild the blighted city. He founded Devrouax + Purnell, an African-American architectural firm. In 1986, Mr. Devrouax designed Frank D. Reeves Municipal Building which initiated the revitalization of the historic U Street neighborhood.

Mr. Devrouax was a trailblazer in the architectural field in Washington, DC. The Pepco Headquarters became the first building in downtown Washington designed by an African-American architectural firm. Mr. Devrouax also worked on many of the city's recent landmarks, including the Walter E. Washington Convention Center, the Verizon Center, the Nationals Stadium, and the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial. His passion for his profession and his community spurred him to mentor young architectural students.

Mr. Devrouax's legacy will forever be a part of the city and his dedication to community embodies the spirit of New Orleans. Stories like his will inspire generations of Americans to pursue their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of Mr. Devrouax, a beloved father, and example to aspiring entrepreneurs everywhere.

RECOGNIZING THE CHAMBERSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA NOONTIME LIONS CLUB FOR 90 YEARS OF HISTORY AND SERVICE

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Chambersburg Noontime Lions Club on the occasion of its 90th year of service to the Chambersburg community.

The Chambersburg Noontime Lions Club is one of the oldest of 46,000 Lions Club International chapters in operation today. Since the club was chartered in 1925, its members have included a diverse group of individuals united in their passion for community service. In that time, hundreds of men and women have lent their time and talents to improve the quality of life throughout the Chambersburg area. The Noontime Lions Club continually invests in the organizations that have the greatest access to areas of high need in the community, with resources going to Meals on Wheels, Easter Seals, Little League, Girl Scouts, and more.

Although they tackle a breadth of community concerns, they focus the majority of their efforts on eyesight preservation projects. As such, the Noontime Lions Club frequently offers eye exams, assists in the purchase of eyeglasses, and maintains active partnerships with organizations such as Leader Dogs for the Blind and Beacon Lodge. As an example of their generosity, the Chambersburg Noontime Lions Club has previously assisted a local family by funding much needed surgery for their seeing-eye dog.

Though much has changed throughout Chambersburg in the past ninety years, the commitment of Noontime Lions Club has remained steadfast, serving the needs of the local community. I am grateful for their contributions throughout Pennsylvania's 9th district and would like to thank all who have helped the organization reach this momentous milestone of 90 consecutive years of service.

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN'S 104TH NATIONAL DAY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the National Day of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on October 10. As we approach the commemoration of Taiwan's 104th National Day, it is appropriate that we take stock of the incredible progress Taiwan has made in recent decades.

This year marked the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II, and I am reminded that American servicemen stood side by side with servicemen from the Republic of China. From General Stilwell to the Flying Tigers, our two countries have a shared experience from that epic struggle, and today we share a commitment to democracy, rule of law, and human rights. Taiwan has consolidated its transition to a full-fledged representative democracy. Its success serves as an example of what can be built based on these principles, and that is why it is so important to strengthen the U.S.-Taiwan relationship.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important ways the U.S. can show support for Taiwan is to protect Taiwan's international space. As such, I support Taiwan's aspiration to be included in a second round of the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement. Taiwan is a responsible nation which abides by international laws and norms of conduct, and seeks to foster peace and contribute to aid efforts in a challenging region of the world. It is the U.S.'s tenth largest trading partner and Los Angeles County's fourth largest, and an obvious candidate for inclusion in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Given all the two-way trade and business between the U.S. and Taiwan, I actively supported Taiwan's entry into the Visa Waiver Program and passed legislation to make Taiwan an observer to the International Civil Aviation Organization. I am now supporting legislation for Taiwan to join INTERPOL as an observer to increase the safety and efficiency of our people and commerce.

As Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have made the U.S.-Taiwan relationship a top priority. Last March, I led a seven member bipartisan congressional delegation to Taipei to reaffirm the U.S.-Taiwan relationship. It was my third visit in as many years. I am also proud to represent one of the largest Taiwanese American communities in the country. The community serves as a bridge of cultural, familial, and business ties to Taiwan and is at the heart of U.S.-Taiwan relations.

On this important day, we reaffirm the strength of U.S.-Taiwan relations, and America's steadfast commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act which has underpinned the relationship for thirty-six years. We are committed to provide for Taiwan's self-defense, and I am dedicated to ensuring that we abide by our promise to provide the defense items to Taiwan that it needs.

Today, I am honored to rise in support of our great friend, Taiwan. We join the people of Taiwan in the celebration of their National Day, recognize the shared strengths of the relationship, and salute the strong friendship between the U.S. and Taiwan.

RECOGNIZING THE SOUTH CHINA SEA PEACE INITIATIVE AND 104TH ANNIVERSARY OF DOUBLE TEN DAY FOR THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss issues important to Taiwan, our close partner and ally in the Asia-Pacific region. In particular, I am concerned about current maritime disputes in the South China Sea, also known as the East Sea. I am concerned about China's growing presence in disputed waters in the South China Sea through land reclamation, neglect of international law, and disregard of the needs and territorial claims of its neighbors. A number of U.S. partners and allies in the region have taken different steps to address these illegal actions. Each plays an important role in signaling international disapproval of Beijing's actions. However, I want to highlight the efforts of Taiwan, under President Ma Ying-jeou, who has proposed a South China Sea Peace Initiative, which I believe should be seriously considered.

Taiwan understands that the tensions between claimants in the East China Sea and South China Sea threaten the peace and stability of the entire region. These disputes also threaten the political, economic, and security interests of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region. Through the South China Sea Peace Initiative, Taiwan calls on all relevant parties to exercise restraint, respect international law, shelve sovereignty disputes, and adhere to a code of conduct.

This course of action is similar to the one proposed by President Ma in his East China Sea Initiative of 2012. The spirit of that proposal helped to alleviate tensions among China, Taiwan, and Japan, and led to a fisheries agreement between Taiwan and Japan in 2013—ending a 40-year fisheries dispute. It is my hope that the South China Sea Peace Initiative will have a similar effect on the parties of the South China Sea dispute. Moreover, the South China Sea Peace Initiative is similar to the Declaration of the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea, which was agreed to by ASEAN, including China, in 2002. The declaration committed all parties of the territorial disputes to "reaffirm their respect for and commitment to the freedom of navigation in and over flight above the South China Sea as provided for by the universally recognized principles of international law" and to "resolve their territorial and jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, without resorting to the threat or use of force."

I encourage my colleagues to commit to a greater focus on developments in the Asia-Pacific region, particularly with regards to China's illegal actions in the South China Sea, and to this latest initiative from Taipei. During the 113th Congress, the House passed House Resolution 714, which was introduced by the good friend and former Congressman Eni Faleomavaega of American Samoa, and sent a clear message that the U.S. will not stand for these illegal and dangerous actions by China in the South China Sea. I hope that we will pass a similar resolution again this Congress, and I commit to working with my colleagues to send a clear message to China that their actions are intolerable.

Moreover, I hope that my colleagues will join me in sending another important signal about Congress' commitment to our allies and partners in the Asia-Pacific region by acknowledging the upcoming celebrations of the 104th anniversary of "Double Ten Day." Double Ten Day is a celebration of the birth of democracy in Taiwan. It traces its roots to the Wuchang Uprising that occurred on October 10, 1911. The Wuchang Uprising signaled the end of the Qing Dynasty and the start of a democratic movement that continues to be celebrated and recognized.

The strength of the relationship between the people of Taiwan and the people of the United States is strong. I look forward to continue working to expand business opportunities between our countries and deepen our mutual appreciation for each other's unique cultures. Exchange of our cultures is clearly evidenced on Guam, which is home to many people of Chinese ancestry. Guam continues to benefit from their cultural contributions to our community and the promotion of trade and economic opportunities.

On this 104th Anniversary of Double Ten Day, it is important to recognize that Taiwan has proven time and again to be a friend working to ensure continued peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. I extend my appreciation to Taiwan for their continuing friendship and contributions to regional peace.

RECOGNIZING JIM JOHNSTON FOR HIS LEADERSHIP ON ISSUES RELATED TO SMALL BUSINESS AND TRANSPORTATION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jim Johnston of Grain Valley, MO. This October, Jim will be completing his eighth term and fourth decade as the President of the Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association (OOIDA), an organization that formed to give owner-operators and drivers a voice where they previously had none. Jim is widely considered a national leader on all issues affecting small business trucking professionals and professional truck drivers.

It is hard to believe that OOIDA began in an office trailer chained to a light pole at a truck stop in Grain Valley. Under Jim's leadership, it is now the largest organization of small business trucking professionals and professional truck drivers in the country, with more than 155,000 members nationwide. OOIDA has members in every state and every Congressional district.

There is no single person or organization that is more capable of representing the interests of truck drivers. In fact, Jim leads a twenty-two member Board of Directors that collectively has more than eight-hundred years of truck driving experience, and a staff of three-hundred twenty OOIDA employees, many of whom were truck drivers themselves. Needless to say, Jim is an invaluable resource on trucking and transportation issues to those fortunate enough to work with him.

To say that Jim is a tireless advocate representing the interests of truck drivers is an understatement; it has been his life's work and there is nobody more dedicated to the cause. Throughout his career, he has worked with legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government, law enforcement agencies, other trucking and transportation organizations, and he has served on numerous commissions and advisory boards. His mission is simple: fight for the rights of all professional truck drivers. While some of his colleagues might say that he is a fierce adversary—perhaps another understatement—I think most people would agree that he conducts himself with integrity and the utmost professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to work with Jim and his team at OOIDA. I would ask all of my colleagues to join me in commending Mr. Jim Johnston for his lifelong dedication to the members of OOIDA and the trucking industry and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING LEON EWING ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM FIRSTMARK CREDIT UNION

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Mr. Leon Ewing, President and CEO of Firstmark Credit Union in San Antonio, on his over four decades of hard work and contributions to South Texas.

On December 31, 2015, Mr. Ewing will retire from Firstmark Credit Union after 34 years, concluding a distinguished career in the credit union industry. Under Mr. Ewing's leadership, Firstmark Credit Union became the fourth largest credit union in San Antonio.

In the local community, Mr. Ewing contributed his time and energy to San Antonio by serving on the boards of the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce and the Children's Hospital of San Antonio. He has earned the trust and respect of his colleagues, employees, and customers and we wish him all the best in the years ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 1, 2015 I was not present to cast

a vote on the conference report for H.R. 1735 and H.R. 3457.

Had I been present for roll call No. 532, I would have voted "NO."

Had I also been present for roll call No. 533, I would have voted "NO."

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SACRAMENTO CABRILLO CIVIC CLUB

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Ms. MATSUI to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the historic Cabrillo Civic Club in Sacramento, California—an institution that has brought families and communities together since its establishment.

The Spanish mission style building began as the Sutter School in 1915, an elementary school whose students were mostly children of immigrants. Due to the majority of students being of Portuguese descent or children of Japanese farmers, the students of the Sutter School relied heavily on their education to assimilate as Americans. As the school grew in popularity and enrollment increased, two additional wings were added to the building, but eventually closed its doors as a school in 1952.

In 1954, the property was purchased by the current owners, Cabrillo Civic Club Number 5 of Sacramento County. The members of the Cabrillo Civic Clubs of California are dedicated to the civic progress of Californians of Portuguese descent in memory of their compatriot, John Rodrigues Cabrillo, discoverer of California on September 28, 1542. Being third generation Portuguese, I feel strongly that this organization has helped foster the growth of our rich culture and sustained the strong community values we hold.

Today the members continue to be dedicated to community development and involvement in and around every club. Not only is the building available for rent to host events such as weddings, anniversaries, birthdays, reunions, fundraisers, and memorials for the Sacramento County, but the club also promotes scholarships for students of Portuguese descent and better education in campus youth programs. These programs perpetuate the achievements of other Portuguese forefathers in the state of California, just like Cabrillo.

The Club has also been known for many charitable activities, including: blood drives; fund raising for polio and cancer research, and assisting candidates for U.S. citizenship. In addition, they foster a great amount of energy into promoting Portuguese culture through sponsorship of various special events such as Portuguese Immigrant Week and local "Festas Portuguesas." The Cabrillo Civic Club of Sacramento County has done an incredible job for the past 100 years in uniting families of Portuguese descent in a community where public service, education, and culture are valued.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that Ms. MATSUI and I ask our colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in congratulating the 100th anniversary of the historic Cabrillo Civic Club in Sacramento, and to wish them many more prosperous years in promoting Portuguese achievements in the state of California.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PENN STATE FAYETTE, THE EBERLY CAMPUS

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Penn State Fayette, The Eberly Campus on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Since the return of Penn State undergraduate education to southwestern Pennsylvania in 1965, the Fayette campus has grown to encompass about 100 acres and 10 buildings. Penn State Fayette's impressive development is also illustrated by its increased breadth and depth of program offerings, which now includes nine baccalaureate and seven associate degree options. Just as when it first came to the area, Penn State Fayette continues to offer our area students a local option for a globally competitive education.

Additionally, I am proud to highlight those who have made these remarkable advancements possible. While a debt of gratitude is owed to those who have supported Penn State Fayette's continuing progress, like the Eberly Family, the campus's administration and faculty have also played a fundamental role in this success. Unlike many other universities, the faculty at Penn State Fayette serves students as not only teachers but also advisors, enabling students to get a truly worthwhile educational experience.

Walking around the campus today, visitors will notice an atmosphere of unity that has been cultivated by more than 25 student clubs and organizations. In addition to creating this vibrant and dynamic learning environment, the Fayette campus also maintains the Coal and Coke Heritage Center, which pays homage to the area's rich industrial past and represents the hardworking nature of Fayette County citizens, from its students to those who have long since retired.

I am privileged to congratulate Penn State Fayette, The Eberly Campus for 50 years of success, and to thank all who have helped this community continue to grow and prosper.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS HUNT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Lois Hunt for being selected as Ringgold County's 2015 inductee into the Iowa 4-H Hall of Fame.

Lois' contributions to 4-H have been far-reaching, as she has served in a number of different capacities within Extension 4-H as a volunteer, Extension Council member, program assistant, area specialist, and area director. She has also been involved with the Iowa 4-H Foundation It has been said that Lois has "green blood" and cherishes the success she sees in Iowa's youth who have participated in 4-H throughout her years of service with the organization.

Mr. Speaker, Lois' efforts embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent her, and Iowans like her, in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Lois for her achievements and wish her nothing but continued success.

CONGRATULATING DR. BARBARA IGLEWSKI

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Barbara Iglewski on her induction into the National Women's Hall of Fame. On October 3, Dr. Iglewski and nine other women were honored in Seneca Falls, New York, the birthplace of the women's rights movement.

Dr. Iglewski was chosen for this honor in recognition of her outstanding work in the field of microbiology. Her groundbreaking research led to a landmark scientific discovery about the impact of infectious bacteria on the body's immune system. Her work led to the development of preventative medications that protect humans from several types of infections and diseases.

Dr. Iglewski earned a bachelor's degree in biology from Alleghany College before earning her master's and doctorate degrees in microbiology from Penn State University. She currently holds the distinguished positions of Professor Emeritus of Microbiology and Immunology and Director of International Programs at the University of Rochester Medical Center. In addition, she has previously served as Chair of the Department of Microbiology and Immunology and Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education. Dr. Iglewski has published over 150 research papers and is recognized by the Institute of Scientific Information as a highly cited scientist.

Equally as impressive is the work Dr. Iglewski has done to create opportunity for women in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math. As president of the American Society for Microbiology, she helped women advance their careers by obtaining editorial positions at various scientific journals. As the first woman to chair a department at the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, she mentored female students and paved the way for female scientists to become leaders in their fields of study.

I commend Dr. Iglewski on this well-deserved recognition. Her induction into the National Women's Hall of Fame cements her place in history alongside Maya Angelou, Susan B. Anthony, Helen Keller, and the many other women whose contributions have had a profoundly positive impact on our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AVALON ACADEMY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor The Avalon Academy, a unique and visionary school in Burlingame, California which is celebrating 10 years of exceptional service. The school provides educational and therapeutic opportunities to children with cerebral palsy and similar movement disorders.

Avalon Academy was founded by two sets of parents of children with cerebral palsy, Annie Noonan and her husband, Jeffrey Wohl, and Lynette Mullens and her husband, Stephen Dilly, and a special education teacher, Kinga Czegeni. They were frustrated with the fragmented educational system for children with motor disabilities and decided to create a learning environment that addresses the academic, motor skill development, recreational, social and emotional needs of these students. The outcome is a beautiful school that for ten years has allowed the children to thrive and give their families peace of mind and certainty that their children are developing to their fullest potential.

Avalon Academy is certified as a non-public school by the California Department of Education for grades K through 12. It started ten years ago with three students, three staff members and three volunteers. Today it serves 8 children and has 27 staff members. Most of the students have cerebral palsy. Their degree of mobility ranges from being able to walk with assistance to being dependent on a wheelchair. Their cognitive abilities also vary greatly and the faculty caters to their individual needs. Cerebral palsy commonly coexists with related challenges from communication delays, intellectual impairment, social and emotional difficulties and eating challenges. Traditional schools are mostly not specialized to meet those challenges and that is why Avalon Academy is so effective and essential because the school addresses all the needs in one location. The teachers, physical therapists and speech pathologists integrate movement into all classroom activities, no matter the level of physical limitation of the student. This unique approach enhances motor abilities and encourages the children to be as independent and safe as possible in their lives.

I have the highest regard and admiration for the faculty at Avalon Academy who work miracles every day. They are led by Kinga Czegeni, the Head of School. She holds an M.A. in Special Education from the International Peto Institute in Budapest, Hungary and was recruited to California in 1997. Before co-founding Avalon Academy she was the director of Step by Step in Millbrae. She is a certified practitioner in the Ana Baniel Method, has worked with children with cerebral palsy for two decades and has developed Avalon's unique Movement Integrated Special Teaching System.

The two other founders and now board members are professional women and amazing mothers. My dear friend, Annie Noonan, is a successful attorney and employment law expert. She is the mother of Julianne and Sam, who developed cerebral palsy after an illness when he was 14 months old. Annie took Sam's condition and turned it into a rallying cry for better educational opportunities for children like him. I continue to be in awe of her energy and optimism.

Lynette Mullens holds a Ph.D. and specializes in the clinical research and development of drugs for the treatment of neurologic and psychiatric disorders, including drugs that are commonly used for seizures associated with cerebral palsy. Her work in California with a non-profit that provides online access to clinical trials inspired her to enhance the lives of children with cerebral palsy. She is the mother of George, who has cerebral palsy, Fred and Harriet.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor the extraordinary individuals who founded and have run Avalon Academy for a decade. They provide the best education imaginable for children with special needs and should serve as a model around the country.

TRIBUTE TO SOUTHWEST IOWA PLANNING COUNCIL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Southwest Iowa Planning Council as they celebrate their 40th year in operation.

The Southwest Iowa Planning Council's goals are to promote regional cooperation, to serve the counties and cities within our region with community and economic development activities, and to improve the quality of life for all residents in Southwest Iowa. Southwest Iowa Transit Agency (SWITA) operates the public transit system in our eight-county region, and Southwest Iowa Housing Trust Fund (SWIHTF) provides safe, affordable housing by expanding housing opportunities in the region. These additional services the Southwest Iowa Planning Council provides play an important role in improving the quality of life for Iowans.

Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to represent Southwest Iowa Planning Council and its hard working employees in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating the Council on their 40th anniversary and wish them nothing but continued success.

IN HONOR OF THE 104TH NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. TOM PRICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to rise in support of a great friend of the United States, Taiwan. As you know, October 10 is the 104th National Day of the Republic of China.

No one forgets the unbelievable sacrifices the Chinese endured against Imperial Japan during World War II. Nor do we forget that the Republic of China was in that conflict a full four years prior to the entry of the United States. Earlier this year, our two countries observed the 70th anniversary of the end of that war. After 1949, Taiwan held out as a key non-Communist partner during the early days of the Cold War. As a well-established democracy and as an economic powerhouse, Taiwan has set a model example for the rest of Asia and the world in recent years.

Given our long shared history as allies, it is entirely appropriate that we share in the celebration of Taiwan's National Day. To all of my Taiwanese friends, I wish you a happy and joyous day.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. NANCY MACDONALD CLARK

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Nancy MacDonald Clark, a champion of nursing education in the San Joaquin Valley. Dr. Clark's efforts in improving the lives of Valley residents, as well as expanding the California State University Stanislaus Department of Nursing, makes her extraordinarily deserving of having the university's Community Health Simulation Lab named in her honor.

Nancy Joan MacDonald Clark was born July 13, 1946 in San Francisco to Joseph MacDonald, a pharmacist, and Edith Bakke MacDonald, a registered nurse. She passed away on December 29, 2014 after a lengthy battle with cancer.

Nancy's family moved from the bay area to Atwater, California in 1951 to open a drug store. Nancy learned the value of service from her parents' involvement in the community. Her father served as Mayor of Atwater for two terms, and her mother hosted Atwater Chamber of Commerce coffee meetings for the newly arrived airmen at Castle Air Force Base. Nancy graduated from Atwater High School in 1964 and became an active member of the Atwater Women's Club.

Nancy graduated from then Fresno State College with a Bachelor's of Science degree in Nursing in 1968. She then went on to earn a Master's of Science in Nursing from California State University Fresno in 1983. She completed a Master's in Public Administration from Golden Gate University in San Francisco in 1985, and earned her Doctorate in Education from University of California, Davis/California State University Fresno's Joint Doctoral Program in 2004.

Dr. Clark worked in acute care in San Francisco, Texas and Florida for two years before relocating to the Central Valley, where she worked in Migrant Health. She then worked as a nurse in the Merced County Health Department for six years. After raising two young children for a number of years, she accepted an appointment at California State University, Stanislaus as a visiting lecturer. Nancy eventually progressed through the ranks to become a full professor in the nursing program, an RN to BSN Second Degree Program.

Dr. Clark was appointed Chair of the Nursing Department at CSU Stanislaus in 1999

and implemented a partnership with Sonoma State University to bring an MSN–FNP Program to campus. As Chair of the program, Nancy was most proud of founding the Pre-licensure Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program in 2002, the first generic nursing program to open in California in ten years. Before leaving the department, she had completed a needs assessment and proposal for an MSN program which opened in spring 2009.

After earning her doctorate in 2004, Dr. Clark was appointed Interim Associate Dean of the College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences at CSU Stanislaus. Following two years of leave and twenty-eight years in academia, Nancy retired in the summer of 2008 to focus on her health and family.

Mr. Speaker it is with reverence that I recognize the memory of Dr. Nancy Joan MacDonald Clark. Nancy dedicated many years of her life educating nurses of the future, and enabling those students to not only improve the lives of California residents but the lives of people throughout our nation. May her years of service to the California State University, Stanislaus never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO NICK AND SUE HUNT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Nick and Sue Hunt of Atlantic, Iowa, for receiving the 2015 Conservationist of the Year Award, presented by the Cass County Soil and Water Conservation District. This award is a joint effort of the Governor's Office, the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship, and the Department of Natural Resources.

The Conservationist of the Year Award recognizes the exemplary voluntary actions of farmers who work to improve and protect the environment and natural resources of our state. Nick and Sue were selected for this award because of their outstanding work in their farming operations and for serving as local leaders in environmental stewardship on their farm, utilizing a variety of techniques and best management practices. Their efforts have helped improve and protect the environment in the State of Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Nick and Sue for earning this award. They are shining examples of how hard work and dedication to conservation can benefit their property and the environment around them for years to come. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them for this outstanding achievement and wishing them nothing but continued success.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 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 $18,150,604,277,750.63. We've added $7,523,727,228,837.55 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.

HONORING BROWARD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Broward County Public Schools and the School Board of Broward County as they celebrate their centennial anniversary and the school system's impressive history of educational excellence. As the second-largest public school system in Florida and the sixth-largest in the nation, Broward County teachers and administrators continue to demonstrate their commitment to the betterment of our South Florida community.

This remarkable system includes 238 schools, centers and technical colleges, and 99 charter schools. Their impact on our state and this nation reaches far beyond the 265,000 young students and 175,000 adult students currently enrolled in one of their programs. Indeed, this school system is a cornerstone of South Florida's growing and vibrant economy.

Broward County Public Schools continues to prepare our students for the challenges of the 21st century. The school system educates students from 204 different countries who speak 184 different languages. Through innovative initiatives and a focus on the needs of our diverse community, they stand as beacon of the American ideals of educational achievement, upward mobility and the resolve to succeed.

It is with great pleasure that I honor Broward County Public Schools, the School Board of Broward County, and its Superintendent, Mr. Robert Runcie.

HONORING TEAM INC. ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join the communities of the Lower Naugatuck Valley in extending my sincere congratulations to TEAM, Inc. as they celebrate their 50th Anniversary—a special milestone for this outstanding organization.

Guided by the mission to connect individuals and families with solutions that lead to well-being, self-sufficiency and full participation in the community, over the course of the last five decades TEAM, Inc. has diligently worked to provide programs and services to those most in need. From Meals on Wheels for seniors to Head Start programs for children, from energy assistance to eviction prevention and security deposit assistance, and from financial education workshops and employment services to their annual holiday toy drive, as the needs of those they serve have changed, TEAM Inc. has expanded their work to provide their clients with skills and resources they need to succeed and thrive.

TEAM, Inc. works with individuals and families in times of crisis and stressful life changes. People of all ages turn to them for help with things ranging from basic needs and relief during a crisis to support in making long term changes in their lives. I want to extend a special note of thanks to all of the staff and administration of TEAM, Inc. whose hard work and contributions have strengthened the organization and advanced their mission. It takes a special combination of compassion and dedication to provide the myriad of programs and services at TEAM, Inc. The staff and administrators possess those unique qualities and through their efforts make a real difference in the lives of others.

I have had many opportunities to work with TEAM, Inc. and always find myself in awe of the scope of work they undertake every day. In their 50-year history, TEAM, Inc. has touched the lives of thousands, bringing the most precious of gifts—that of hope. There is no greater gift that we can provide to our fellow citizens. I am proud to stand today and extend my heartfelt congratulations to everyone at TEAM, Inc. on this very special occasion and wish them all the best for many more years of success.

TRIBUTE TO DORIS SAMUELSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Doris Samuelson of Council Bluffs, Iowa, on the celebration of her 90th birthday. Doris celebrated her 90th birthday in September. She was married to Bill Samuelson for 56 years and has four children. She also taught at the elementary school in the Council Bluffs School District.

Mr. Speaker it is an honor to represent Doris and Iowans like her. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Doris on this incredible milestone, and wish her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN AND BARBARA CROSSEN

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of John and Barbara Crossen, who celebrated their 70th wedding anniversary on September 30th.

Both children of Boston Police Department officers, John and Barbara met and fell in love as teenagers. Married on September 30, 1945

at the Most Precious Blood Church, the young couple lived in Hyde Park for many years before moving to Walpole, Massachusetts in the 1990s.

For many years, John worked at New England Telephone and spent countless hours volunteering on local initiatives. During my years as a Massachusetts State Senator, I had the privilege of working alongside John—who devotedly served his neighbors as an earnest and dedicated community representative. Barbara, too, dedicated her life to public service as Director of Human Resources for the Suffolk County District Attorney's office. Though they are now both retired, they are still involved in their community and maintain a keen interest in politics and public affairs.

As a testament to the profound impact John and Barbara have had on their family, their spirit of service and community has transcended generations. Over the years, many of their children and grandchildren have gone into law enforcement and served in the Boston Police Department. John and Barbara celebrate their 70th anniversary surrounded by their loving family, which has grown to five children, eleven grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor John and Barbara on this joyous occasion. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing them and their family many more years of happiness.

HONORING PETER AND SHEILA ARELLANO

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the lives of a well-known and beloved couple in the Escalon community, Peter and Sheila Arellano. They passed away within a year of each other. Sheila on October 7, 2014 and Peter on June 14, 2015.

Peter, fondly known as ''Chessie'' to his friends and family, grew up in Sonora, California where he was noted as a star athlete. After graduating from high school, Peter enlisted in the United States Air Force during WWII. He was stationed in the South Pacific, Australia, New Guinea, the Philippines, and Europe where he spent several years diligently and courageously serving our Country. After returning from WWII, he graduated from San Jose State to begin a career teaching and coaching. He also served in his local Lions Club for over 65 years in various positions from Past President to Chairman. He was Stockton County Fair Escalon Exhibit Co-Chair for over 20 years. He also started the Peter Arellano Athletic Scholarship and he previously hosted the Peter Arellano Athletic Scholarship Golf Tournament to raise money for scholar athletes from Escalon High School. Peter married the love of his life, Sheila, and together they moved to Escalon, California where they lived for over 58 years. Pete continued his passion for teaching at Escalon High School.

Sheila proudly worked as the assistant editor for the Escalon Times. Sheila also served as President of the Chamber of Commerce for two terms, member of the Historian Society, Escalon City Committee, Red Hats, Catholic YLI, Actor in Readers Theater, retired teacher aide at Den Elementary and El Portal Middle School, Escalon Soroptimist Group, and Stockton Country Fair Escalon Exhibit Chair for over 20 years. She started the Escalon Low Vision Support Group, hosted bingo lunch with seniors twice a month, and continued to be an acting Ambulance board member. The community honored them as Mr. and Mrs. Escalon because of their immense participation and contributions.

They have left a permanent mark on the Escalon Community. Both were inspiring human beings even in the face of difficult times. Sheila endured two bouts of breast cancer, kidney failure, heart attacks, and blindness due to macular degeneration. Despite all this, she maintained a smile on her face and a high spirit of gratitude. Pete's energy was just as contagious, and it allowed for them to be confident together. Both lived life the way it should be lived; they enjoyed the simple things and made the most of their time together every day.

Family was central to the Arellanos and they loved their family above all else. They are survived by their three children George Arellano, Tina Jensen and Bahrt Arellano; seven grandchildren Kim Theisen, Craig Berchtold, Holly Page, Heidi Rech, Jeremy Jensen, Cortez Arellano, Vincent Arellano; and eight great-grandchildren Kelsie Theisen, Callie Theisen, Trenton Berchtold, Emma Berchtold, Madelyn Page, Colton Page, Olivia Jensen and Vivian Jensen.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing Peter and Sheila Arellano for their numerous years of unwavering dedication to the Escalon community. They will be deeply missed by many and may God bless them always.

TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTHEAST POLK HIGH SCHOOL BASEBALL TEAM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Southeast Polk High School Boys Baseball Team for winning the Iowa Class 4A State Baseball Championship.

I would like to congratulate each member of the Team:

Players: Cam Shannon, Kyle Underwood, Tim Neff, Austin Martin, Cole Horton, Nathan Gjersvik, Ryan Lamke, Brayden Shepherd, Jace Surprenant, Brandon Ross, Sam Henry, Thomas McLaughlin, Alex DuToit, Jake Nelson, Sean Joelson, Carter Bauge, Zack Hamilton, Cole Hauser, Alex Pierce, Cole Hassman, Sam Hermes, and Connor Young.

Coaches: Scott Belger, Dave Hartman, Mike Steele, Rick Fee, Ty Weatherman, Scot Surprenant, and Blake Kielman.

Mr. Speaker, the success of this team and their coaches demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent them in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating these young men and the rest of the team for competing in this rigorous competition and wishing them all nothing but continued success.

RECOGNIZING MELANIE L. CAMPBELL FOR 20 YEARS OF SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP AT THE NATIONAL COALITION ON BLACK CIVIC PARTICIPATION

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Melanie L. Campbell, President and CEO of the National Coalition on Black Civic Participation (the National Coalition) for her exemplary leadership to expand and preserve civil, human and women's rights in the United States. This year marks the 20th year Ms. Campbell has led the National Coalition, which is composed of organizations that represent some 40 million people across our great nation. Campbell is well known for her unique ability to build powerful coalitions and networks that bring diverse people together for the common good.

The National Coalition was founded nearly 40 years ago on May 5, 1976 in the District of Columbia by great heroes and sheroes of the Civil Rights Movement, including the late Dr. Dorothy Irene Height, Norman Hill, the late Maynard Jackson, Rev. Dr. Joseph E. Lowery, William ''Bill'' Lucy, Eddie Williams and many others—all of whom mentored Campbell to embrace servant leadership as a way of life in her journey in the fight for justice for all people.

Melanie Campbell is a nationally recognized expert in civic engagement, voting rights, women's rights and youth empowerment, and has led many successful coalition-based campaigns that have empowered thousands of African Americans to have a voice in our representative democracy including: 1) the Unity Voter Empowerment Campaign helping increase Black voter participation to historic records over the past decade; 2) the Unity Diaspora Census Campaigns helping reduce the undercount of the Black population in 2000 and 2010; and 3) organizing the ReBuild Hope NOW Coalition in 2005 to assist survivors of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in rebuilding their lives in the Gulf Coast Region.

Ms. Campbell acknowledges that one of her most rewarding accomplishments at the National Coalition has been creating an innovative, youth-led civic leadership development program, Black Youth Vote, which was launched April 4, 1996, under the banner, ''the ballot, not the bullet'' in commemoration of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Campbell is a passionate advocate for women's rights and serves as convener of Black Women's Roundtable (BWR), an intergenerational public policy and organizing network of the National Coalition. Under her leadership, BMR empowers thousands of women and girls annually with tools and resources to live a higher quality of life. BWR is focused on fighting for income equality for women and a living wage job for all Americans.

In 2014, Campbell led a Black Women's Roundtable delegation to challenge the NFL to

address domestic violence and diversity in the league; and organized prayer vigils on Capitol Hill, with the National African American Clergy Network, to pray for Congress to confirm Loretta Lynch to become the first African American woman and second woman in history to serve as the U.S. Attorney General of the United States.

Most recently, she established the Black Youth Vote/Gathering of Black Men & Boys Initiative which held a Capitol Hill day on April, 23, 2015, with over 200 young men and boys coming together to learn how the public policy process works and meeting their Congressional representatives from both parties to share their concerns that are impacting their lives. For her black male initiatives work, she was recently appointed to the My Brothers' Keeper Alliance Advisory Council supported by President Obama.

Campbell is an active member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority and several other prominent national organizations. She is a native of Mims, Florida and attributes her passion for civil rights and social justice to her parents, Mrs. Janet Campbell and the late Isaac Campbell, Sr., who instilled in her a strong faith in God and the understanding that ''helping others is the rent we pay for being born.''

Melanie L. Campbell has spent her entire professional life as a mentor and a role model for countless women and youth in the District of Columbia, the nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in saluting Melanie L. Campbell for her 20 years of service to our nation as a non-profit leader at the National Coalition, and for being a great humanitarian and outstanding citizen of the United States of America.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Collegiate Honors Council (NCHC) for their 50th Anniversary and outstanding commitment to collegiate honors education. The National Collegiate Honors Council is dedicated to excellence in education, as they serve over 800 colleges and universities across the country and is composed of over 325,000 students dedicated to achieving excellence in diverse subject and curriculum areas to fulfill professional career goals.

I would also like to call attention to Saint Leo University in my district for their dedication to academic excellence and for being a member of the National Collegiate Honors Council. Students at Saint Leo University experience and grow in core values such as excellence, community, integrity, respect, personal development and responsible stewardship.

The Honors Program at Saint Leo University was started over 30 years ago. Alumni and current students continue to express to others the enormous impact the program has had on their professional work experience. One graduate is now a professional working in instructional technology developing safety training in the energy field and credits the Honors Program at Saint Leo for preparing him to adapt intellectually and to be ready to explore new fields. Students are encouraged to broaden their horizons with a change of scenery and culture through this program. One student interned for a museum in London and was able to incorporate this experience in with their history course. Another student worked on an oral-care education project for the small children of migrant farmworkers who live within a short drive of the campus.

As you can see through the Honors Program, students have been challenged to think deeply about what they want to accomplish personally and professionally, and are already making strides toward those goals. Saint Leo Honors Program has shown and continues to show their commitment to educating students and influencing their lives positively to help shape them in every way.

Once again, please join me in commending the National Collegiate Honors Council on their 50th Anniversary. Their service to programs like those at Saint Leo University and their dedication to academic excellence and achievement is honorable.

COMMEMORATING 104TH ANNIVERSARY OF TAIWAN

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Taiwan on the 104th anniversary of their great Republic on October 10. This day, known as ''Double Ten Day'' because it falls on the 10th day of the 10th month, is revered in Taiwan the same as we celebrate the 4th of July. It commemorates the Wuchang Uprising, the event that triggered a revolution that led to the overthrow of China's imperial regime and the establishment of the Republic of China on January 1, 1912.

Over the following century, as a result of the hard work and dedication of the people of Taiwan, Taiwan has become a democracy that stands as a model to other nations around the world.

On this national day, I would also like to take the time to thank Taiwan for their continuing focus on buying American goods. In 2014, Taiwan surpassed India and Saudi Arabia to become the United States' 10th largest trading partner. Last year, Taiwan purchased nearly $200 million worth of goods from my home state of Michigan, bolstering our chemical, metal and machinery sectors.

104 years after the Wuchang Uprising, Taiwan has transformed into a flourishing, economically robust society where social justice is a priority. Taiwan's praiseworthy commitment to social justice is perhaps best exemplified by their implementation of the single-payer National Health Insurance (NHI) system. This year marks the 20th anniversary of the system, which guarantees all Taiwanese citizens access to necessary medical care. In just two decades, Taiwan's healthcare system has become globally renowned for providing citizens with easy access to high-quality medical services, and it provides an important lesson to the world about the feasibility of a transition to a single-payer system.

I am proud to commemorate the 104th anniversary of Taiwan's Double Ten Day, and I look forward to continuing the meaningful friendship and cooperation between the peoples and governments of the United States and Taiwan.

TRIBUTE TO TOM AND NORMA TROXEL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tom and Norma Troxel of Farragut, Iowa, for their induction into the Iowa 4–H Hall of Fame during a ceremony at the 2015 Iowa State Fair.

Tom and Norma have been involved in 4–H for most of their lives. They are longtime members of 4–H and became 4–H leaders when their three daughters, Andria, Maggie, and Kimberly, became old enough to join. Tom is a 4th generation ag producer, and Norma has served on the Extension Council and the 4–H Youth and Endowment Committees for a number of years.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Tom and Norma for being inducted into the 4–H Hall of Fame. They are shining examples of how hard work, leadership, and dedication can serve to promote and support our youth and the mission of 4–H. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Tom and Norma and wishing them nothing but continued success.

IN MEMORY OF SAMUEL J. SWORN, JR. OF POMPANO BEACH, FLORIDA

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an esteemed educator, community leader, and personal friend, Mr. Samuel J. Sworn, Jr. Brother Samuel was a community icon and a charter member of the Fort Lauderdale Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity. He sadly transitioned into the Chapter Invisible on October 5, 2015, surrounded by family, friends, and his beloved wife Millicent.

Brother Samuel believed that mentorship, volunteerism, and philanthropy are the cornerstones of a thriving community and because of his efforts, the Fort Lauderdale Alumni Chapter continues to be a ''beacon of light'' and a positive influence in the lives of the people of Broward County.

Brother Samuel was also a wonderful educator. For over 30 years, he served the students of Broward County, first as a Blanche Ely High School teacher, then transitioning through the Broward County system to become an administrator at Plantation High School. He had a knack for helping people and on June 13, 2009, Pompano Beach officials dedicated the new aquatic center Houston-Sworn Aquatic Center at Mitchell-Moore Park to honor his many contributions to the Pompano community.

Mr. Speaker, I once again want to honor Mr. Samuel J. Sworn, Jr. for his dedication and commitment to education, our fraternity, his community, and most of all to his family. He was a kind human being whose legacy and memory will always live on. I was truly proud to call Samuel my friend and will miss him dearly.

CONGRATULATING DONALD ''TRAE'' SHEEHAN III

HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Donald ''Trae'' Sheehan III of Troop 165 of the Shenandoah Area Council in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, for earning the rank of Eagle Scout. This accomplishment required leadership, service to his community, and a great deal of hard work. It makes me proud to see young West Virginians such as Donald work to better themselves and their communities as they prepare to become our nation's future leaders. I join with Donald's family and friends in congratulating him on becoming an Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO VAN CLARK JR.

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Van Clark Jr. for his retirement from Modern Optical in Des Moines after 43 years of dedicated service.

Van has spent his life helping his patients enjoy their lives to the fullest. His dedication to helping others is second to none. During his time at Modern Optical, Van would make special trips to nursing homes in the area to offer optical assistance to those who were in need. He now plans to spend as much time as possible with his family and travel with his wife.

Mr. Speaker, Van's selflessness and willingness to help others is a true embodiment of the Iowa spirit. It is an honor to represent him and Iowans like him in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him on this momentous occasion and wish him nothing but continued success and happiness in his retirement.

RECOGNIZING PAULETTE PYLE

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my very good friend, Paulette Pyle, for her many years advocating for Oregon's farmers, ranchers and foresters. Paulette is retiring from Oregonians for Food and Shelter where she delivered 35 years of historic service as their Director of Grassroots, and is one of the most respected and expert advocates in the country in her field. Since many of my colleagues call Paulette a dear friend, I'd like to pay tribute to her numerous contributions to Oregon and its natural resource industries.

Born in Sioux City, Iowa and raised on a wheat and dairy operation near Cottonwood, Idaho, agriculture has always been close to Paulette's heart. As she has worked on behalf of Oregon's farmers for over three decades, Paulette became well known statewide for the passion for and commitment to the farm, ranch and timber families she worked for.

In 1972, after nearly a decade working in health care, Paulette made her first professional foray into politics, serving as district staff for Senator Steve Symms of Idaho during his time in the U.S. House. She campaigned her way from Idaho to Oregon. A tenacious and well-liked go-getter from the start, she was known to go door to door on campaigns with her twin baby girls—one on each hip.

Paulette took her grassroots experience to the newly formed Oregonians for Food and Shelter in 1980. Over the next 35 years, she became a beloved and relied upon household name for Oregon's farmers, ranchers and foresters as well as a highly regarded advocate around the state capitol and in the halls of Congress.

In that role, Paulette became an integral part of Oregon's natural resources community, tying together sometimes differing groups towards a common goal. If there was an issue heating up that affected the industry, you knew you'd find Paulette leading the charge to ensure progress.

Guided by what she knew was right and in the best interest of Oregon, Paulette knew how to get things done. At times when others may have been turned off by a defeat, Paulette just got creative. And this approach often led to success.

One example of Paulette's creative, can-do disposition is the time Paulette worked tirelessly to move a pesticide bill through the legislature, only to have the Governor veto it. Unwilling to give up on the effort, Paulette went to work again, getting the language attached to a bill referring a decision on a light rail project to the voters—a legislative vehicle that the Governor was eager to see approved. Left with a choice between letting the bill move forward with Paulette's language included, or vetoing his own legislative priority, the Governor signed the bill into law. Paulette scored a win on behalf of family farmers, and voters went on to vote down the Governor's project.

This tenacity and skill served Paulette well at the federal level too. Her grassroots efforts were integral as we worked to turn the heat up on the Senate and push the last major federal forest policy reform to become law, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act, across the finish line.

State legislators and members of Congress weren't the only ones leaning on Paulette for advice and assistance. President George W. Bush became fast friends with Paulette, and made sure she was included in any ranching, farming or forestry discussion affecting Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. The president's team would call me before one of his many visits to Oregon during his presidency to confirm that I had not forgotten to make sure Paulette would be available to join ''43'' when he visited our family farmers, ranchers and foresters. The Bush White House team soon learned that I did not need a reminder to include Paulette as I'd tell them she was always first on my call list.

In addition to Paulette's significant professional achievements, it is important to note that an even higher priority for her is her cherished family and the faith that guides her daily. Paulette and her husband Ken raised six outstanding children, who in turn are raising their 16 grandchildren. Paulette has led her family by love and Christian example, and this is very clear to all who know her.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, please join me in recognizing and thanking my good friend, Paulette Pyle, for her years of leadership and tremendous dedication on behalf of the natural resource industry. Oregon's farmers, ranchers and foresters have benefited in countless ways over the past three and a half decades thanks to Paulette. I wish Paulette and Ken the best for many years of good health and happiness in retirement and the years ahead. She will forever remain a very special friend.

CONGRATULATING THE 2015 HONOREES OF THE TOLEDO AFRICAN AMERICAN LEGACY PROJECT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate thirteen community leaders who are being recognized as 2015 honorees of the Toledo African American Legacy Project. The Toledo African American Legacy Project is dedicated to bringing together people to document and preserve the history of northwest Ohio's African American communities and demonstrate the impact and influence of individuals upon Toledo and the greater world community.

This year's honorees are indeed a celebrated group. Elinor Allen is a retired school teacher who for 33 years served as an elementary teacher, Unit Leader, and reading teacher in Toledo Public Schools. Ronald Jackson, Sr., was appointed as the first African American Deputy Chief of the Toledo Police Department and also served as Executive Director of the Board of Community Relations. Theresa M. Gabriel has served in many capacities within the city government including Director of Parks, Recreation and Forestry and Director of Department of Human Resources. She currently serves on Toledo City Council. John Moore is a consultant, motivational speaker and author whose current and past board memberships include Owens Community College and the College's foundation, Boys and Girls Clubs of Toledo and Hospice of Northwest Ohio. Doni Miller is the CEO of the Neighborhood Health Association, a federally qualified health center. She earned a Doctor of Jurisprudence from the University of Toledo and has 25 years of experience in health administration in addition to hosting a local public affairs television program. Ben Williams has dedicated his life to youth. He is currently the Executive Director of the Ben E. Williams Youth Service, Inc., and was the first African American coach inducted into the Ohio High School Basketball Coaches Association Hall of Fame.

The Toledo African American Legacy Project also posthumously recognized: Dr. Frank A. Brown, who was elected the first African American as Vice President of the Toledo Board of Education and eventually President; and Roland A. Gandy, Jr., who was Chief of Staff at Mercy Hospital and Maumee Valley Hospital and was known for providing services free of charge to Scott High School and the University of Toledo athletics.

In addition to honoring these community leaders, the Toledo African American Legacy Project also highlights young, emerging African-Americans leading the way for the future. This year, four people were recognized for their efforts. Larome Myrick is a Parole Service Supervisor in the Department of Youth Services Toledo Region. Kelly Westmoreland is an agent for Bankers Life and Casualty. Jason Woodward is a minister, deacon and finance director at Trinity Faith Tabernacle Church. Rashieda Timpson is founder and CEO of the Christian based non-profit organization United Sisters (women inspiring women).

It is my sincere pleasure to congratulate all of these honorees for their hard work and dedicated service. We stand on the shoulders of those who came before us and together we build community forward. The 2015 African American Legacy Project honorees represent the excellence that is in us. Their leadership inspires.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARSHA BIANCONI'S SERVICE AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE CONFERENCE OF WESTERN WAYNE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Marsha Bianconi for her distinguished service as the Executive Director of the Conference of Western Wayne. Marsha's commitment to our community has enriched the lives of so many and helped guide the leaders of our region towards collective and coordinated success.

The Conference of Western Wayne is a consortium of eighteen western Wayne County communities who meet monthly to discuss issues including; legislation, transportation, public safety, substance abuse, economic development, and the environment. For over thirty five years, the Conference of Western Wayne has moved forward with its mission to support the bi-partisan, mutual interest of its member communities. For twenty seven of those years, Marsha has shaped the mission, vision, and programming of the organization and taken it far beyond what anyone would have imagined when it started.

As we reflect on her service and accomplishments, it is important to recognize that Marsha has been a wonderful mother of two children, Steven and Melissa, and a loving wife to her husband Bob. After all, we are all working to build stronger, safer communities not just for ourselves, but for our families and friends. While she is looking forward to retirement, I know that we will not lose her insight and leadership in our region because she will continue to stay involved in so many of our community organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Mrs. Marsha Bianconi for her twenty seven years of service to our communities and for her dedication to regional cooperation. I thank her for her leadership and wish her many years of joy in her retirement.

TRIBUTE TO SARA ROSS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Sara Ross of Minden, Iowa, for being selected as the Midwest Farm Mom of the Year. Sara grew up in a small rural community in Nebraska, but she did not grow up on a farm. When Sara married her husband Kevin, a sixth-generation Iowa farmer, she took it upon herself to learn the farm business.

The criteria used in selecting the ''Farm Mom of the Year'' by the American Agri-Women, a national coalition of farm, ranch, and agribusiness women, is based on support for family and commitment to agriculture. Sara's commitment is evident through her blog about farm life, her involvement in volunteer farm organizations, and her international work, including traveling to China to teach women there about U.S. agriculture and soybean production.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Sara for her leadership in the agriculture community in Pottawattamie County, the State of Iowa, and with international partners. Sara's hard work and dedication to her family and farm represents our Iowa values, and I am proud to represent her in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Sara and in wishing her and her family nothing but the best.

A TRIED AND TRUE TRADITION: TEXAS BARBECUE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, barbecue is among the great traditions of Texas. Texans are passionate about their favorite barbecue as they are about football and politics. I've heard barbeque, football, and politics should not be brought up in mixed company. All three are contact sports here.

We take our barbecue seriously, and we know we smoke it the best way. Folks are known to plan road trips across the state to remedy a hankering for barbecue at legendary joints, like Louie Miller Barbecue in Taylor, Black's Barbecue in Lockhart, or City Market in Luling. Let's not forget one of the world's best barbecue cook-offs is held every year at the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo.

Folks ask me all the time, ''Where do you go for good Texas barbecue?''

My choice, hands down, is located practically in my backyard—Tin Roof BBQ in Atascocita. There are few places I would rather be than sidled up to a table at Tin Roof, catching up on local conversations with neighbors and enjoying authentic Texas barbecue.

Tin Roof has been a staple in our community for 14 years, and over the years, I've eaten there so often that I consider the owners, Ronnie and Nancy Webber, to be friends. Ronnie and Nancy decided to open Tin Roof soon after Ronnie retired from the Houston Police Department. Not content with retirement, they purchased a historic home, located close to Memorial Park, which was used during World War II to house military personnel at Camp Logan. A developer was going to tear it down until the Webbers saved it. They moved the structure to Atascocita and outfitted it in Texas-themed decor.

The restaurant has grown from the original house with several additions, including a Texas-sized covered deck. On a typical Saturday night, folks fill the place to sample delicious, homemade cooking, from Texas' best barbecue to side dishes made from scratch. Of course, there's Ronnie's delicious homemade sauce, sweet tea, and live music.

Family-owned restaurants, like Tin Roof, are the heart of our community. Ronnie and Nancy are deeply rooted here, and it shows. They give back whenever they can. They provide food, friendship, and support for a number of neighborhood organizations, area schools, and our local law enforcement officers. Recently, they participated in a charity cook-off to help the Banded Brigade Outdoors, an organization that provides morale-boosting events, such as hunting, fishing, and target shooting, for those who have served our great country.

Many love barbecue for its taste. Aficionados love it for its craft. Texans love it for its tradition, steeped in community with friends and family gathered around a picnic table, making memories. This weekend grab the family and head to the nearest Texas barbecue joint. Just be careful if you mix it with football and politics.

And that's just the way it is—y'all.

RECOGNIZING PROFESSOR GZ (CHARLIE) BROWN

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize University of Oregon Professor GZ (Charlie) Brown, Philip H. Knight Professor of Architecture. For 38 years, Professor Brown has taught and inspired generations of University of Oregon students and practitioners.

Prof. Brown is a leader in sustainable design and founded the UO Energy Studies in Buildings Laboratory, (ESBL) located in Portland and Eugene. As director of the ESBL, he developed and oversaw research projects focused on understanding how building and transportation design determines energy consumption. The lab collaborates with designers, builders, developers, and governmental agencies to develop strategies and design tools that maximize energy efficiency in new materials, components, assemblies, buildings, and communities. The ESBL has acted as a design consultant on more than 100 projects.

Prof. Brown is a pioneer. In 1988, he collaborated on a study investigating the impacts

of climate change on the energy performance of buildings. In 1991, he served as an advisor on the Global Warming project for the Office of Technology Assessment of the U.S. Congress. He is the author of a pioneering book on the practice of sustainable design, Sun, Wind and Light: Architectural Design Strategies, and co-author of Natural Ventilation in Northwest Buildings and Inside Out: Design Procedures for Passive Environmental Technologies. His list of publications includes more than 100 papers and reports on computing, energy, climate, and housing. He has also co-authored software programs to facilitate design, including Energy Scheming, SIP Scheming, Energy Module, and Auto Architect.

Prof. Brown's research topics include visualization of building information, manually activated pneumatic shade controls, natural ventilation, daylighting (including the impact of structural design), heat exchangers, modular construction (with a focus on structural insulated panels), classroom design, building massing, passive design, insulation, energy auditing, and straw bale construction.

He is a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects and the American Solar Energy Society, and has received awards for leadership in research from the U.S. Green Building Council and the Architectural Research Centers Consortium. In 1984, Prof. Brown received the National Award for Energy Innovation from the U.S. Department of Energy and the Governor's Award for Energy Innovation from the State of Oregon.

Prof. Brown will be honored this month by the University of Oregon for his contributions, and it is my honor to recognize and congratulate him for his years of exemplary service.

TRIBUTE TO TALL CORN MOTEL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Tall Corn Motel of Shenandoah, Iowa. For over 60 years, the Tall Corn Motel has been a constant in the Shenandoah community. The business was founded in 1955 and was one of the first motels to be built in the state.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s the motel went through many changes and new ownership to accommodate what quickly became a famous Iowa landmark. With the economy booming, many motel guests looked at the motel as their home away from home. In fact, even world famous movie stars and musicians, such as the Everly Brothers, Elizabeth Taylor, Dolly Parton, Lucille Ball, John Wayne, and Marilyn Monroe, made appearances throughout the years at the Tall Corn Motel.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Tall Corn Motel for 60 years of dedicated service to the communities and visitors of Shenandoah and southwest Iowa. I urge my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the Tall Corn Motel owners, and wishing them and their entire staff nothing but the best moving forward.

EL FARO TRAGEDY

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my heart and prayers go out to the families of those aboard the cargo ship, *El Faro*, which disappeared Thursday evening, northeast of the Crooked Islands, Bahamas. Along with the family members, I hold out hope that the Coast Guard's search and rescue mission will be able to save the lives of surviving crew members.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I will be asking for a complete investigation into this tragic incident. I commend the Coast Guard for everything they do for our nation in the areas of maritime security and environmental protection, and have worked closely with the agency for many years. I was briefed today by the Coast Guard, and was told that in their search and rescue mission, they currently have:

Two Coast Guard HC–130 Hercules airplanes from Coast Guard Air Station Clearwater, Florida.

Two Navy P–8 fixed wing airplanes.

One Coast Guard MH–60 Jayhawk from Coast Guard Air Station Clearwater, Florida.

Coast Guard Cutter *Northland*, a 210-foot medium endurance cutter homeported in Portsmouth, Virginia.

Coast Guard Cutter *Resolute*, a 210-foot medium endurance cutter homeported in St. Petersburg, Florida.

Coast Guard Cutter *Charles Sexton*, a 154-foot fast response cutter homeported in Key West, Florida.

Three commercial tugboats.

Additionally, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) will have an investigative team that will arrive in Jacksonville tomorrow, and I will continue to monitor the situation closely and provide any assistance I am able to.

RECOGNIZING LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA, AS THE HAPPIEST CITY IN AMERICA

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lafayette, Louisiana, for being recognized as the Happiest City in America. Lafayette is my home. I was raised there, attended elementary and high school there, obtained my undergraduate degree from the University of Southwest Louisiana there, and began a family there. Anyone who has spent time in our city can tell you it is a place filled with joie de vivre—where friends and neighbors become family, our unique Cajun food, music, and culture abound, and everyone knows how to have a good time.

This designation was awarded by the National Bureau of Economic Research based on a 2014 study conducted by Edward Glaeser of Harvard University, Joshua Gottlieb of the Vancouver School of Economics, and Oren Ziv, a Harvard University doctoral student. Amazingly, every city in the top five hail from Louisiana, with Houma, Shreveport-Bossier City, Baton Rouge, and Alexandria following Lafayette in the study's findings. Accordingly, Louisiana was found to be the happiest state in the country.

This is just another reason I am proud to call Lafayette, Louisiana, my home. I'm honored to represent this beautiful and diverse city in Congress, and am grateful to be able to recognize its distinction as the Happiest City in America.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT LUCAS COLOSIMO

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Lucas Colosimo for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained for more than a century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as complete an Eagle Project to benefit the community. For his Eagle Scout Service Project, Lucas made and installed an outdoor meditative pathway, which included the Stations of the Cross at St. Thomas More Center in Panora, Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Lucas and his supportive family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him on reaching the rank of Eagle Scout, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

IN HONOR OF THE 75TH BIRTHDAY OF JOHN JENKINS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize John Jenkins on his 75th birthday on October 16th.

Mr. Jenkins was born in Dayton, Ohio in 1940. In his childhood, he worked on his family's farm, and showed a strong worth ethic and a dedication to every job he held. He eventually began a career as an investment specialist, helping others achieve the American dream.

However, not everything in John's life was perfect. He struggled with alcoholism, which later led to an addiction to crack cocaine. His addictions caused him to reach rock bottom, and he found himself living in a burned out

building. A stranger told John about His Place, a Christian recovery home in Opelika, Alabama.

While there, John overcame his addictions, and found religion. He resolved to make good on the change in his life by helping others, and over the past 15 years has served in numerous positions at His Place, most recently becoming an assistant director there. He also serves as a deacon and elder at Grace Falls Church, and is known and loved throughout his community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the life and achievements of Mr. Jenkins and wishing him a happy 75th birthday.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT AWARENESS MONTH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to recognize October as National Disability Employment Awareness Month. As we celebrate the 70th year of recognizing individuals with disabilities within our national workforce, it is paramount that we, as a country, do everything we can to ensure individuals with a disability have opportunities to enter the workforce without barriers.

Individuals with disabilities are a vital part of our national workforce and have contributed greatly to the U.S. economy. Yet, only 19.1% of these Americans are participants in the labor force. Accessibility, transportation, and perceptions of individuals with disabilities are some of the many obstacles that prevent these Americans from being given the opportunity to put in a full day's work and become active members of our communities. Likewise, it is critical that we recognize the organizations and individuals across the country that provide these opportunities.

The Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind is one such organization in my district that deserves this special recognition. Founded in 1931, the Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind provides employment opportunities for the visually impaired. The organization enhances the lives of hundreds of individuals with disabilities. In doing so, they bring tremendous value to our community.

As we recognize October as National Disability Employment Awareness Month, I call on employers, schools, and other organizations to work throughout the year—not only in October—to ensure that individuals with disabilities have a chance to contribute in meaningful and long-lasting ways through gainful employment. Mr. Speaker, individuals with disabilities have a lot of value to contribute to our society, and I am pleased to recognize their contributions during this very special month.

HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE UMPQUA COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRAGEDY

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I submit an article from Roseburg, Oregon's News-Review to honor and remember the lives of those who were taken too soon at Umpqua Community College on Thursday, October 1, 2015.

I ask that all Americans pray for the friends and families of these nine victims as they grieve and rebuild from this tragedy.

We must also keep in our thoughts and prayers those who were injured physically and emotionally by this event. It will take time and our support and patience as they grieve and recover.

Roseburg is a strong and tight-knit community. I am heartened, and not surprised, by the acts of kindness and generosity in response to an unthinkable act. We call that "UCC Strong," "Roseburg Strong." It is this strong spirit that will carry everyone through this difficult time.

[From the News-Review, Roseburg, Oregon, Oct. 2, 2015]

VICTIMS' FAMILIES: 'OUR LIVES HAVE BEEN SHATTERED BEYOND REPAIR'

The victims who died in Thursday's Umpqua Community College shooting were far more than a list of names. Five of the nine people who died were under 21 years old.

They were youth with bright futures, a teacher who loved the river, older students getting a fresh start.

Their families, friends and community are devastated by their loss.

TREVEN ANSPACH

Treven Anspach's close friend Danny Gil said Anspach loved playing soccer and basketball, and he was good at it because he was taller than everybody else. He also liked just hanging out with friends.

"He always had a smile on his face, I don't know. He was just like the type of guy that was always cheerful to be around," Gil said.

Gil was devastated when he heard from his roommate that a mutual friend had seen Anspach get shot. He believes Anspach was the victim who was brought to Mercy Medical Center and died there.

"I wasn't ready to let him go. I just wasn't ready for it. I just cry about it and talk to my friends about it and my family," Gil said.

Gil said Anspach had his whole life ahead of him.

"He was doing good in college. He had a girlfriend. He was engaged, and he was ready for life to just begin," he said.

In a statement, Anspach's family described him as "one of the most positive young men, always looking for the best in life. Treven was larger than life and brought out the best in those around him."

According to his parents, Anspach was "a perfect son."

Anspach played basketball for the Sutherlin Bulldogs and at UCC.

Umpqua Riverhawks basketball coach Dan Leeworthy wrote on Facebook that Anspach wanted to "marry his high school sweetheart, be a firefighter like his Dad, and to serve others."

"To me he was a friend and a coach's dream. He was a friend to everyone," Leeworthy wrote.

LARRY LEVINE

Larry Levine was an assistant English professor at Umpqua Community College. He was an avid fisherman, a member of the Steamboaters fishing group and a former fly fishing guide.

Levine was teaching an English class just before the shooting, and it was his classroom the gunman entered when the terror began.

Friend and fellow Steamboater Dale Greenley remembered Levine as an "easy-going, kind of quiet, laid back" man. Greenley had known Levine since the 1970s. He said Levine did whatever it took to stay by the river so he could keep on fishing.

"He could have gone off somewhere and probably made good money, but he loved the Umpqua and he stayed here and he finally got that job at the UCC and that was really nice," he said.

Greenley doesn't have a television set, so he didn't know about Levine's death until he was called by a reporter with a national news outlet.

"That's when I found out. It was kind of a shock. I'm still kind of processing it," he said.

Greenley said Levine was fun to talk to. They shared fishing stories together. Levine was a great writer who loved to describe the North Umpqua River he loved, Greenley said.

"He was just part of the river," Greenley said. "Larry loved the river. He committed his life to it."

He was also popular with students.

"If you ever had any questions or problems or anything else, he was Johnny-on-the-spot to help you out," said Taylor Gunn, 21, of Myrtle Creek who took her first ever community college class from Levine last spring.

KIM DIETZ, 59, ROSEBURG

Kim Dietz was a strong and compassionate woman, whose love of animals defined her, said Carolyn Whitehorn, Dietz's mother-in-law.

Dietz owned two Great Pyrenees dogs.

Whitehorn recalled Dietz setting out to befriend a local feral cat who was determined to stay wild.

"Feral cats are not easy to tame," she said through tears. "But she had him tamed in what seemed like no time at all. She would sit outside when he was around and just talk to him and offer him food until he came close enough to pet."

Eventually, the cat became the family pet who lived with Dietz for many years.

"She was such a strong and powerful woman," Whitehorn said. "She will be missed greatly."

LUCAS EIBEL, 18, ROSEBURG

Lucas Eibel's family said they have been "trying to figure out how to tell everyone how amazing Lucas was, but that would take 18 years."

Eibel was an FFA member and a volunteer with Wildlife Safari and Saving Grace. He was a Ford Family Foundation scholarship recipient and was studying chemistry.

He and three of his siblings were quadruplets. They were nicknamed The Quad by their friends at Roseburg High School.

In 2014, Lucas Eibel told News-Review reporter Kate Stringer it's "always funny to see people's reactions" when they find out the four are fraternal quadruplets.

Eibel was studying chemistry in his first year at UCC. It was his favorite subject in high school.

The family has asked that donations be given to Roseburg High School FFA and to the injured victims.

QUINN GLEN COOPER, 18, ROSEBURG

Quinn Glen Cooper was in his fourth day of college.

"We are shocked this has happened," his family's statement said.

Cooper was funny, smart and compassionate. He was the kind of guy who stood up

for other people, according to family members. He was going to take his brown-belt test in karate next week.

''I don't know how we're going to move forward with our lives without Quinn. Our lives have been shattered beyond repair,'' the family statement said.

''I can't actually believe you are gone,'' wrote Cooper's friend Andrew Phillips on Facebook. ''You always made me laugh and we always finished each other's sentences.''

Former classmate Luke Counsell wrote on Facebook about a time that Cooper was the only one to follow him to the changing room to comfort him when he broke down while rehearsing for a play.

''He wasn't just a 'friend,' he was a brother,'' Counsell wrote.

REBECKA ANN CARNES, 18, MYRTLE CREEK

Rebecka Carnes had just started both a new job and her college career, according to her cousin Lisa Crawford. She was studying for a job in a health care field.

''She had people in her life that loved her fiercely and are devastated,'' Crawford wrote on Facebook.

Carnes was a relative of U.S. Sen. Jeff Merkley—his cousin's great-granddaughter.

Merkley called Carnes a ''beautiful spirit,'' according to The Oregonian.

She graduated South Umpqua High School in June. She played softball.

Kristy Westbrooks, an English teacher said, ''Going to UCC was always her plan A she worked really hard to earn scholarships last year.''

''Everybody said she was a sweet person and very well thought of,'' said Jim Howard, superintendent of the South Umpqua School District.

LUCERO ALCARAZ, 19, ROSEBURG

Lucero Alcaraz was in the UCC Scholars program and studying to become a pediatric nurse. Friends called her beautiful and kind-hearted.

Friend Brittany Eggers said Alcaraz was a talented artist and a great person.

''She was probably the sweetest person I know, probably the most genuine too,'' Eggers said. ''She never once said anything bad about anybody.''

Eggers said she is confused and angry about what happened to her friend.

''I just don't understand,'' she said.

Alcaraz's sister Maria Alcaraz, heartbroken, wrote on Facebook that she never got the chance to tell her how proud she was of her accomplishments.

''You were going to do great things love,'' she wrote.

JASON JOHNSON, 33, WINSTON

Jason Johnson spent the last few months of his life fighting.

A part of The Salvation Army's rehabilitation program to battle addiction, Johnson went from being beat up and physically ill to being a role model, said close friend Chuck Bellinger, who described their friendship as a brotherhood.

''He was always right there,'' said Bellinger who was in the program along with Johnson. ''His room was right next to mine and every night I'd go to bed and before that boy would get into his bed, he'd come pop my door open and tell me good night and that he loved me.

''We have to carry the torch. His torch is a bright one and probably very difficult to go on with,'' he said.

But Bellinger said that Johnson's death was not in vain.

''Our brother was following his dream and sobered up and was becoming a productive member of society,'' he said. ''He died a sober and upright man—a dude that was loving his family and an example for everyone.''

He was attending UCC and his family said Johnson had found the right path and they were proud of him for enrolling in school.

SARENA DAWN MOORE, 44, MYRTLE CREEK

Sarena Moore was a Seventh-Day Adventist who loved animals, according to Oregon Public Broadcasting.

According to the online Adventist magazine Spectrum, Moore was a firm believer of prayer, a single mother with few possessions but a big heart. She attended Reno High School and had recently moved to Myrtle Creek from Grants Pass to attend UCC.

Her pictures on Facebook are of dogs and horses, suggesting she was an animal lover.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF FRIENDSHIP MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize the 125th anniversary of the founding of Friendship Missionary Baptist Church, in Anniston, Alabama.

The church was founded in March 1890 by four local reverends, when it was then known as the Galilee Baptist Church. During the first 10 years of the church's existence, the congregation held services under a tent in what is now a local park in Lincoln, Alabama.

In 1900, the church moved into their first building. Sadly, this burned down in April of 1905. The congregation again met under a tent for services, doing so until 1910 when they built their own church, a wooden structure. With a significantly expanding membership, Reverend W.L. Maddox ordered the construction of a red brick building on the site in 1921, which still stands today.

The church has had four pastors since then, and seen significant expansions, such as the construction of a family life center. The current pastor, Reverend Carlton L. Phillips, has served since 2010.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the congregation of Friendship Missionary Baptist Church on their 125th Anniversary.

TAIWAN'S DOUBLE TEN DAY

HON. CHARLES J. "CHUCK" FLEISCHMANN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, as the people of Taiwan celebrate their national holiday, Double Ten Day, on October 10th, I would like to extend my congratulations and best wishes to them.

The United States and Taiwan enjoy a longstanding relationship that stems from our shared values: democracy, the rule of law, and free enterprise. Taiwan is a strong national security and economic partner. The island is now our 10th-largest trading partner. Also, Taiwan is the 5th largest export market for Asia in my home state of Tennessee.

In recent decades, Taiwan has created a democracy which conducts direct presidential elections every four years and has witnessed the peaceful passage of power from one political party to another on two occasions. This serves as a powerful example to other nations in the region and beyond who aspire to democracy. Taiwan is a regional and global economic force, and they make global contributions culturally in many diverse fields, Through our shared security partnership, the island also contributes to the security of the Asia-Pacific and is a humanitarian force around the globe.

I would like to congratulate Taiwan on the occasion of Double Ten Day, and I look forward to many more years of friendship between our two countries.

IN HONOR OF THE HERITAGE FELLOWSHIP CHURCH ON THEIR 37TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Heritage Fellowship Church of Reston, Virginia. Heritage Fellowship Church, initially named Christian Community Fellowship, began in 1978 as the town of Reston's first African-American church. In the church's early stages, it moved around, having its services in different high schools. Howard University's School of Divinity and the Washington DC Community of Faith provided pastors to lead the church and the church's first pastoral advisor was Dr. Harold Hunt of Howard Divinity School, who served from May of 1978 to January of 1979. Dr. Earnest W. Armstrong, Sr. was next to give pastoral leadership to Heritage Fellowship Church, serving from January of 1979 to March of that same year. Over the years, Heritage Fellowship Church has had many distinguished advisors from the religious community, attesting to its deep community ties. In 1995, on the first Sunday in November, Reverend Dr. Norman A. Tate began his 20 year tenure at Heritage Fellowship Church as an Interim Pastor. Three dedicated years later he rose to the office of Senior Pastor. In June of 2012, a 73,000 square foot building was finished, the result of a years-long capital campaign. This building houses a youth center, staff offices and many other rooms that benefit the entire community. This year, on Saturday, October 10th, they will celebrate two significant events. The first is the 37th anniversary of Heritage Fellowship Church and the second is the 20th anniversary of Reverend Dr. Tate's leadership at Heritage Fellowship Church. Heritage Fellowship Church and Reverend Dr. Tate have both made a great impact on our community, and for that, we are all grateful.

104TH NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the 104th National Day of the

Republic of China approaches on October 10th, I rise today to commemorate that historic event and to congratulate the people of Taiwan. October 10th, 1911 marked the beginning of the Wuchan Uprising, which led to the establishment of the Republic of China in 1912. Today, Taiwan is one of the world's most developed economies, a consolidated representative democracy, and a great friend of the United States of America.

Taiwan is there to lend a helping hand wherever and whenever there is a natural disaster or other humanitarian tragedy. When the World Health Organization declared the Ebola outbreak an international public health emergency, Taiwan stepped up preparatory measures to protect its citizens while collaborating with the international community to mount an effective response. Taiwan's Center for Disease Control set up an emergency response team and organized expert consultation meetings for more than 100,000 public health professionals.

Additionally, under the leadership of President Ma Ying-jeou, Taiwan made a significant donation to the CDC Foundation's Global Disaster Response Fund, pledged all necessary measures to prevent the spread of Ebola in Taiwan, and agreed to donate 100,000 sets of protective equipment for the Ebola workers in West Africa. Taiwan seeks to become a member of important international organizations such as the World Health Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL). Given Taiwan's proven success in international healthcare and peaceful operations, we should do all we can to support Taiwan's participation in those key international organizations.

Taiwan is also a responsible member of the international community and constantly works for the peaceful resolution of disputes. Taiwan has achieved a remarkable reduction of cross-strait tensions, and I believe that Taiwan deserves to be a member of international organizations so that it can more effectively work for peace, harmony, and civilized conduct by all nations throughout the world.

It was my privilege to visit Taiwan in July of this year. I personally witnessed Taiwan's vibrant democracy, advanced development and women's right promotion. I encourage my colleagues to visit Taiwan, support of our friends there, and support their bids for entrée into international organizations.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7129–S7172

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2136–2146, S. Res. 278–279, and S. Con. Res. 22. **Pages S7159–60**

Measures Passed:

Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act: Senate passed H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7167–71**

Daines (for Thune) Amendment No. 2709, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7171**

Quarterly Financial Report Reauthorization Act: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3116, to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S7171**

Daines (for Sasse) Amendment No. 2710, to protect privacy for the American public. **Page S7171**

White House Fellows program 50th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 22, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the White House Fellows program. **Page S7171**

Honoring Red Land Little League Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 279, honoring the Red Land Little League Team of Lewisberry, Pennsylvania, for the performance of the Team in the 2015 Little League World Series. **Page S7171**

Congratulating the University of Kansas: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 272, congratulating the University of Kansas for 150 years of outstanding service to the State of Kansas, the United States, and the world, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S7171–72**

Measures Considered:

Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. **Pages S7129–31**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, October 8, 2015. **Page S7129**

Conference Reports:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. **Pages S7131–56**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 73 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. 275), 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 conference report to accompany the bill. **Page S7136**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, October 7, 2015, with the time until 1 p.m. equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; that the time from 1 p.m. until 1:30 p.m. be controlled by the Democratic manager, or his designee, and that the time from 1:30 p.m. until 2 p.m. be controlled by the Chairman, or his designee; and that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all post-cloture time on the conference report to accompany the bill be deemed expired at 2 p.m. **Page S7172**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, the Supplementary Agreement amending the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Czech Republic; which was referred to the Committee on Finance. (PM—28) **Page S7159**

Messages from the House: **Page S7159**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S7130**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S7159, S7172**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S7159**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7160–61**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7161–63**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7157–59**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7163–67**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7167**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S7167**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—275) **Page S7136**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 p.m. and adjourned at 7:01 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 7, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7172.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

AFGHANISTAN

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the situation in Afghanistan, after receiving testimony from General John F. Campbell, USA, Commander, United States Forces-Afghanistan, Department of Defense.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE AND ENERGY SECURITY

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the potential modernization of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and related energy security issues, after receiving testimony from Ernest J. Moniz, Secretary of Energy; Admiral Dennis C. Blair, USN (Ret.), Commission on Energy and Geopolitics, Kevin Book, ClearView Energy Partners, LLC, and Sarah O. Ladislaw, Center for Strategic and International Studies, all of Washington, D.C.; and Jason E. Bordoff, Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs Center on Global Energy Policy, New York, New York.

U.S. ROLE AND STRATEGY IN MIDDLE EAST

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the United States role and strategy in the Middle East, focusing on Yemen and the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council, after receiving testimony from Mary Beth Long, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and Stephen A. Seche, The Arab Gulf States Institute in Washington, both of Washington, D.C.

NLRB JOINT EMPLOYER DECISION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the National Labor Relations Board's joint employer decision, after receiving testimony from Ciara Stockeland, MODE, Fargo, North Dakota; Edward Martin, Tilson Home Corporation, Austin, Texas; Mark G. Kisicki, Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak and Stewart, P.C., Phoenix, Arizona; and Michael Rubin, Altshuler Berzon LLP, San Francisco, California.

REGULATION AND MINORITIES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts concluded a hearing to examine regulation and minorities, after receiving testimony from Michael Barrera, The Libre Institute, Kansas City, Missouri; Timothy Sandefur, Pacific Legal Foundation, Sacramento, California; William C. Scott, Tristatz, LLC, Mosses, Alabama; Sabina Loving, Loving Tax Services, Inc., Chicago, Illinois; and Amit Narang, Public Citizen, Aaron Mair, Sierra Club, and Harry C. Alford, National Black Chamber of Commerce, all of Washington, D.C.

HEALTH AND BENEFITS LEGISLATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine pending health and benefits legislation, including S. 717, to designate certain non-Department mental health care providers who treat members of the Armed Forces and veterans as providers who have particular knowledge relating to the provision of mental health care to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, S. 1676, 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, S. 1754, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the temporary increase in number of judges presiding

over the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, S. 1885, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of assistance and benefits to veterans who are homeless, at risk of becoming homeless, or occupying temporary housing, S. 2013, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, and S. 2022, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, after receiving testimony from Senators Donnelly, Feinstein, and Shaheen; Thomas Lynch, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health Clinical Operations, Veterans Health Administration; David B. Norris, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Tracy, California; and Lauren Augustine, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Louis Celli, Jr., The American Legion, and Elisha Harig-Blaine, National League of Cities, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Michael Herman Michaud, of Maine, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 12 public bills, H.R. 3684–3695; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 463–465 were introduced. **Page H6835**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6836–37**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1525, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10–K and regulation S–K, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–279);

H.R. 1553, to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle (H. Rept. 114–280);

H.R. 1839, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–281);

H.R. 2091, to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify the ability to request consumer reports in certain cases to establish and enforce child support payments and awards (H. Rept. 114–282);

H.R. 3102, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration, streamline transportation security regulations, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–283);

H.R. 3510, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–284);

H.R. 2295, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to identify and designate National Energy Security Corridors for the construction of natural gas pipelines on Federal land, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–285);

H.R. 2288, to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–286);

H.R. 2358, to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to enhance the reliability of the electricity grid and reduce the threat of wildfires to and from electric transmission and distribution facilities on Federal lands by facilitating vegetation management on such lands, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–287, Part 1);

H. Res. 461, establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (H. Rept. 114–288); and

H. Res. 462, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3192) to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from October 12, 2015, through October 19, 2015 (H. Rept. 114–289). **Pages H6834–35**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Smith (NE) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6797**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:24 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H6799**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:10 p.m. and reconvened at 4:01 p.m. **Page H6801**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Child Support Assistance Act of 2015: H.R. 2091, to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify the ability to request consumer reports in certain cases to establish and enforce child support payments and awards; **Pages H6801–02**

Small Bank Exam Cycle Reform Act of 2015: H.R. 1553, to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 411 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 534; **Pages H6802–04, H6818**

Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act of 2015: H.R. 1525, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10–K and regulation S–K; **Pages H6804–05**

RAISE Act of 2015: H.R. 1839, amended, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain transactions involving purchases by accredited investors, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 404 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 535; **Pages H6805–08, H6818–19**

United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2015: S. 2078, to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom; **Pages H6808–11**

Airport Access Control Security Improvement Act of 2015: H.R. 3102, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform programs of the Transportation Security Administration and streamline transportation security regulations; **Pages H6811–13**

Department of Homeland Security Cybersecurity Strategy Act of 2015: H.R. 3510, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security; **Pages H6813–15**

Adoptive Family Relief Act: 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; **Pages H6815–17**

West Coast Dungeness Crab Management Act: H.R. 2168, amended, to make the current Dungeness crab fishery management regime permanent; and **Pages H6819–20**

Albuquerque Indian School Land Transfer Act: S. 986, to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico. **Pages H6820–21**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:48 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H6817**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress of the Supplementary Agreement to the Social Security Agreement between the United States and the Czech Republic—referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–64). **Pages H6800–01**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H6801.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6818 and H6819. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Committee Meetings

HOMEBUYERS ASSISTANCE ACT; RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A SELECT INVESTIGATIVE PANEL OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 3192, the ''Homebuyers Assistance Act''; and a hearing and markup on a resolution establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. In section 2, the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from October 12, 2015, through October 19, 2015: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. In section 3, the rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of

the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2. Testimony was heard from Chairman Hensarling and Representatives Maxine Waters of California, Blackburn, and Pallone. The resolution establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce was ordered reported, without amendment.

BUSINESS MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting on Member access requests. Motion to grant the request for access to certain Committee documents made by Mr. Poe of Texas passed. Motion to grant House Armed Services Committee and Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee staff access to certain classified information received by the Committee, and to authorize the Chairman, in consultation with the ranking member, to allow cleared House Armed Services Committee and Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee staff to attend committee hearings or briefings on this particular issue passed. This meeting was closed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine the National Institutes of Health, focusing on investing in a healthier future, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine Iranian influence in Iraq and the case of Camp Liberty, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine removing barriers to wireless broadband deployment, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy, to hold hearings to examine the North Korea threat and United States policy, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 708, to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, S. 1607, to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, S. 1818, to amend title 5, United States Code, to reform the rule making process of agencies, S. 1820, to require agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules, S. 1817, to improve the effectiveness of major rules in accomplishing their regulatory objectives by promoting retrospective review, S. 1873, to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, S. 2021, to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, S. Res. 104, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the success of Operation Streamline and the importance of prosecuting first time illegal border crossers, S. 2093, to provide that the Secretary of Transportation shall have sole authority to appoint Federal Directors to the Board of Directors of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, H.R. 998, to establish the conditions under which the Secretary of Homeland Security may establish preclearance facilities, conduct preclearance operations, and provide customs services outside the United States, H.R. 322, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office", H.R. 323, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office", H.R. 324, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11662 Gravois Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office", H.R. 558, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 South Pioneer Boulevard in Springboro, Ohio, as the "Richard 'Dick' Chenault Post Office Building", H.R. 1442, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Cornell Street in Kingston, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz Post Office Building", H.R. 1884, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 206 West Commercial Street in East Rochester, New York, as the "Officer Daryl R. Pierson Memorial Post Office Building", H.R. 3059, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4500 SE 28th Street, Del City, Oklahoma, as the James Robert Kalsu Post Office Building, an original bill entitled, "Directing Dollars to Disaster Relief Act of 2015", an original bill entitled, "Inspector General Mandates Reporting Act of 2015", and an original bill entitled, "Fraud Reduction and Data Analytics Act of 2015", 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 1579, to enhance and integrate Native American tourism, empower Native American communities, increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets, and expand heritage and cultural tourism opportunities in the United States, and H.R. 487, to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine S. 817, to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon, S. 818, to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, S. 1436, to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, S. 1761, to take certain Federal land located in Lassen County, California, into trust for

the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, S. 1822, to take certain Federal land located in Tuolumne County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, S. 1986, to provide for a land conveyance in the State of Nevada, and H.R. 387, to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, to hold hearings to examine S. 2102, to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: business meeting to consider S. 1811, to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to make loans to certain businesses, homeowners, and renters affected by Superstorm Sandy, S. 2116, to improve certain programs of the Small Business Administration to better assist small business customers in accessing broadband technology, S. 2126, to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, an original bill entitled, ''Small Contractors Improve Competition Act of 2015'', an original bill entitled, ''Small Business Subcontracting Transparency Act of 2015'', and an original bill entitled, ''Improving Small Business Innovative Research and Technologies Act of 2015'', 11 a.m., SR–428A.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine if the Federal Government is doing enough to protect seniors from identity theft, 2 p.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing to review the development of the 2015 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 9 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled ''Plutonium Disposition and the MOX Project'', 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Strengthening Head Start for Current and Future Generations'', 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled ''Protecting America's Workers: An Enforcement Update from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration'', 1 p.m., 2261 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled ''EPA's CO2 Regulations for New and Existing Power Plants'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''Improving Federal Spectrum Systems'', 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Reforming Food Aid: Desperate Need to Do Better'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Food Security and Nutrition Programs in Africa'', 12:45 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled ''Reviewing President Xi's State Visit'', 12:15 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, hearing entitled ''Examining the Mission, Structure, and Reorganization Effort of the National Protection and Programs Directorate'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 974, the ''Yellowstone and Grand Teton Paddling Act''; H.R. 1107, the ''Bureau of Reclamation Transparency Act''; H.R. 1452, to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; H.R. 1820, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to retire coal preference right lease applications for which the Secretary has made an affirmative commercial quantities determination, and for other purposes; H.R. 2212, to take certain Federal lands located in Lassen County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and for other purposes; H.R. 2270, the ''Billy Frank Jr. Tell Your Story Act''; H.R. 2406, the ''SHARE Act''; and H.R. 3382, the ''Lake Tahoe Restoration Act of 2015'', 4 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 538, the ''Native American Energy Act''; and H.R. 702, to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The EMV Deadline and What It Means for Small Businesses'', 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled ''Ensuring Aviation Safety in the Era of Unmanned Aircraft Systems'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''A Call for System-Wide Change: Evaluating the Independent Assessment of the Veterans Health Administration'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on the rising costs of higher education and tax policy, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 7

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, National Defense Authorization Act. At 2 p.m., Senate will vote on adoption of the conference report to accompany the bill.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, October 7

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 3192—Homebuyers Assistance Act (Subject to a Rule). Possible consideration of H. Res. 461—establishing a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E1432
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1427
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E1435
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1435
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1430
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1432
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1428, E1429
Costello, Ryan A., Pa., E1426
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E1434
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E1425
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1430
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1431
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1434
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1432
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1433
Keating, William R., Mass., E1430
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1425
Mooney, Alexander X., W.Va. E1433
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E1431
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1427
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1434
Price, Tom, Ga., E1429
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1428
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E1426
Royce, Edward R., Calif., E1426
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1425, E1426, E1427, E1428
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E1427
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E1429
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E1425
Walden, Greg, Ore., E1433
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E1430
Young, David, Iowa, E1428, E1429, E1430, E1430, E1431, E1432, E1433, E1434, E1435

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.